Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	129905
District	MABANK ISD	

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	95.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.5%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	13.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	00/	00/	VE0.		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 ≥ 81%		82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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	129905
District	MABANK ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No 154901 MADISONVILLE CISD District

Region

06

State 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	93.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	58.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	11.3		TLS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	154901
strict	MADISONVII I F CISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MAGNOLIA ISD	

06

170906

Region

County District No

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 76.2% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 68.1% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 11.9% ≤ 10% 15.7% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 66.4% 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 23.8% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 54.0% 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 52.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	170906
District	MAGNOLIA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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)

District MAINI AND PREPARATORY ACADEMY

Region 04 County District No 084801

mip.//www.tea.state.tx.us/s	pecial.eu/			Feder	al Fiscal Yea	ar 2012 (2012-13)	Dist	rict	MAINLAND	PREPARAT	ORY ACAD	EMY
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recemajority 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	N/A	N/A	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	N/A	N/A	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level not reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading N/A	Reading N/A	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math N/A	Math N/A	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 76	TLS		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		not reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity.	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported

for children with disabilities

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

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

MAINLAND PREPARATORY ACADEMY District

Region

084801

County District No

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

County District No District MALAKOFF ISD

07

107906

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.5%	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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	58.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	169		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No _	107906
District	MALAKOFF ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 57%		59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some 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	109908

District ____ MALONE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	45.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary			\/=0	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	75.0%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70	120		120			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	109908
District	MALONE ISD	

Region

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57% 59% YES Due to sma numbers, dis level data are reported		s, district a are not		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

one year of leaving high school.

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

District	MALTA ISD	

Region

County District No

80

019910

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	123		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No	019910
District	MAI TA ISD	

Region

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	MANARA ACADEM

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 71.4% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A ≤ 10% NO 3.6% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 53.0% 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 63.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

10 Region County District No 057844

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	057844	
District	MANARA ACADEMY		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District MANOR ISD

Region

County District No

13

227907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	71.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.3%	YES	5B: 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
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	26.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	≥ 75%	56%	NO	44.0%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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	13
	County District No	227907
ictrict	MANOP ISD	

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO	NO	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	MANSFIELD ISD

Region

County District No

11

220908

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	78.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through with IEPs 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	4.3%	NO
	≥ 95% 98% YES 98.0% YE	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	29.8%	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	1 281% 82.7% YES			o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	U%	163		169	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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	220908

MANSFIELD ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

	•	
istrict	MARATHON ISD	

Region

County District No

18

022902

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 100% YES ≥ 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 6 of 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 50.0% NO 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 50.0% 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 100% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	022902
District	MARATHON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

isi		

MARBLE FALLS ISD

County District No

Region

13 027904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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%	Target? YES	5A: 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	3.7%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	10.2%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	59.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
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 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	123		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	027904
rict	MARBLE FALLS ISD	

Region

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	MARFA ISD	

18

189901

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 66.7% 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 8.3% YFS ≤ 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 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 100% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 47.0% 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 45.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	189901
District	MARFA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	13
County District No	094904

MARION ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.3%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.0%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	88.9%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 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 level data are not reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills			58.9%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%		YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool Summary children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	169		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	094904
District	MARION ISD	

Region

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MARLIN ISD	

12

073903

Region

County District No

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 YES ≥ 68% NO YES 81.8% 66% 72.2% 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 NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 9.1% ≤ 10% 14% 11.9% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.7% 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 100% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 24.0% 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 26.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	073903
District	MARI IN ISD	

Region

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district 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)

District	MARSHALL ISD

07

102902

Region

County District No

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 85.7% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 55.6% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 7.1% ≤ 10% 12.4% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 3.0% 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 61.9% 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 16.7% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 52.0% 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 45.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	102902
District	MARSHALL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	MART ISD	

12

161908

Region

County District No

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 YES ≥ 68% NO YES 85.7% 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 NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 14.3% 10.8% ≤ 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 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 100% YES ≤ 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 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 57.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	161908
District	MARTISD	

Region

12

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

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)

District	MARTINS MILL IS

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 66.7% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 70.0% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 33.3% NO 0.0% YFS ≤ 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 NO 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 2.0% 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 60.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

07 Region 234905 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)

	County District No _	234905
District	MARTINS MILL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MARTINSVILLE IS

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 65.9% 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 2.3% YFS ≤ 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 100% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 91.0% 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 65.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

07 Region 174909 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)

	County District No	174909
District	MARTINSVILLE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	15
County District No	157901

District ___ MASON ISD

State 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	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: 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		YES	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.1%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5 Summary		81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Sumr Statem		≥ 61%	61.8%	YES			
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 91.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	91.0%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		-1	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	001	YES		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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	157901
District	MASON ISD	

Region

15

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	MATAGORDA ISI
DISTRICT	INIA I AGUNDA ISI

County District No 158904

Region

03

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 25.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 25.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of		58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	11.3		TLS			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	158904
District	MATAGORDA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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

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

District	MATHIS ISD	

02

205904

Region

County District No

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 84.6% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 52.6% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 15.4% ≤ 10% 17.5% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 2.2% 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 28.6% 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 98.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 49.0% 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 46.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	205904
District	MATHIS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	•	-
District	MAUD ISD	

County District No

Region

80

019903

LEA State State **LEA Met** State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class ≥ 78% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 56.4% 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 9.1% YFS ≤ 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 76.0% 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 55.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	019903
District	MAUD ISD	

Region

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	15
County District No	025905

District MAY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	25.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.5%	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	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	. ==0/		\/=0	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	76.0%	YES	ninomougo una onino	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70	123		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No	025905
District	MAY ISD	

Region

15

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MAYPEARL 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% 76.9% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 56.7% 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% ≤ 10% NO 5.0% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.8% 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 10.0% 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 99.0% YES ≤ 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 40.0% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 69.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 66.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

10 Region County District No 070915

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	070915
District	MAYPEARL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MCALLEN ISD	

01

108906

Region

County District No

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 73.0% NO ≥ 68% NO 66% 62.2% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 18.0% ≤ 10% 19.2% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1.2% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES NO Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 11.0% 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 98.0% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 13.4% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 53.0% 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 55.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	108906
District	MCALLEN ISD	

Region

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

District	MCCAMEY ISE

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% 82.8% 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 3.4% YFS ≤ 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 42.9% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 52.0% 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 44.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Region 18 231901 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)

	County District No _	231901
District	MCCAMEY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

istrict	MCDADE ISD	

Region

County District No

13

011905

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 82.4% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A 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 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 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 YFS YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 73.0% 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 27.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	011905
District	MCDADE ISD	

Region

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MCGREGOR 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% 76.9% NO 83.3% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 49.1% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 16.7% NO 10.0% YFS ≤ 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% 0.9% 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 42.9% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 75.0% 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 65.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

12 Region 161909 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)

	County District No	161909
District	MCGREGOR ISD	

Region

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MCKINNEY ISD
District	MICKINIAL I 13D

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 89.9% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 68.8% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 1.0% ≤ 10% 14.0% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.2% 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 17.0% 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 99.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 3.6% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 70.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 69.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

10 Region County District No 043907

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	043907
District	MCKINNEY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	MCLEAN ISD	

Region

County District No

16

090903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 90.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	60.0%	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	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	0 /0			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No _	090903	
District	MCLEAN ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported			
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	MCLEOD ISD	

Region

County District No

80

034906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.5%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.0%	YES	
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority 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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte 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	Due to small numbers, district level		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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	Due to small		
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statemer		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	034906
etrict	MCI FOD ISD	

Region

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	MCMULLEN	COUNTY IS

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 92.3% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 7.7% YFS 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 82.0% 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 73.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

02 Region 162904 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)

	County District No	162904
District	MCMULLEN COUNTY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators State Rate State Target?		LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MEADOW ISD	

Region

County District No

17

223902

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 92.0% 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 4.0% YFS ≤ 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 57.0% 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 38.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

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

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

	County District No _	223902
District	MEADOW ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Performance Report Indicators Target F		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District

MEADOWLAND CHARTER SCHOOL

Region 20 County District No 130801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	96.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 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	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 24.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 24.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 76	11.3		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

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

District	MEADOWI AND	CHARTER	CCHOOL
District	MEADOWLAND	CHARIER	SCHOOL

Region

130801

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO	YES	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	04
County District No	101801

District MEDICAL CENTER CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 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	0.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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 education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	163		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District MEDICAL CENTER CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

101801

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Target?		State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	MEDINA ISD	

20

010901

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 35.1% 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 8.1% YFS ≤ 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 96.0% 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 86.0% 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 59.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	010901
District	MEDINA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

trict	MEDINA VALLE
liicl	MICDINA VALLE

Dist EY ISD

Region

County District No

20

163908

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.2%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.4%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.8%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	88.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 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%		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	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		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
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		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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 invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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	20
County District No	163908

District MEDINA VALLEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary in the time they left school. ≥ 57% 59%		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No	043908

Region

MELISSA ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 ≥ 79% 81.7% YE with IEPs who		YES	Due to small — numbers, district level			
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	163		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	043908		
District	MELISSA ISD			

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

C	County District No	096904

Region

16

MEMPHIS ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 77.0%	Math YES	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, distri data are not re	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	00/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No _	096904
District	MEMPHIS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	MENARD ISD	

15

164901

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	94.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 39.0%	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 24.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0 70	120		120		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	164901
District	MENARD ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	MERCEDES ISD

Region

County District No

01

108907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	76.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.6%	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		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	78.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to 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 leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved 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	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No	108907	
District	MERCEDES ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	MERIDIAN 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% 76.9% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 53.1% 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% ≤ 10% NO 0.0% YFS 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 NO 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 10.2% 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 33.3% 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 66.7% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 83.0% 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 73.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

12 Region County District No 018902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	018902
District	MERIDIAN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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

MERIDIAN WORLD SCHOOL LLC

County District No

Region

13 246801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	73.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 83.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 76	113		ILS			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

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

District	MERIDIAN WORLD SCHOOL	LLC

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

County District No	221904
_	

Region

District MERKEL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	71.4%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	42.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills			58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		163			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	County District No	221904
District	MERKEL ISD	

Region

14

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	MESQUITE ISD
DISTRICT	MESQUITE ISD

Region

County District No

10

057914

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	84.3%	YES	5A: 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	11.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.5%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	27.8%	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		≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	123		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No _	057914
District	MESQUITE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	12
County District No	147903

District _ **MEXIA ISD**

State 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	84.2%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	52.6%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.2%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	25.4%	NO	
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	9.1%	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	27.3%	NO	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to 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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 34.0%	Math NO	h acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summa		≥ 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	004	004	VEC		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool Summary children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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	12
	County District No	147903
Dietrict	MEXIVISD	

12

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

04
101855

District MEYERPARK ELEMENTARY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 0.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	> 570/	50.00/	VE0	,	district level ot reported	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	0.0%	NO		Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES			
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		small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	370	5 70			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	riate behaviors to Summary		73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	Oddrity District No	101033
District	MEYERPARK ELEMENTARY	•

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

District	MEYERSVILLE
District	

County District No 062906 E ISD

Region

03

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	C					district level ot reported	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	56.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		-	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		I ES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

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

	County District No _	062906
District	MEYERSVILLE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No	197902

Region

District MIAMI ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 90.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No	197902
District	MIAMLISD	

Region

16

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

MIDLAND ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

County District No

Region

18

165802

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	93.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and 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	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	U 76	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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

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

County District No _____165802

District MIDLAND ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

18

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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	MIDLAND ISD	

Region

County District No

18

165901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	67.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	19.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.4%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 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	23.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.4%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No _	165901	
District	MIDLAND ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No	070908

Region

10

District MIDLOTHIAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	81.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood 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		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	C					district level ot reported
	knowledge and skills St	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	and and more opposite						
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	U 76	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Cummon	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

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

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

	County District No _	070908
District	MIDLOTHIAN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region 01
County District No 108804

District MIDVALLEY ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summa stateme		≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	25.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	uata are m	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES	of appropriate behaviors to Summai	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level 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)

MIDVALLEY ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT District

Region

108804

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	MIDWAY ISD	

Region

County District No

09

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	6.7%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 70.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		VEQ	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0% YES			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	039905	
District	MIDWAY ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	MIDWAY ISD	

Region

County District No

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.7%	YES	5A: 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	2.4%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	21.7%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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	34.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	31.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00%	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0% YES		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	161903
District	MIDWAY ISD	

Region

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	MILANO ISD	

06

166903

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 84.1% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% 2.3% YFS ≤ 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 33.3% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 51.0% 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 56.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	166903
District	MILANO ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MILDRED ISD	

12

175910

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 77.6% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 2.0% YFS 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 63.0% 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 63.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	175910
District	MILDRED ISD	

Region

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	MILES ISD	

15

200902

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.4%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 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		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	40.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	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			YES	00.070	YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	200902
District	MILES ISD	

Region

15

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 57% YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	MILFORD ISD	

10

070909

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 81.8% 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% ≤ 10% NO 0.0% YFS 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 79.0% 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 79.0% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	070909
District	MILFORD ISD	

Region

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

Region

County District No

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district 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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	11.3		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 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)

County District No	112907
MILLED CDOVE ICD	

Region

80

District

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

Region

County District No

11

184904

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 64.8% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 11.1% 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 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 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 50.0% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 75.0% 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 65.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	184904
District	MILLSAP ISD	

Region

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

MINEOLA ISD

District

07

250903

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	14.2%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority 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	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.1%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	51.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		- [
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	U%	169		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No	250903
District	MINEOLA ISD	

Region

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District MINERAL WELLS ISD

Region

County District No

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	76.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	15.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	2.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	12.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 38.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	U%	1 1 5		1 1 2	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	11
County District No	182903

District MINERAL WELLS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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)

	County District No	108908
District	MISSION CISD	

Region

01

108908

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 67.5% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 76.9% 66% 78.2% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 18.8% NO NO ≤ 10% 14% 11.5% 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% 0.9% 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 2.8% 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 97.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 36.0% 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 46.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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 suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% YES schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	108908
District	MISSION CISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD

County District No

Region

18

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	58.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	15.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.4%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	20.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 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
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	11.3		TLS			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD District

level data are not

reported

Region

County District No

18

238902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district

one year of leaving high school.

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region

County District No

09

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 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	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	U 76	123		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district 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)

	County District No _	169908
District	MONTAGUE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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 MONTE ALTO ISD

Region

County District No

01

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	37.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 17.0%	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 24.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 ≥ 81% with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		1 E 9	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	108915	
District	MONTE ALTO ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

County District No 170903 District MONTGOMERY ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	89.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	37.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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		small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	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%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	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)

	County District No	170903
District	MONTGOMERY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

	MOODY ISD	1	

Region

County District No

12

161910

District MOODY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.3%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.3%	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		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES	
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority 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	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 76	ILS		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	, district level not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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)

	County District No	161910		
District	MOODY ISD			

Region

12

reported

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 11: Percent of children who were 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.6% 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

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)

District	MORAN ISD	

Region

County District No

14

209902

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 95.0% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 5.0% YFS ≤ 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special YES 95.0% YES ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 39.0% 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 37.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	209902
District	MORAN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

12

018903

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 81.3% 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% ≤ 10% NO 6.3% YFS 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 "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 6.3% 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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 92.0% NO ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 91.0% 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 73.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	018903	
District	MORGAN ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	MORGAN MILL IS	C

Region

County District No

11

072910

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and 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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	U 70	163		IES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	072910
District	MORGAN MILL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	MORTON ISD	

Region

County District No

17

040901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						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%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No _	040901
District	MORTON ISD	

Region 17

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established targets under the approved conditional No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver for specific provisions. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies 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	17
County District No	173901

District MOTLEY COUNTY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	46.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority 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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	-	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No _	173901
District	MOTLEY COUNTY ISD	

Region

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	MOULTON 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% 76.9% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 37.0% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 11.1% 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 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 76.0% 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 91.0% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

03 Region County District No 143902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	143902
District	MOULTON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

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

District	MOUNT	CALM ISD
District	INICOIAI	CALINI 13D

≥ 81%

≥ 72%

≥ 76%

Statement 1

Summary

Statement 2

82.7%

73.2%

77.6%

YFS

YES

YES

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

12

109910

Region

County District No

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 92.0% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A ≤ 10% NO 4.0% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 92.0% NO ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 75.0% 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 67.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary

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%

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	109910
istrict	MOUNT CALM ISD	

Region

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

istrict	MOUNT ENTERPRISE ISD
1511101	MICONI ENTERFRISE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.3%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES			
3C: 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	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	special education services w schools facilitated parent inv	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results		77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

Region 07 County District No 201907

Di

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	201907
MOUNT ENTERPRISE ISD	

District

Region

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	08
County District No	225902

District MOUNT PLEASANT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	97.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.7%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.1%	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	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.6%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	72.0%	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	12.2%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES			
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	ion and use of		58.9%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 | ocal Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

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

	County District No	225902
District	MOUNT PLEASANT ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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	MOUNT VERNON ISD	

Region

County District No

80

080901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	47.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.0%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	80.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	13.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VE0.		V/50	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	080901
District	MOUNT VERNON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

strict	MUENSTER ISD	

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	38.3%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.4%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	-	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 84.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 86.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2			YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
AA: 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	U 76	U 70	163		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invested for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	049902
District	MUENSTER ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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)

	County District No	009901
District	MULESHOE ISD	

Region

17

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 87.5% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 76.9% 66% 81.3% 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 YFS ≤ 10% 14% 1.6% 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1% 0.8% 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 73.9% 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 26.1% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 51.0% 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 62.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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 suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% YES schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	009901		
District	MULESHOE ISD			

Region

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

District	MULLIN ISD	

Region

County District No

12

167902

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% 79.2% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 100% NO 8.3% 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1% 0.0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 100% 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 YFS YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 88.0% 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 81.0% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	167902
District	MULLINISD	

Region

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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

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

District	MUMFORD ISD	

06

198906

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 94.1% 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 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 YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1% 2.9% 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 YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 100% 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 YFS YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 73.0% 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 71.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	198906
District	MUMFORD ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	MUNDAY CISD
District	MICHUAL CIOD

Region

County District No

09

138903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.4%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and 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	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	17.6%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 32.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0%	VES		VEQ	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0% YES	TES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No	138903
ictrict	MINDAY CISD	

Region

09

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	MURCHISON ISD
District	MICHOLINGOIN ICD

07

107908

Region

County District No

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 77.8% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A ≤ 10% NO 0.0% YFS 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 89.0% 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 67.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

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

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

	County District No _	107908
District	MURCHISON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	07
County District No	174904

District NACOGDOCHES ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	77.1%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	48.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.0%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a 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	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	ath acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

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

	County District No	174904	
District	NACOGDOCHES ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	NATALIA 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% 76.9% NO NO ≥ 68% NO 50.0% 66% 65.0% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 16.7% ≤ 10% NO 7.0% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1.0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES 0.0% NO Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special YES 95.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 54.0% 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 58.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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 Region County District No 163903

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	163903
District	NATALIA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	NAVARRO ISD	

Region

County District No

13

094903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.0%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.5%	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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.5%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math Children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 YES Skills (including social relationships) 7A: Percent of preschool Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES			
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 72.0%	Math 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						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No _	094903
District	NAVARRO ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	NAVASOTA ISD	

Region

County District No

06

093904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	81.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	60.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.2%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	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	19.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 54.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO		Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, dis data are not	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs			YES	40.076		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	0% 0%	0%	TES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are not rep	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 | ocal Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

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

	County District No _	093904
District	NAVASOTA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25% 27% YES num leve		numbers level dat	ue to small bers, district data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	NAZARETH ISI
DISTRICT	NAZANETHIS

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% 77.8% 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 0.0% YFS ≤ 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 33.3% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 80.0% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Region 16 County District No 035903

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	035903
District	NAZARETH ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	NECHES ISD	

07

001906

Region

County District No

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 66.7% NO ≥ 68% NO 66% 52.3% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 33.3% ≤ 10% NO 6.8% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 NO ≥ 95% 98% 100% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 69.0% 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 73.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	001906
District	NECHES ISD	

Region

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	> 57% 50% VES nun		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	NEDERLAND ISD	

05

123905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.1%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	7.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.8%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	55.8%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to 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	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 64.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	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		ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U76	U 76	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No _	123905
District	NEDERLAND ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	> 57% 50% VES nun		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	NEEDVILLE ISD

Region

County District No

04

079906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.1%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.4%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	11.1%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 district level	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	U 76	123		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	079906	
District	NEEDVILLE ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	NEW BOSTON ISD

80

019905

Region

County District No

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 85.7% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 54.3% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 7.1% 22.5% ≤ 10% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 62.5% 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 74.0% 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 65.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	019905	
District	NEW BOSTON ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

	AIT VAL	DDALINEEL	
trict	INEVV	BRAUNFEL	i

Dist S ISD

Region

County District No

13

046901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	79.2%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	63.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.5%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	11.9%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	21.4%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	6.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	046901
District	NEW BRAUNFELS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	NEW CANEY ISD
DISTRICT	NEW CANETIOD

06

170908

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO	5A : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.4%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	8.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	7.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	38.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	TES		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	170908	_
District	NEW CANEY ISD		

Region

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 NO ≥ 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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

County District No

District **NEW DEAL ISD**

Region

17

152902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.9%	YES		5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	79.4%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.3%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 79.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 77.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /0	113		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No _	152902	
District	NEW DEAL ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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)

District	NEW DIANA ISD

07

230906

Region

County District No

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 85.7% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 61.5% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 14.3% ≤ 10% NO YFS 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 "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1.5% 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 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 94.0% NO ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 96.0% 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 78.0% 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 58.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	230906
District	NEW DIANA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

NEW FRONTIERS CHARTER SCHOOL District

County District No

Region

20

015805

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A		5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	68.0%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills			58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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

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

District	NEW FRONTIERS CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

015805

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	NEW HOME ISD	

17

153905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	72.2%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		Due to 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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No _	153905	
District	NEW HOME ISD		

Region

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

Region

County District No

07

037908

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	40.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement Statement		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0 /0	ILS		ILO			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	County District No	037908
District	NEW SUMMERFIELD ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 57%		59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary et imperiod in higher than the time they left 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	NEW WAVERLY 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% 76.9% NO 83.3% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 45.2% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 11.8% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 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 95.0% YES ≤ 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 25.0% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 73.0% 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 56.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

06 Region County District No 236901

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	236901
District	NEW WAVERLY ISD	

Region

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

District	NEWCASTLE ISD

Region

County District No

09

252902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	89.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	5.3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 88.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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
AA: 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 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	163		159			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	tho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	252902
District	NEWCASTLE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary 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 level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for 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 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary in the secondary school in the		YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		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 11
County District No 220817
NEWMAN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF ARLINGTON

District	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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	Due to small numbers, district level	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	123		110			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No 2208

NEWMAN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF

Region

District ARLINGTON

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	NEWTON ISD	

05

176902

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	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	23.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5		81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	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 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	U 76	123		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

	County District No _	176902
District	NEWTON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	NIXON-SMILEY C

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 68.4% 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% ≤ 10% NO 1.0% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 58.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 59.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

13 Region 089903 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)

	County District No	089903	
District	NIXON-SMILEY CISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level dat repo	s, district a are not

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	09
County District No	169902

District **NOCONA ISD**

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.2%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C : Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 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	44.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	quisition and use of		58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0 76	113		ILG			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	169902
District	NOCONA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	03
County District No	062902

NORDHEIM ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 92.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved 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	≥ 75% 0%	56%	NO YES	67.0%	NO YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 70	123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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 invi 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)

	County District No _	062902
District	NORDHEIM ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District ___ NORMANGEE ISD

06

145906

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	54.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	66.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 With IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to 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
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	145906
District	NORMANGEE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	NORTH EAST ISD
District	NON ILACI ICE

Region County District No 015910

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	64.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	17.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.6%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	53.8%	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	3.6%	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
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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
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 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	ILS		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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 _	015910
District	NORTH EAST ISD	

Region

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

NORTH HOPKINS ISD District

Region

County District No

80

112906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.4%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.7%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	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	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district lev data are not reporte 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 35.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
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 le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	TLS		TLS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	112906
District	NORTH HOPKINS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District	NORTH LAMAR
DISTRICT	NOR IT LAWAR

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	92.0%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	67.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	40.5%	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	14.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 68.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	123		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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

Region County District No 80 139911

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	139911	
strict	NORTH LAMAR ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	06
County District No	154903

District NORTH ZULCH ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		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 level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	and use of		58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	163		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

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

	County District No _	154903
District	NORTH ZULCH ISD	

Region

LEA LEA State LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met LEA Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 9: Percent of districts with 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable disproportionate representation of racial postsecondary goals that are annually updated and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition 0% 0% YES YES NO YES inappropriate identification assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in 10: Percent of districts with Due to small disproportionate representation of racial secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time numbers, district 0% YES YES YES and ethnic groups in specific disability 0% they left school, and were enrolled in higher ≥ 25% 27% level data are not education within one year of leaving high school. categories that is the result of reported inappropriate identification 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in 11: Percent of children who were Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.6% NO YES ≥ 57% 59% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not year of leaving high school within which the evaluation must be reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B, and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district YES and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.7% NO education or in some other postsecondary ≥ 72% 69% NO level data are not education or training program; or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

244905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?						
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES						
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES						
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES						
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES						
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		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 level data are not reported							
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small						
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 89.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	acquisition and use of		58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported							
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		YES	7C: Percent of preschool Summary children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small						
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2 ≥ 72% 73.2%		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary ≥ 72%		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary ≥ 72% 73		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary ≥ 72% 73.2%		YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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 of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

	County District No _	244905
District	NORTHSIDE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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)

District	NORTHSIDE	ISD

20

015915

Region

County District No

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 74.8% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 76.0% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 8.9% ≤ 10% 11.2% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 2.8% 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 YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 44.4% majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special YES 99.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 5.9% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 63.0% 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 61.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	015915	
District	NORTHSIDE ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No _	061911
_	

Region

District NORTHWEST ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	79.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.5%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.8%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.2%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	10.2%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.9%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	62.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data aro ri	ot roportou	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥81% 82.7% YES		YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	169		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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	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 _	061911
District	NORTHWEST ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	NORTHWEST PREPARATORY

04

101848

Region

County District No

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO 66% 48.0% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A ≤ 10% NO 40.0% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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 85.0% NO ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 25.0% 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 24.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	Oddrity District NO	1010-0	
District	NORTHWEST PREPARATOR	Y	

Region

101848

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

istrict	ΝΟΥΑ ΑСΑΡΕΜΥ	

Region

County District No

10

057809

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 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 demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 33.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO			≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U76	U 76	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No _	057809
District	NOVA ACADEMY	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

NOVA ACADEMY (SOUTHEAST) District

Region 10 County District No 057827

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	76.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	201	\/F0		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	001021
District I	NOVA ACADEMY (SOUTHEA	(ST)

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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

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

District	NOVICE ISD	

15

042906

Region

County District No

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO 66% N/A N/A 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A ≤ 10% NO N/A 14% N/A 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% N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% N/A N/A 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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 N/A N/A ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS N/A N/A 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 N/A N/A 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 N/A N/A 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	042906
District	NOVICE ISD	

Region

15

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

County District No 069902 CISD

Region

15

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	listrict level ot reported
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		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, 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)

	County District No	069902	
strict	NUECES CANYON CISD		

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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

235904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	14.3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		nte special	≤ 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	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No _	235904
District	NURSERY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	NYOS CHARTER SCHO
DISTRICT	NIOS CHARIER SCHO

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 78.5% 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% ≤ 10% NO 1.3% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 75.0% 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 65.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

13 Region 227804 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)

	County District No	22/804
District	NYOS CHARTER SCHOOL	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	OAKWOOD ISE
DISTRICT	UARWUUD ISL

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% 72.2% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 11.1% 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 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 56.0% 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 54.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

06 Region County District No 145907

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	145907	
strict	OAKWOOD ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. ≥ 25%		27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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 ___ **ODEM-EDROY ISD**

02

205905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.4%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	87.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math Math Math Math Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summ		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		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	078	0 78	11.3		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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 _	205905	
District	ODEM-EDROY ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES		
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported			
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		numbers, district level data are not	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to 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)

District	O'DONNELL 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% 76.9% NO 66.7% NO ≥ 68% NO 66% 56.3% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% 18.8% ≤ 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% 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 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 58.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Region 17 County District No 153903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	1/
County District No	153903

District O'DONNELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	04
County District No	084802

District ODYSSEY ACADEMY INC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5		81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to 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	43.0%	NO		Statement 2	- 0.70	00.070	. 20		
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 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70						≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

County District No	084802

Region

District **ODYSSEY ACADEMY INC**

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	OGLESBY ISD
District	OGELODI IOD

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% 80.0% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 20.0% 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% 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 50.0% 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 38.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

12 Region 050904 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)

	County District No	050904	
District	OGLESBY ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	15
County District No	200906

District **OLFEN ISD**

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 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	83.3%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES			
3C : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	83.0%	YES	Miowieuge and skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 /0	113		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No	200906
District	OLFEN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District OLNEY ISD

Region

County District No

09

252903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.9%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.8%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES	
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	58.3%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	41.7%	NO	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	data are n	district level not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	65.0%	NO	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 /0	120		120			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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

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

	County District No	252903
District	OLNEY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

	County District No	140905
District	OLTON ISD	

Region

17

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% 86.9% 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 6.6% YFS ≤ 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 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 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 66.0% 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 63.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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 suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% YES schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	140905
District	OLTON ISD	

Region

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	ONALASKA 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% 76.9% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 61.2% 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% ≤ 10% NO 9.4% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 37.5% 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 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 68.0% 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 65.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

06 Region 187910 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)

	County District No	187910	
District	ONALASKA ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	ORANGE GROVE

County District No 125903 ISD

Region

02

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	15.4%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 59.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
AA: 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.		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 78	0 78	ILS		ILS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	125903
triot	ODANCE CROVE ICD	

Region

02

ORANGE 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?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	ORANGEFIELD ISD

05

181905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	40.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	16.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	46.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	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	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	113		110		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No _	181905
District	ORANGEFIELD ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, 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)

District	ORE CITY ISD
DISTRICT	OKE CITTION

07

230903

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	49.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.9%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			-	00.070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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

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

	County District No _	230903
District	ORE CITY ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	ORENDA CHARTER SCHOOL

Region County District No 12 014804

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	90.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	5.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 39.0%	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 33.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District NO	014004	
District	ORENDA CHARTER SCHOOL	_	

Region

County District No.

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	OVERTON ISD	

Region

County District No

07

201908

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	78.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	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	09/	09/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	169		152	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	tho report that colvement 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)

	County District No _	201908	
District	OVERTON ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. 2 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	PADUCAH ISD

17

051901

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 74.1% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 11.1% 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 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 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 89.0% 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 74.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	051901	
District	PADUCAH ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. 2 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 ___ **PAINT CREEK ISD**

Region

County District No

14

104907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 88.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	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%	U 76	163		159	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	104907	
District	PAINT CREEK ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

	County District No	048903
District	PAINT ROCK ISD	

Region

15

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% 80.0% 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 20.0% ≤ 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 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% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 50.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math 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 YFS YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 60.0% 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 20.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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 suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% YES schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	048903
District	PAINT ROCK ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	PALACIOS ISD

03

158905

Region

County District No

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 90.0% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 88.1% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 10.0% NO 9.2% YFS ≤ 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 83.3% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 57.0% 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 62.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

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

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

	County District No _	158905
District	PALACIOS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PALESTINE ISD
District	I ALLO IIIVE IOD

County District No

Region

07

001907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	93.3%	YES	5A: 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	6.7%	YES	5B: 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	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children 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	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	55.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		- [
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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%	169		159			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No	001907
District	PALESTINE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	10
County District No	070910

District PALMER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.5%	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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	21.4%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Matri Matri Matri Matri Matri Watri Watri Watri Watri Watri Watri Watri Watri Statement	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level						
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Iternate Iternate Neading Neading Neading Neading Neading Children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math		Summary		58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	64.0%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0%	0%	YES	/ES	YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
		0 70						≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are not repo	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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)

	County District No	070910		
District	PALMER ISD			

Region

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

District	PALO PINTO ISD	

Region

County District No

11

182906

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 75.0% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A ≤ 10% NO 0.0% YFS 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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 83.0% NO ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 67.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	182906
trict	DALO DINTO ISD	

Region

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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	PAMPA ISD

Region

County District No

16

090904

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 YES ≥ 68% NO YES 96.3% 66% 81.7% 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 3.7% NO 5.9% 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 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 80.8% 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 YES ≤ 17% 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 98.0% 11.5% 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 YFS YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 56.0% 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 55.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	090904
District	PAMPA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	PANHANDLE 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% 76.9% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 77.4% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 11.3% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1.6% 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 98.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 76.0% 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 86.0% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Region 16 County District No 033902

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	033902
District	PANHANDLE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

strict	PANOLA CHARTER SCHOO	٦I

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	50.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES			
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to 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	
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VEC		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	YES		1 5	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Region 07 County District No 183801

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	103001	
PANOLA CHARTER SCHOOL		
	· —	PANOLA CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	PANTHER CREEK CIS

15

042905

Region

County District No

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 NO ≥ 68% NO 62.5% 25.0% 66% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 75.0% ≤ 10% NO 6.3% YFS 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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 92.0% NO ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 85.0% NO 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 82.0% 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 55.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	042905
District	PANTHER CREEK CISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PARADISE ISD	

Region County District No

11

249906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	91.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				01.070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with EPs 9% 9% YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported			
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No _	249906
District	PARADISE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	08
County District No	139909

District _ PARIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	77.3%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.6%	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		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	91.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	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		te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	2.2%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	> 570/	50.00/	VEO	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	56.0%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summai	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No	139909
District	PARIS ISD	

Region

80

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

District	PASADENA ISD

Region

County District No

04

101917

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	60.9%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	17.0%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	18.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	33.4%	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	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%			ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to smal	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U76	U 76	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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 _	101917
District	PASADENA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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		NO	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 071803

District PASO DEL NORTE ACADEMY 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		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 31.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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 oot 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 19 County District No 071803

PASO DEL NORTE ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 PATTON SPRINGS ISD

17

063906

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	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	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 89.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	00/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 ≥ 81% 82.7% \frac{1}{2}		YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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 _	063906
District	PATTON SPRINGS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

PAWNEE ISD District

02

013902

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to 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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	ES with IEPs who demonstrate improved use		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	113		ILS			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	013902
District	PAWNEE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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	PEARLAND ISD
DISTRICT	PEAKLAND ISD

Region

County District No

04

020908

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.3%	YES	5B: 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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 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	31.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	7.0%	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	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%			ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	U%	169		1 5	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No	020908
rict	PEARLAND ISD	

Region

Dist

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District PEARSALL ISD

Region

County District No

20

082903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.6%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	6.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	18.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	YES demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 39.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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	082903	
District	PEARSALL ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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)

County District No	184908

Region

District PEASTER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	30.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	C				,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	57.0%	NO	knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57%		58.9%	YES			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	169		1 1 2 3			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	184908
District	PEASTER ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District

County District No PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH ISD

Region

18

195901

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 91.7% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 76.9% 66% 78.3% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 8.3% ≤ 10% 14% 11.6% 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% 1.0% 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 88.9% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 11.1% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 40.0% 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 45.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

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

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

District	PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH ISD

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate scresidential 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		small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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		small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /6	123		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No 05780
PEGASUS SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS AND

Region

District SCIENCES

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	PENELOPE ISD
District	I LIVELOI E IOD

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 85.7% 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% ≤ 10% NO 9.5% YFS 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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 94.0% NO ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 73.0% 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 56.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

12 Region County District No 109914

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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	109914

PENELOPE ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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 data	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level data	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	PERRIN-WHITT	CIS
District	I FIXIXII4-4411111	VI.

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 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 76.9% 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% ≤ 10% NO 5.1% YFS 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 56.0% 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 53.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

09 Region County District No 119903

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	119903
District	PERRIN-WHITT CISD	

Region

09

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PERRYTON ISD	

Region

County District No

16

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VEC		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	YES		1 5	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2 ≥ 72%		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 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)

	County District No _	179901
District	PERRYTON ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PETERSBURG I
District	I LILINODONO I

Region County District No 095904 ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	76.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	> F70/	50.00/	VEC	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	38.0%	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	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No _	095904
District	PETERSBURG ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

	County District No	039903
District	PETROLIA ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.6%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 85.0%	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 88.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	U%	163		1 [5	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	039903	
District	PETROLIA ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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	PETTUS ISD	

02

013903

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	63.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	2.1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 72.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
AA: 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	U 76	U 76	123		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	013903
District	PETTUS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region	08
County District No	172905

District ____ PEWITT 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	92.3%	YES		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	81.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	13.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	18.8%	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	12.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 59.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO			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					-	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 ≥ 81% 82.7% Statement 1 Summary Statement 1		YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level oot 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	172905
District	PEWITT CISD	

Region

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District	PFLUGERVILLE IS

County District No 227904 SD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	79.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	61.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.9%	YES		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	12.9%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	48.3%	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	10.7%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
AA: 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%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

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

	County District No	227904	
District	PFLUGERVILLE ISD		

Region

13

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD
District	I IIAIII GAILGGAILAEAIIG IGE

Region 01 County District No 108909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	82.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	6.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.9%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular 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	44.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	12.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	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	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%	169		152		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

istrict	PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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

County District No 116801 PHOENIX CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	270	270	0		0		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level 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)

	·
District	PHOENIX CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 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	061903

District PILOT POINT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and recemajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	26.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 79.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statemen with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	061903
District	PILOT POINT ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators Target?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	PINE TREE ISD
DISTRICT	FINE IKEE IOU

Region

County District No

07

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	76.7%	NO		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	67.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	56.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	37.5%	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	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	U 76	TES		169	demonstrate improved use		73.2%	YES		ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	092904
District	PINE TREE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 579		59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

PINEYWOODS COMMUNITY ACADEMY District

Region 07 County District No 003801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	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	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1		≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	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	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	201	VE0.		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	Summary > 73% 73.3% VES d		,	district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	PINEYWOODS	COMMUNITY	ACADEMY

Region

003801

County District No

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PITTSBURG ISD	

Region

County District No

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	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		5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	78.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	13.6%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6—21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	70.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	23.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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		not reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary 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	≥ 75%	56%	NO	66.0%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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 _	032902
District	PITTSBURG ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 579		59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District PLAINS ISD

Region

County District No

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	53.0%	NO		Statement 2		2 57% 56.9% YES			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to sma	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 70			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	ate behaviors to Summary		73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	251902
District	PLAINS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	PLAINVIEW ISD	

17

095905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	77.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.0%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	53.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.9%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	ion and use of	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			YES	31.0%	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		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No _	095905
District	PLAINVIEW ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		NO		YES	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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	PLANO ISD	

10

043910

Region

County District No

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 NO ≥ 68% NO 76.8% 66% 63.1% 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 3.1% NO 13.9% ≤ 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.3% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES 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 99.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 73.0% 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 68.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

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

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

	County District No	043910
District	PLANO ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District **PLEASANT GROVE ISD**

Region

County District No

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	21.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	10.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	40.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	acquisition and use of		58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	123		TES	of appropriate behaviors to		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	019912	
District	PLEASANT GROVE ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within	≥ 72%	69%	NO	level dat	s, district

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

one year of leaving high school.

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	PLEASANTON ISD
Diotilot	1 22/10/1111011102

20 Region County District No 007905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.0%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	25.0%	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, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Summary Statement 2		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	169		152	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, o data are n	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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	

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	007905
strict	PLEASANTON ISD	

Region

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No 117904

Region

16

District PLEMONS-STINNETT-PHILLIPS CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	50.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Summary Statement 2		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 72.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	9% YES	-	district level ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VE0.		V/50	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

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

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

PLEMONS-STINNETT-PHILLIPS CISD District

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	POINT ISABEL I	СL
DISTRICT	PUINT ISABELT	OL.

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 84.6% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 54.1% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 14.1% 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.5% 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 10.8% 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 YES ≤ 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 98.0% 17% 27.0% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 45.0% 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 47.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

Region 01 031909 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)

	County District No _	031909	
District	POINT ISABEL ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PONDER ISD

Region

County District No

11

061906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	23.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	47.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 61.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	113		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	061906
District	PONDER ISD	

Region

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers	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	POOLVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.1%	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		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.6%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and rece 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	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 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 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	tho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Region 11 County District No 184901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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	184901

POOLVILLE ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	POR VIDA ACADEMY

20

015801

Region

County District No

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 26.7% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 87.2% 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 NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 66.7% ≤ 10% 2.1% YFS 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 YES 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 95.0% 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 46.0% 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 23.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	015801	
District	POR VIDA ACADEMY		

Region

LEA LEA State LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met LEA Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 9: Percent of districts with 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable disproportionate representation of racial postsecondary goals that are annually updated and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition 0% 0% YES YES NO YES inappropriate identification assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in 10: Percent of districts with Due to small disproportionate representation of racial secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time numbers, district 0% YES YES YES and ethnic groups in specific disability 0% they left school, and were enrolled in higher ≥ 25% 27% level data are not education within one year of leaving high school. categories that is the result of reported inappropriate identification 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in 11: Percent of children who were Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.6% NO YES ≥ 57% 59% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not year of leaving high school within which the evaluation must be reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B, and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district YES and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.7% NO education or in some other postsecondary ≥ 72% 69% NO level data are not education or training program; or competitively reported employed or in some other employment within

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

District	PORT ARANSAS IS
DISTRICT	FUR I ARANGAG R

County District No 178908

Region

02

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	84.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 81.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	11.3		TLS	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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	02
County District No	178908

PORT ARANSAS ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

County District No 123907

Region

05

District PORT ARTHUR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	79.6%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.8%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	24.7%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	83.2%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		not reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	County District No	123907
District	PORT ARTHUR ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PORT NECHES-GROVE
DISTRICT	PUR I NECHES-GRUVI

County District No ES ISD

Region

05

123908

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	96.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	64.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	19.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		not reported
3C: 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	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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)

		.2000
District	PORT NECHES-GROVES ISD)

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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

POSITIVE SOLUTIONS CHARTER SCHOOL

County District No

Region

20

015814

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 83.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

POSITIVE SOLUTIONS CHARTER SCHOOL District

Region County District No 015814

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	17
County District No	085902

District **POST ISD**

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.4%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	25.0%	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	16.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	62.0%	NO		Statement 2		00.070	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70			120			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi 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)

	County District No	085902
District	POST ISD	

Region

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	POTEET ISD	

20

007906

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	72.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	18.2%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.5%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.0%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summa		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary Statement 1 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	076	0%	TES		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement 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)

	County District No	007906
District	POTEET ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

	·	
District	POTH ISD	

County District No

Region

20

247904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	14.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	14.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			YES	33.078	YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No	247904
District	POTH ISD	

Region

20

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	POTTSBORO ISD

10

091913

Region

County District No

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 85.7% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 55.5% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 16.8% 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% N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.8% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES NO Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 7.1% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 69.0% 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 64.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	091913
District	POTTSBORO ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are 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	PRAIRIE LEA ISD

13

028906

Region

County District No

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 100% YES ≥ 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 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% NO 0.0% YFS 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 60.0% 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 95.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 61.0% 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 22.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	028906
istrict	PRAIRIE I EA ISD	

Region

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	PRAIRIE VALLEY ISI
DISTRICT	FRAIRIE VALLETISI

LEA State State **LEA Met** State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating **5A:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class ≥ 78% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 54.5% 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 9.1% YFS ≤ 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 N/A Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading N/A 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% YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% N/A N/A 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 80.0% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

09 Region 169909 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)

County District No	169909
DD VIDIE AVI I EA IGU	

District

Region

09

LEA LEA State LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met LEA Met Met **Performance Report Indicators Target** Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Target? Rate State Target? Target? Target? 9: Percent of districts with 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable disproportionate representation of racial postsecondary goals that are annually updated and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of and based upon an age appropriate transition 0% 0% YES YES NO YES inappropriate identification assessment, transition services, including courses 100% 99.3% of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs 14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in 10: Percent of districts with Due to small disproportionate representation of racial secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time numbers, district 0% YES YES YES and ethnic groups in specific disability 0% they left school, and were enrolled in higher ≥ 25% 27% level data are not education within one year of leaving high school. categories that is the result of reported inappropriate identification 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in 11: Percent of children who were Due to small evaluated within 60 days of receiving secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time parental consent for initial evaluation or, they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district 100% 98.6% NO YES ≥ 57% 59% YES if the State establishes a timeframe education or competitively employed within one level data are not year of leaving high school within which the evaluation must be reported conducted, within that timeframe 12: Percent of children referred by Part C 14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in prior to age 3, who are found eligible for secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time Due to small Part B, and who have an IEP developed they left school, and were enrolled in higher numbers, district YES and implemented by their third birthdays 100% 99.7% NO education or in some other postsecondary ≥ 72% 69% NO level data are not education or training program; or competitively reported

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	PRAIRILAND 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% 76.9% NO YES ≥ 68% NO 90.0% 66% 66.3% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 10.0% NO 9.2% YFS ≤ 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 NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% 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 70.6% 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 NO ≥ 95% 98% 23.5% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 52.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 57.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

80 Region County District No 139912

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	139912
District	PRAIRILAND ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

County District No 072801 PREMIER HIGH SCHOOLS District

Region

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	44.2%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.8%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	1.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	84.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	123		113	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	07280
PREM	NER HIGH SCHOOLS	;

District

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES		
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to numbers level dat repo	a are not
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to 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)

District

PREMIER LEARNING ACADEMY

Region 04 County District No 084805

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	96.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 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 Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	
	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	numbers, distric data are not rep	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, o data are n	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

District	PREMIER LEARNING ACADEMY

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

District	PREMONT ISD
District	I INCINIONI IOD

02

125905

Region

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.9%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO		5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	5.3%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	5.3%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 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		≥ 30%	31%	YES	25.0%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 31.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, dist data are not		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				01.070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		NO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		NO	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	County District No _	125905
District	PREMONT ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	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)

	·	
District	PRESIDIO ISD	

County District No

Region

18

189902

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 NO ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 0.0% 66% 36.7% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 100% NO YFS ≤ 10% 14% 10.1% 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1% 0.0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 100% 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% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 56.0% 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 52.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	189902
District	PRESIDIO ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	3 1 35/% 1 5U% 1 YES 1		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

strict	PRIDDY ISD	

12

167904

Region

County District No

Dis

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.6%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	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 Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	TES		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	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)

	County District No	167904
District	PRIDDY ISD	

Region

12

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	3 1 35/% 1 5U% 1 YES 1		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PRIME PREF	ACADI
DISTRICT	LUIME LVE	ACADI

EMY

County District No

Region

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with 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	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C : Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority 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 with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so 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		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 18.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	113		TLS			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	11
County District No	220818

PRIME PREP ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	they left school and were enrolled in higher 1 > 25% 1 27% 1 YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 57% YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PRINCETON ISD

Region

County District No

10

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	91.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	76.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	13.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	48.0%	NO		Statement 2		00.070	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70	120			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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)

	County District No _	043911	
District	PRINCETON ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District	PRINGLE-MORSE C
District	I KINGLE-MONGE O

County District No 098903

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 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	45.5%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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	0.0%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 91.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 83.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, o data are n	ot reported		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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 invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho 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	098903
DDING! E MODOE 010D	

District PRINGLE-MORSE CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District

PRIORITY CHARTER SCHOOLS

County District No

Region

	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 I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	IES		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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)

	0000
PRIORITY CHARTER SCHOOL	LS

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	-	-
istrict	PROGRESO ISD	

Region

County District No

01

108910

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 NO ≥ 68% NO YES 0.0% 66% 76.9% 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% 16.3% 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1% 1.0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 57.1% 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% 96.0% 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 YFS YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 32.0% 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 40.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary *IEPs* of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

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

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

	County District No	108910	
District	PROGRESO ISD		

Region

01

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

District PROMISE COMMUNITY SCHOOL

Region 04 County District No 101853

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	84.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 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	0.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite 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		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 43.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, 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		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	00/	VEC		7C: Percent of pres children aged 3 thre with IEPs who		Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	YES		YES	YES with IEFs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, o data are n	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, 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)

District PROMISE COMMUNITY SCHOOL	

Region

County District No.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

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

District	PROSPER 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% 76.9% NO 90.0% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 50.6% 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 6.3% YFS ≤ 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 YES 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.9% 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 23.7% 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% 10.5% 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 79.0% 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 75.0% YES 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YFS 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

10 Region County District No 043912

Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	043912
District	PROSPER ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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