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

District	QUANAH ISD	

Region

County District No

09

099903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	91.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> 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	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	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	h Math Math Math Math Summa Statement		Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	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	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

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

	County District No _	099903
District	QUANAH 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  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher ≥ 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)

80

034907

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 92.3% YES ≥ 68% NO 67.9% YES 66% 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% 7.1% 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 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 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 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	034907
QL	JEEN CITY ISD	

District

Region

80

reported

**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

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

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

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

116908

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% NO 91.7% YES ≥ 68% NO 76.9% 66% 52.8% 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 8.3% ≤ 10% 14% 13.1% 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% NO 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 64.3% 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% 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 28.6% 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 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 58.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	116908
District	OLIINI AN 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	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	QUITMAN ISD

07

250904

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 92.3% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 65.7% 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 1.0% 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% 15.2% 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 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 97.0% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 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 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 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 _	250904
District	QUITMAN ISD	

Region

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

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

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

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

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

Region 20 County District No 015815

District RADIANCE ACADEMY OF LEARNING

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	97.1%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> 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	97.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	knowledge and skills Summa	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 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%	TES		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

RADIANCE ACADEMY OF LEARNING District

Region

015815

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)

Region	07
County District No	190903

District **RAINS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	95.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	123		IES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	190903
District	RAINS 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)

County District No 054903

District RALLS ISD

Region

17

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C</b> : Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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 program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	27.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	60.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data aro ri	orroportou
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 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	U76	0%	TES		IES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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

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

	County District No	054903
District	RALLS 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	RAMIREZ CSD
DISTRICT	NAMINEZ COD

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% 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 ≤ 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 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 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

02 Region County District No 066005

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	066005
District	RAMIREZ CSD	

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	RANCH ACADEM

07

234801

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 33.3% 66% 65.7% 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 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 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 97.0% 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 92.0% YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 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 51.0% 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 _	234801	
District	RANCH ACADEMY		

Region

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

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

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 20 County District No 015906 District RANDOLPH FIELD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	80.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	6.6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 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	with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recein majority of special education	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).		31%	YES	100%	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	56.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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%	U%	169		1 5	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	pehaviors to Summary		73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	015906	
ANDOLPH FIFLD ISD		

District

Region

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

Region

County District No

14

067907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.2%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
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	16.7%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.7%	NO	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				44.070		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	067907
istrict	RANGER 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 S they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at 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.  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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	RANKIN ISD	

Region

County District No

18

231902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	6.3%	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		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	123		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	231902	
District	RANKIN ISD		

Region

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

RAPOPORT ACADEMY PUBLIC SCHOOL District

Region 12 County District No 161802

		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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the 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 oprogram; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 81.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> 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	076	076	163		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	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)

RAPOPORT ACADEMY PUBLIC SCHOOL 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	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)

Region 04
County District No 101806

District RAUL YZAGUIRRE SCHOOL FOR SUCCESS

State 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	77.8%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the 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	95.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 64.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	> 570/	E9 00/	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	59.0%	NO		Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	TES		
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	370	570						≥ 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

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

County District No 101806

RAUL YZAGUIRRE SCHOOL FOR SUCCESS

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	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent 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)

District	RAVEN SCHOOL

Region

County District No

06

236801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	5.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	96.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	40.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	85.0%	NO	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 27.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 0.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		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 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	123		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summar Statemen		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	236801
District	RAVEN SCHOOL	

Region

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

argets District Region 01
County District No 245903

rict RAYMONDVILLE 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	54.2%	NO	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	NO
<b>3B:</b> 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	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		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%			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  Summar Statement		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	245903
District	RAYMONDVILLE ISD	

Region

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

Region

County District No

18

192901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	62.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	2.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	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 Statement with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	ool year for children with 0% 0% YES YES demonstrate improv	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	ot reported				
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

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

County District I	Νo	192901
DEACAN COUNTY I	en.	

District

Region

18

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	RECONCIL	IATION	AC
SUIGU	KECONCIL		70

County District No 057841 Dist CADEMY

Region

10

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

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

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

	County District No _	05/841	
District	RECONCILIATION ACADEM	Y	

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)

District	RED LICK ISD

Region

County District No

80

019911

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 86.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 86.0%	Math YES	h acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summ		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district leve 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		VES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	U%	163		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summa.	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	019911	
District	RED LICK 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	070911

District \_\_\_ RED OAK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	2.1%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> 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 with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	9.4%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	31.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use	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	rho report that olvement 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)

	County District No	070911	
District	RED OAK 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	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	REDWATER ISD	

80

019906

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% 66.3% 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% ≤ 10% 12.8% 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% 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 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% 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 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 65.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

	County District No	019906
District	REDWATER ISD	

Region

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

03

196903

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 88.9% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 84.4% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 11.1% 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 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 30.0% 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 NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 20.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 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 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 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

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	196903
District	REFUGIO 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	13/902
	_	
District	RICARDO ISD	

Region

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 N/A N/A ≥ 68% NO YES 76.9% 66% 93.3% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A 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 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 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% 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 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 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 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	137902
District	RICARDO 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 Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	03
County District No	045903

RICE CISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.2%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.5%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.6%	NO	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	66.7%	NO	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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	
<b>3C</b> : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	46.0%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /0	ILG		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	045903
District	RICE CISD	

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

County District No

Region

12

175911

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 92.5% YES 66% 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 1.9% 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 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 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 YES ≤ 17% YES ≥ 95% 98% 98.0% 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 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 62.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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	175911
District	RICE 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

RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (AMARILLO)

County District No

Region

16

188801

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a 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	23.8%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	93.0%	NO	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	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		ot reported
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		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 child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	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 RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (AMARILLO)

Region

County District No

16

188801

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) County District No 068801

District RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (ECTOR COUNTY)

Region

18

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	97.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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 program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 24.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 16.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	165		1 1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 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 <u>068801</u>

District RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (ECTOR COUNTY)

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 level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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 11 220812

District RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (FORT WORTH)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	30.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	60.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	92.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	92.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 33.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary					district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	27.0%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (FORT WORTH) 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	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	101854
RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (SU	JBURBAN
HOUSTON)	

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	18.2%	NO	<b>5A:</b> 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	63.6%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	5.6%	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	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	75.0%	NO	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 38.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that 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	101854
RICHARD MILBURN ACADEMY (SUE	BURBAN

Region

04

District HOUSTON)

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

Region 02
County District No 178804
RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH SCHOOL
(CORPUS CHRISTI)

District

	Todal and Todal 2012 (2012 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	44.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.1%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day <b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 23.0%	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		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	163		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summar Statement		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region \_ County District No \_

178804

RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH SCHOOL
District (CORPUS CHRISTI)

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

Region County District No 014801

RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH SCHOOL (KILLEEN)

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	58.8%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	97.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	29.4%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.8%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> 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	89.0%	NO	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 25.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 8.0%	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	00/	00/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	1 E S		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	014801
	RICHARD MILBURN ALTER HIGH	SCHOOL
District	(KILLEEN)	

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	RICHARDS ISD
District	INIONIANDO IOD

06

093905

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% 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 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 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 62.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets
Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

	County District No	093905	
District	RICHARDS 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 **RICHARDSON ISD** 

Region

County District No

10

057916

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.6%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	8.7%	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	46.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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	0%	0%	TES		TES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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 _	057916
District	RICHARDSON 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 057840

Region

10

District RICHLAND COLLEGIATE HIGH SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	N/A	N/A
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	N/A	N/A
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	N/A	N/A
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	N/A	N/A	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	N/A	N/A	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading N/A	Reading N/A	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math N/A	Math N/A	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 057840 RICHLAND COLLEGIATE HIGH SCHOOL District

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	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	RICHLAND SPRINGS ISD
DISTRICT	KICHLAND SPKINGS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs attending a separa	BB: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special ducation class, separate school or esidential facility		17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	-	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 40.0%	Math NO	aemonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	165		1 1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Region County District No 15 206902

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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	206902

District RICHLAND SPRINGS ISD

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

Region

County District No

12

161912

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	84.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)  Summary Statement 2		≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	123		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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	161912
District	RIESEL 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% VES nu		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r reported	

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

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

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

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

District \_\_\_\_

Region 01
County District No 214901

trict RIO GRANDE CITY CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	84.6%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate 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 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	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	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5 Sta		≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	and use of	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	56.0%	NO		Statement 2	= 37 70	30.370	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /0	123		110			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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)

Region	01
County District No	214901
DIO CDANDE CITY CICD	

01

District

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

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

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

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

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

Region	01
County District No	031911

District **RIO HONDO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	95.8%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.8%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.6%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.8%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and 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	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		≥ 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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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 _	031911	
District	RIO HONDO 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	RIO VISTA ISD

Region

County District No

11

126907

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% 59.4% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 15.8% 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 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 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 48.0% 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	126907
DIO VICTA ICD	

Region

11

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 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	RISE ACADEMY
District	NIOL ACADEMII

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% 69.6% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO N/A N/A ≤ 10% NO 4.3% 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 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 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 95.0% 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 17 County District No 152802

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	152802
District	RISE 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/.

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

14

067908

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

YES

≥ 76%

77.6%

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% 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 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 20.0% 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 93.0% YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 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 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 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

YES

YES

0%

0%

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

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

rvegion	17
County District No	067908

**RISING STAR ISD** District

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

Region

County District No

16

188902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.6%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	12.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	25.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills  Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				13.070		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	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	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	188902
District	RIVER ROAD 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	RIVERCREST ISD
District	INITENCE TO TOP

80

194903

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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 12.0% 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 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 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 81.0% 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 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

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	194903
District	RIVERCREST 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)

District	RIVIERA ISD	

02

137903

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 92.9% YES 66% 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 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 55.0% 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

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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	137903
Dietrict	DIVIED A ISD	

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

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

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

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

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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	041902

District ROBERT LEE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	20.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.2%	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	94.0%	NO	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district 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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	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	50.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 37 /6	38.976	11.5		
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		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /0	123		110			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	15
County District No	041902
DODEDT   EE 10D	

District ROBERT LEE ISD

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

	County District No	161922
District	ROBINSON 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	14.6%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	43.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	31.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	169		159	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region	12
County District No	161922
DODINGON ICD	

12

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	ROBSTOWN ISD

02

178909

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 51.6% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 69.1% 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 25.8% ≤ 10% NO 8.7% 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 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 85.2% 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 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 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 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 of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

	County District No _	178909
District	ROBSTOWN ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	14
County District No	076903

District **ROBY CISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.7%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.3%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a 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	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	93.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)  Summary Statement 2		≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary 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	92.0%	YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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	076903
District	ROBY CISD	

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	ROCHELLE
District	INCOMPLETE.

Region County District No ISD

15

160904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	76.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 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 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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 41.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	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	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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)

rtegion	10
County District No	160904

Region

District ROCHELLE ISD

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

06

166904

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	91.7%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	61.9%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.0%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	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	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	50.0%	NO	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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	
<b>3C:</b> 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	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	U%	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		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	166904	
District	ROCKDALE 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	ROCKSPRINGS
District	NOCKSI NINGS

Region 15 County District No 069901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.2%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small		
	≥ 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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 30.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 30.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
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			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

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

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

	County District No	069901
District	ROCKSPRINGS 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  ≥ 57%  59%		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

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

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

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

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

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

District	ROCKWALL 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 81.4% 66% 65.1% 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 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% 0.5% 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 0.7% 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 99.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 4.4% 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 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 70.0% 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 199901

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	199901
District	ROCKWALL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	ROGERS ISD
DISTRICT	KUGEKS 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% 86.2% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% NO 3.4% 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 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% N/A facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1.7% 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 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 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 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

12 Region County District No 014907

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	014907	
District	ROGERS ISD		

Region

12

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

**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

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

≥ 72%

69%

NO

education or in some other postsecondary

one year of leaving high school.

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

100%

99.7%

NO

Part B, and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

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

YES

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

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

District ROMA ISD

Region

County District No

01

214903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	82.1%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.8%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.1%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.1%	NO	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	48.5%	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		≥ 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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	62.0%	NO	nnomouge and online	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
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	,		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	214903
District	ROMA 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)

	•	-
strict	ROOSEVELT ISD	

Region

County District No

17

152908

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% 59.8% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 15.7% ≤ 10% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 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 77.8% YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special YES 99.0% YES ≤ 17% 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 YFS 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 65.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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 _	152908
District	ROOSEVELT ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at 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	17
County District No	110905

District \_\_ **ROPES ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 72.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	monstrate improved use appropriate behaviors to Summary		73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

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

	County District No	110905
District	ROPES 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	econdary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher ducation or competitively employed within one  ≥ 57%  59%  YES		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

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

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

**ROSCOE COLLEGIATE ISD** District

Region County District No 177901

14

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	53.0%	NO		Statement 2		00.070			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

Region	14
County District No	177901
•	

**ROSCOE COLLEGIATE 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)

District	ROSEBUD-

County District No 073905 -LOTT 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 Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.0%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	75.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 42.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	40.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 37 70	56.9%	163		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	of appropriate behaviors to Summary		73.2%	YES	-	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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)

Region	12
County District No	073905

**ROSEBUD-LOTT 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 nostsecondary.		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		

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

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

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

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

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

District	ROTAN ISD	

Region

County District No

14

076904

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 74.2% YES 75.0% 66% 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% 12.9% ≤ 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 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 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 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

## 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	076904
District	ROTAN 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	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 \_\_\_ **ROUND ROCK ISD** 

13

246909

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	76.1%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.7%	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	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> 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).  6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	32.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	29.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	11.3		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement 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)

Region	13
County District No	246909

**ROUND ROCK 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 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	Due to small	

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

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

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

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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

Region

13 075908

District	ROUND TOP-CARMINE ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 95.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	13
County District No	075908

**ROUND TOP-CARMINE 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 enlucation or in some other nostsecondary.		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		

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

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

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

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

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

District	ROXTON ISD	

County District No

Region

80

139908

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% 95.7% 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% 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 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 94.0% NO ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% 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 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 82.0% 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	139908
District	ROXTON 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)

District	ROYAL ISD

Region

County District No

04

237905

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	94.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	58.6%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.3%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	72.0%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	24.0%	NO	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level		
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math Math Math Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills  56% NO 53.0% NO		acquisition and use of	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported				
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
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 level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	237905
District	ROYAL 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  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

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

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

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

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

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

District	ROYSE CITY ISD	

10

199902

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 85.2% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 61.4% 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 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 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 90.7% 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 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 65.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	199902
DOVEE CITY ISD	

District

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	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)

Region	14
County District No	104903

District \_\_\_\_ RULE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.7%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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		
	≥ 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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 38.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

Region	14
County District No	104903

District RULE ISD

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

Region

County District No

03

128903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	50.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	50.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate 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	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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
AA: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 /6	113		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	128903
District	RUNGE 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	037907

District **RUSK ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.9%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.0%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
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	5.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ite special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	10.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	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 district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 70.0%	Math NO		Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /6	0 76	ILS		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	037907
District	RUSK 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	S AND S CISD	

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 71.4% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 74.3% 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 NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 28.6% ≤ 10% 14% 17.1% 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 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 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 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

10 Region County District No 091914

#### 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)

10
091914

District S AND S CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	SABINAL	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% 79.1% 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 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 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 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 41.0% 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 232902

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	232902
District	SABINAL 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	SABINE ISD	

Region

County District No

07

092906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.1%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	28.6%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 65.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	092906
District	SABINE 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 SABINE PASS ISD

05

123913

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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.5%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 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	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 88.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
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%	U 76	163		159	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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 _	123913
District	SABINE PASS ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 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	SAINT JO 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% 53.6% 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 0.0% 17.9% ≤ 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% 0.0% 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% 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 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 65.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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

09 Region County District No 169911

## 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 _	169911	
District	SAINT JO 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)

District	SALADO 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% 81.6% 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% 12.6% 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 14.3% 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 42.9% NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 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 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 76.0% 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

12 Region 014908 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	014908
District	SALADO ISD	

Region

12

**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	SALTILLO ISD

80

112909

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% 77.5% 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% 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 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 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 87.0% 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	112909
District	SALTILLO ISD	

Region

80

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 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 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 074917

Region

10

SAM RAYBURN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	57.1%	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		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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 84.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 79.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	U 76	163		IES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	074917	
District	SAM RAYBURN 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	15
County District No	226903

District SAN ANGELO 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	69.2%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	5.0%	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	37.5%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 54.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	52.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		·
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	U%	169		150	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	226903
trict	SAN ANGELO ISD	

Region

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

SAN ANTONIO CAN HIGH SCHOOL

	1		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	60.9%	NO		<b>5A:</b> 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	13.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C:</b> 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 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	97.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 25.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 21.0%	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		VEQ	YES  7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	IES		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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

Region 20 County District No 015817

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

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

District	SAN ANTONIO CAN HIGH SCHOOL
District	SAN ANTONIO CAN HIGH 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	SAN ANTONIO ISD

20 Region County District No 015907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	69.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	18.9%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	1.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	8.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.2%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	1 E S		1 5			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	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 _	015907
District	SAN ANTONIO ISD	

Region

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

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

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

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

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

Region 20
County District No 015820
SAN ANTONIO SCHOOL FOR INQUIRY &
CREATIVITY

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	83.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	98.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> 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 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	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	- numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 54.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	U%	169		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 015820
SAN ANTONIO SCHOOL FOR INQUIRY &
CREATIVITY

Region

District C

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

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

County District No SAN ANTONIO TECHNOLOGY ACADEMY

Region

20

015823

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

YES

≥ 76%

77.6%

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 YES 76.9% 75.0% 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% 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 80.0% NO ≤ 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 80.0% 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 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 YES ≥ 57% 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 50.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% 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

YES

YES

0%

0%

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

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

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

County District No 015823 SAN ANTONIO TECHNOLOGY ACADEMY 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	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% 50% VES NU		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	SAN AUGUSTINE IS
DISTRICT	SAN AUGUSTINE IS

07

203901

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% 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% ≤ 10% NO 3.5% 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 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 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 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 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 _	203901
District	SAN AUGUSTINE 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	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other 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 SAN BENITO CISD

Region

County District No

01

031912

State 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	68.5%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
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	18.2%	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	46.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> 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%	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	031912
District	SAN BENITO CISD	

Region

01

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 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	SAN DIEGO ISD	

Region

County District No

02

066902

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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	57.1%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.5%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	90.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	00/	001	\/F0		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES data are not re		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	066902
District	SAN DIEGO 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)

ictrict	

Region County District No

19 071904

SAN ELIZARIO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	27.8%	NO	<b>5B:</b> 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		YES	<b>5C:</b> 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 receimajority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	12.1%	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	3.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 45.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	-	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district l data are not repo	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	071904	
District	SAN ELIZARIO 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)

District

SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CISD

County District No

Region

15

233901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.1%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.0%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.6%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/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 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	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.4%	NO	
	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	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5  Statemer		≥ 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	,	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	00/	00/	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%	169		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	numbers, d ≥ 72% 73.2% YES data are no					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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

District SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CISD

Region

233901

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

Region

County District No

01

214902

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% 15.4% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% 42.3% ≤ 10% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% YES 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 94.0% NO ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 0.0% 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 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 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

# Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	214902	
District	SAN ISIDRO 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/.

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

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

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

District	SAN MARCOS C

13

105902

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

YES

≥ 76%

77.6%

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 68.9% NO ≥ 68% NO 66% 66.4% 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 NO NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 8.9% ≤ 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 "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1.9% 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 60.5% 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% 11.6% 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 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 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 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

YES

YES

0%

0%

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

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	105902
istrict	SAN MARCOS CISD	

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 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	CAN DEDUTA IOD
District	SAN PERLITA 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% 87.0% 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% ≤ 10% NO 4.3% 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 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 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 YFS ≥ 95% 99% YFS 94.0% 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 94.0% 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 01 County District No 245904

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	245904
District	SAN PERLITA 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	206901
District	SAN SABA ISD	

Region

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% 85.1% 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 7.5% 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 NO Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 9.1% 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% 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 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

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	206901
District	SAN SABA 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	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 SAN VICENTE ISD

Region

County District No

18

022903

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

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	022903
District	SAN VICENTE ISD	

Region

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

17

058909

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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	100%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 72.0%	Math NO	acquinition and use of		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0 70	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	058909
District	SANDS CISD	

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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school <b>YES</b> 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	SANFORD-FRITC
District	SANI OND-I MITO

County District No 117903 CH ISD

Region

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	44.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	11.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	40.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	40.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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		not reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  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	ILS		ILG			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

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

County District No	117903
CANEODD EDITCH ICD	

Region

16

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

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

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

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

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

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

District	SANGER ISD	

Region

County District No

11

061908

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 84.2% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 64.7% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 5.3% ≤ 10% 14% 15.4% 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% 0.4% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES 30.0% 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 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 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	061908
District	SANGER 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school <b>YES</b>		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

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

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

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

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

District SANTA ANNA ISD

15

042903

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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> 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	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	C				,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	50.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		•
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /0	113		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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 _	042903
District	SANTA ANNA ISD	

Region

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

Region

County District No

04

084909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	64.3%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	17.9%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	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	71.9%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	14.1%	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			\/=0		\/=0	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	with IEPS who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	084909
District	SANTA FE 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)

**SANTA GERTRUDIS ISD** District

02 Region County District No 137904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	93.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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		listrict 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	<b>7C:</b> 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%	159		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	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	County District No	137904
District	SANTA GERTRUDIS 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 Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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)

trict	SANTA MARIA IS
llict	SAIVI A IVIAKIA IS

Dist

Region

County District No

01

031913

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	13.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> 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	96.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	123		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	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	031913	
District	SANTA MARIA ISD		

Region

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

Region

County District No

01

031914

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 YES 76.9% 75.0% 66% 83.5% 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 8.3% NO 9.9% 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% 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 27.3% 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% 18.2% 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 42.0% 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 43.0% 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 _	031914	
District	SANTA ROSA 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	11
County District No	182904

District SANTO 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		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	70.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	25.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.0%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	25.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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	,	not reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	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
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	159		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	improved use Summary Summary		73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No	182904
District	SANTO ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 5		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	074911
District	SAVOY ISD	

Region

10

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% 60.0% 66% 57.9% 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 2.6% 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 "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1% 7.9% 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 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% 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 87.0% 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 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	074911
District	SAVOY 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	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	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

SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD

County District No

Region

20 094902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> 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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.1%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	19.0%	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	18.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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 statement 1  Summary Statement 1  Statement 1  Summary Statement 1  Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	169		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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)

District	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD

Region

094902

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	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	SCHLEICHER ISD
DISTRICT	SCHLEICHER ISD

15

207901

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 0.0% NO ≥ 68% NO 66% 48.4% 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% ≤ 10% NO 9.7% 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 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% 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 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 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 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 _	207901
District	SCHLEICHER ISD	

Region

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

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

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

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

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

Region 20 County District No 015806

District SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate 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	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	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	67.0%	NO		Statement 2	- 07 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70	123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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)

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 20 County District No 015827

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements  6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary					district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	42.0%	NO	Knowledge and Skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0 /6	113		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

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

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY District

Region

015827

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	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

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

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

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

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

Region County District No 015831 SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DISCOVERY

20

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	96.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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 iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> 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		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	, -	listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		201	\/=0		= 0	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	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	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 01583\*
SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Region

District DISCOVERY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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 075903 District \_\_\_ **SCHULENBURG ISD** 

13

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	80.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	20.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular 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	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	77.8%	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	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 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  Summ Statemen		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

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	075903

**SCHULENBURG ISD** District

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

ictrict	

SCURRY-ROSSER ISD

County District No

Region

10 129910

State Performance Plan/ Annual	State	State	State	LEA	LEA Met	State Performance Pla	an/ Annual	State	State	State	LEA	LEA Met
Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?		Performance Report Indicators		Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 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	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	66.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES skills (including social relationships)		Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	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						<b>7C:</b> 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		demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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)

	County District No _	129910	
District	SCURRY-ROSSER ISD		

Region

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

Region

County District No

17

083901

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% 69.0% 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% 16.7% 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 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 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 34.0% 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	083901	
District	SEAGRAVES 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)

District	SEALY ISD	

06

008902

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	88.2%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	69.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.8%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	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	13.3%	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	10.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 54.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U76	U 76	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o 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	008902
District	SEALY ISD	

Region

06

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

**SEASHORE CHARTER SCHOOLS** 

County District No

Region

02

178808

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	4.2%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 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	96.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 74.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 78.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	00/	VEC		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	U%	0%	YES		1 1 2 3	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, o data are n	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	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	SEASHORE CHARTER SCHOOLS

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	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  14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school secondary in the time they left school secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school secondary secondary school secon		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)

13
094901

District SEGUIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	72.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	1.7%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	15.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 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).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	80.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 43.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	094901
District	SEGUIN 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	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school <b>YES</b>		YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

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

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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	083903

District \_\_\_ SEMINOLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.5%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	26.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	58.0%	NO	Miowieuge and skills	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 /0	ILS		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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)

Region	17
County District No	083903

District SEMINOLE ISD

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

**SER-NINOS 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate 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 oprogram; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to numbers, o	small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
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%				small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, o data are n	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Region 04 County District No 101802

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

District	SER-NINOS CHARTER SCHOO

Region

101802

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	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	SEYMOUR ISD	

09

012901

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% 73.7% 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 8.8% 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 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 100% YES ≤ 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 30.0% 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 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 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 _	012901
District	SEYMOUR ISD	

Region

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

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

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

District	<b>SHALLOWATER</b>	חפו
DISTRICT	SHALLOWATER	130

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% 77.9% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% ≤ 10% 14% 14.8% 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 YES 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 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 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 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 78.0% 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

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

17 Region 152909 County District No

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	152909
District	SHALLOWATER 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	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	SHAMROCK ISD
District	OI IAMINOON 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 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 ≤ 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 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 59.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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

Region 16 County District No 242902

# 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	242902
District	SHAMROCK 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)

District	SHARYLAND ISD	

Region

County District No

01

108911

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% 70.9% 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 2.5% NO 14.3% ≤ 10% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 1.9% 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 9.4% 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% 15.1% 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 72.0% 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 _	108911
District	SHARYLAND ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual te 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)

District

SHEKINAH RADIANCE ACADEMY

Region 20 County District No 015819

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	98.3%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	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	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 28.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VE0.		\/F0	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		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	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)

strict	SHEKINAH RADIANCE 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	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	SHELBYVILLE ISD
Diotriot	01122211122

07 Region County District No 210903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.8%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	97.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		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
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U%	0%	169		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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	210903
District	SHELBYVILLE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	101924
SHELDON ISD	

District

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.5%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> 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	92.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	4.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				Geleye		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
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	101924
District	SHELDON 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	SHEPHERD ISD	

Region

County District No

06

204904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	68.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 42.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 43.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			\/=0		\/=0	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  Summal Statemen		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	204904
District	SHEPHERD ISD	

Region

06

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

10

091906

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 85.5% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 1.8% NO 14.3% ≤ 10% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.6% 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 14.9% 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% 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 19.4% 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 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 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	091906
District	SHERMAN 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	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

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

District	SHINER ISD	

03

143903

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% 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 YES ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 6.7% 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% 5.0% 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 25.0% 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% 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 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 87.0% 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 72.0% 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	143903
District	SHINER ISD	

Region

03

http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/
Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators

State Rate State Rate State Target?

State Performance Report Indicators

SHINER ISD

LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators

State Target?

State Rate State Performance Report Indicators

Target Rate Target?

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

14

047905

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 0.0% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 90.0% 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 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 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 14.0% 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 14.0% 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)

	Region	14
	County District No	047905
etrict	SIDNEY ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Met Rate State Target?	
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school ≥ 5		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

Region 19 County District No 115902

SIERRA BLANCA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the 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	<b>5C:</b> 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	with IEPs attending a separa	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district 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			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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 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	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	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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)

Region	19
County District No	115902
	•

District SIERRA BLANCA ISD

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

05

100904

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	91.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.8%	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	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.8%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	44.1%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills  Summary Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	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	076	TES		169			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	100904
District	SII SBFF ISD	

Region

05

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

16

023902

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% 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 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 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 93.0% 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

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	023902	
District	SILVERTON 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	019909
District	SIMMS 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 Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.9%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	54.1%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		NO	<b>5C:</b> 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 ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 91.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 73.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills  Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	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%	U%	169		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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	019909
District	SIMMS 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)

District	SINTON ISD	

02

205906

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	90.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	20.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	4.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 36.0%	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				30.078		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	205906
District	SINTON ISD	

02

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	SIVELLS BEND 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 N/A N/A ≥ 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 ≤ 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 75.0% 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 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 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

Region 11 049909 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	049909
District	SIVELLS BEND 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		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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)

strict	SKIDMORE-TYNAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	91.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.3%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	9.6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> 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	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 89.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 74.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	123		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Region County District No 02 013905

Dist

## Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	013905
District	SKIDMORE-TYNAN ISD	

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

Region

County District No

17

152903

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% 70.1% 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 8.7% 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% 0.8% 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 70.0% 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% 12.5% 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 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 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	152903
intrint	CL ATON ICD	

Region

17

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.	≥ 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		14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other 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	SLIDELL ISD

County District No 249908

Region

11

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	50.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VE0.		\/F0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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	11
County District No	249908

District SLIDELL ISD

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

07

001909

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% 56.5% 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 8.7% 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 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 97.0% 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 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 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 _	001909
District	SLOCUM 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 011904

Region

13

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.7%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	011904
District	SMITHVILLE 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	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	SMYER ISD	

17

110906

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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 81.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	123		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	110906
District	SMYER 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	IEP that includes appropriate measurable ondary goals that are annually updated ed upon an age appropriate transition nent, transition services, including courses that will reasonably enable the student to ose postsecondary goals, and annual IEP		NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	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	026903

Region

06

District **SNOOK ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.2%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	43.0%	NO	nnomouge and online	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
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			YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	026903
District	SNOOK ISD	

Region

06

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

Region

County District No

14

208902

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 80.8% 66% 77.1% 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 15.4% 7.1% 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 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 20.0% 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% 43.6% 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 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 42.0% 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 42.0% 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	208902	
District	SNYDER 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	SOCORRO ISI

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 63.4% 66% 64.0% 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 7.5% 17.2% ≤ 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% 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 13.8% 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 99.0% YES ≤ 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 17% 7.4% 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 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

19 Region 071909 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	071909
istrict	SOCORRO ISD	

Region

19

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

20

015909

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 YES 76.0% 66% 72.1% 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 4.0% ≤ 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 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 YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 71.4% 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 97.0% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES NO ≥ 95% 98% 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 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	015909
District	SOMERSET 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 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	SOMERVILLE
Diotilot	OOMERVIELE

Region County District No 026902

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 I	,	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	75.0%	NO		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	85.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	25.0%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate 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%	ОМ
	≥ 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		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 37.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			\/=0			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	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

	County District No _	026902
District	SOMERVILLE ISD	

Region

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

15

218901

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 83.3% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 74.0% 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 16.7% ≤ 10% 2.7% 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 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 18.2% 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 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 50.0% 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	218901
District	SONORA 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 17
County District No 152803

District SOUTH PLAINS 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	91.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 33.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	31.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 57 %	56.9%	TES		
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	370	570				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)

SOUTH PLAINS ACADEMY CHARTER DISTRICT District

County District No

Region

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

ictrict	
II CTTICT	

20 Region County District No 015908

**SOUTH SAN ANTONIO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	60.9%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	28.3%	NO		<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	17.3%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.5%	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	23.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	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		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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 49.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	076	TES		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

County District No		015908
COUTU CAN	ANITONIO ICE	

Region

20

District SOUTH SAN ANTONIO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs 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	O I
County District No	108802
SOUTH TEXAS EDUCATIONAL TECH	INOLOGIES
INC	

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.3%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.6%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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		ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	123		ILO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that 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)

Region	01
County District No	108802
<b>SOUTH TEXAS EDUCATIONAL TECH</b>	INOLOGIES
INC	

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at 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	SOUTH TEXAS
District	000111112//

Region County District No 031916 AS ISD

01

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.1%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).  6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	6	U
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	45.0%	NO	demonstrate improved						small listrict level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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	data are n	listrict level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	031916
District	SOUTH TEXAS 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)

istrict	SOUTHI AND ISD	

Region

County District No

17

085903

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	085903
District	SOUTHLAND 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, distric level data are no reported	

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

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

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

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

District SOUTHSIDE ISD

Region

County District No

20

015917

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	72.4%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.4%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	20.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	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	46.5%	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		≥ 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	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	<b>7C:</b> 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%	159		1 1 2	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

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

	County District No	015917
District	SOUTHSIDE 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	SOUTHWEST IS
DISTRICT	SOUTHWEST

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 86.0% 66% 84.7% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 7.9% ≤ 10% 10.3% 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% 0.3% 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 12.0% 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% 5.3% 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 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 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

20 Region County District No 015912

within which the evaluation must be

12: Percent of children referred by Part C

prior to age 3, who are found eligible for

Part B, and who have an IEP developed

and implemented by their third birthdays

conducted, within that timeframe

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

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

	County District No _	015912	
District	SOUTHWEST ISD		

Region

reported

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

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 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

one year of leaving high school.

14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in

they left school, and were enrolled in higher

education or in some other postsecondary

secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

≥ 72%

69%

NO

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

100%

99.7%

NO

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

YES

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

District

SOUTHWEST PREPARATORY SCHOOL

County District No

Region

20

015807

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	63.0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	29.6%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	95.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> 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 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 42.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 28.0%	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%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 With IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	169		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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)

SOUTHWEST PREPARATORY SCHOOL District

Region

015807

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	B: Percent of youth who are no longer in condary school, had IEPs in effect at the time y left school, and were enrolled in higher ucation or in some other postsecondary ucation or training program; or competitively ployed or in some other employment within a year of leaving high school.		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	SOUTHWEST SCHOOL
District	300 IIIWLSI 30IIOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	56.5%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	99.0%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	34.8%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	0.0%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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				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%	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 leve data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	tho report that colvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

Region 04 County District No 101838

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

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

. tog.c	• .
County District No	101838
COUTUMECT COUOCI	

Region

04

District SOUTHWEST SCHOOL

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

Region

County District No

16

098904

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	nte special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small 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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	rho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

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

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

	County District No _	098904
District	SPEARMAN 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	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)

Region	06
County District No	170907

District SPLENDORA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.0%	YES		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	75.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.4%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> 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 ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	46.7%	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	55.0%	NO	<b>70</b> 5 7 7 7 7	Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /6	123		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	170907
District	SPLENDORA 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	SPRING BRANCH ISE
District	OI KING DIVARGITIOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.5%	NO		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	69.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	15.9%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.0%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.4%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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	12.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	14.5%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 59.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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

Region 04 County District No 101920

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	101920	
District	SPRING BRANCH 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)

rict	SPRING CREEK
HOL	OI IVIIIO OIVEEIV

Distri

16

117907

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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.5%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 40.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved 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		Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 78	11.3		TLS			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	numbers, district level data are not reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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 _	117907
District	SPRING CREEK 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

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

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established targets under the approved conditional No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver for specific provisions. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies 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	SPRING HILL ISD
DISTRICT	SPRING HILL 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% 50.5% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 25.0% ≤ 10% 17.2% 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 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% N/A 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 5.3% 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 NO ≥ 95% 98% 17% 36.8% 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 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 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

07 Region County District No 092907

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	092907
District	SPRING HILL ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	101313
District	SPRING ISD	
District	01 11110 100	

County District No.

Region

04

101010

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 67.0% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 76.9% 66% 75.1% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 19.4% NO NO 19.3% ≤ 10% 14% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 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 50.8% 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% 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 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 43.0% 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	101919
District	SPRING 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)

SPRINGLAKE-EARTH ISD District

Region 17 County District No 140907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		State Performance 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	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with 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	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	40.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 41.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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 Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement.		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	17
County District No	140907

SPRINGLAKE-EARTH 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	SPRINGTOWN ISD

Region

County District No

11

184902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	81.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	45.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.4%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	32.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES			≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	acquisition and use of	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 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	,	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	### ### ##############################		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 _	184902
District	SPRINGTOWN 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	SPUR ISD	

Region

County District No

17

063903

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% 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 ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 18.5% ≤ 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 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 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 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 59.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 48.0% 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	063903
District	SPUR 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	SPURGER ISD	

05

229905

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	85.7%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.5%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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	92.0%	NO	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	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	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	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	U 76	076	163		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	trate improved use priate behaviors to Summary	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a c special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	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 _	229905
District	SPURGER 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	ST ANTHONY SCHOO
District	STANTHONT SCHOOL

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% 93.8% 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 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 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 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 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

10 Region County District No 057836

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	057836
District	ST ANTHONY SCHOOL	

Region

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

Region 02 County District No 013801

ST MARY'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 81.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	00/	00/	VEC		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that 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 ST MARY'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL District

Region

013801

State Performance Plan/ Annual 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 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)

County District No	079910
STAFFORD MSD	

District

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	87.0%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	93.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Will IETS WILD STATE TO STATE T		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	079910	
District	STAFFORD MSD		

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	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	STAMFORD ISD	

Region

County District No

14

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.5%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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)

Region	14
County District No	127906

STAMFORD ISD District

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

Region

County District No

18

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.6%	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	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 51.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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						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  Will IEFS WID  Summary  Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	156902
District	STANTON 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)

Region	12
County District No	167903

STAR ISD District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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
	Example 295% 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		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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						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	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level 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	167903
Dietrict	STAD ISD	

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

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

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

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

County District No 174801
STEPHEN F AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY
CHARTER SCHOOL

Region

07

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due te	small
acmevement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	71.0%	NO	demonstrate improved					numbers, o	
	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	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	001	VEO		V/50	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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	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 1748
STEPHEN F AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY

Region

District CHARTER SCHOOL

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

Region

County District No

11

072903

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 92.3% YES ≥ 68% NO 66% 59.9% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% 12.1% ≤ 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% 0.4% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES 30.0% 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 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 62.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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	072903
ет	EDUENVILLE	

District

Region

11

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

STEPPING STONES CHARTER EL

County District No

Region

04

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	92.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	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		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 96.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 92.0%	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/	VEC		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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)

District	STEPPING STONES CHARTER EL

Region

101859

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	ls in effect at the time enrolled in higher employed within one ≥ 57% 59% YES level d		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

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

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

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

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

District	STERLING CITY IS
טוסנווטנ	STERLING CITT IS

Region County District No 216901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C:</b> 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	<b>6A:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early oprogram; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children 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	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary	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	00/	00/	VEC		VES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 1  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
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	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 _	216901	
District	STERLING CITY ISD		

Region

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

rict	STOCKDALE 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% 46.5% 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 20.2% ≤ 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 YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO 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 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% 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 62.0% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 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 247906

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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 _	247906
District	STOCKDALE 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	16
County District No	211902

District \_ STRATFORD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?				
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	85.7%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.9%	NO				
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.3%	YES				
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> 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	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	33.3%	NO				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small					
	≥ 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					
<b>3C</b> : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	0					district level ot reported				
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	80.0%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		·				
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> 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%	163		169	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  Summary Statement 2		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported				

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

	County District No _	211902	
District	STRATFORD ISD		

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Met Rate State Target?	
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO	YES	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left 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	STRAWN 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% 50.0% 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% 21.4% 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 81.0% 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 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

Region 11 County District No 182905

### Texas Education Agency | Federal 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	182905
District	STRAWN 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	SUDAN ISD	

17

140908

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 60.0% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 84.4% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 20.0% ≤ 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 N/A 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 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 78.0% 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	140908
District	SUDAN 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%	≥ 57% 59% YES nun leve		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 **SULPHUR BLUFF ISD** 

Region

County District No

80

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO		<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	93.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		14%	NO	6.5%	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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).	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO	
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	with IEPs attending a separa	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or		17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0 /0	ILS		ILG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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	112910
cı	III DUIID DI LIEE ICD	

Region

80

District SULPHUR BLUFF ISD

LEA

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

**SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD** 

Region 80 County District No 112901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	78.6%	YES		<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		66%	NO	60.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	14.3%	NO		<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		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		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
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	56.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	17.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 38.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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	201	201	\/=0		\	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	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	112901
District	SULPHUR 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	small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%			numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	72% I 64% I NO I		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

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

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

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

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

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

District	SUNDOWN ISD
District	CONDOMN 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 71.4% NO ≥ 68% NO YES 66% 95.6% 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 NO ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 14.3% ≤ 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 N/A 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 97.0% 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 84.0% 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 17 110907 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	110907
District	SUNDOWN 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	SUNNYVALE 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	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 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	75.0%	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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 64.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			\/=0		\/=0	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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 _	057919
District	SUNNYVALE ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the 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	SUNRAY 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	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	47.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	<b>6B:</b> 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	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 81.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	numbers, district leve 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 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%	163		169			≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	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	171902	_
Dietrict	SLINBAY ISD		

Region

16

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at 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	020906

Region

04

District **SWEENY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	92.3%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.1%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
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	8.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C</b> : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	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	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	62.0%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 With IEPs who Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 70			1.20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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	020906
District	SWEENY 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)

rict	SWEET HO

Distr ME ISD

Region

County District No

03

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	<b>6B:</b> Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		children aged 3 through 5 Stateme		Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	YES with IEPS who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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 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	143905
District	SWEET 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	≥ 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/.

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

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

District	OM/EETM/ATED IOD
District	SWEETWATER 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 86.4% 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 4.5% NO 7.0% 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 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 YES Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading 31.6% 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 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 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

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

14 Region 177902 County District No

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 _	177902
District	SWEETWATER ISD	

Region

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