Region County District No

02 205907

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

District

TAFT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	68.8%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 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	18.8%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	28.6%	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	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO YES TC: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 02 County District No

205907

District

TAFT ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ______ County District No _____

17 153904

District

TAHOKA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool Sun children aged 3 through 5 State	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region <u>17</u> County District No 153904

District

TAHOKA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

04 146907

District

TARKINGTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.7%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	16.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

04 County District No 146907

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

District

TARKINGTON ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 201910

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

District

TATUM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	84.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	60.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No 20

nty District No 201910

07

District

TATUM ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 13 County District No 246911

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

District

TAYLOR 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	95.7%	YES	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.4%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	24.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	2.7%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 13 County District No

246911

District

TAYLOR ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 081904

District

TEAGUE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Ann Performance Report Indicato et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs age		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.7%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	77.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 48.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070					Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

12 081904

District

TEAGUE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)
 Region
 05

 County District No
 123803

 TEKOA ACADEMY OF ACCELERATED STUDIES

 District
 STEM SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 83.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 05 County District No 123803 TEKOA ACADEMY OF ACCELERATED STUDIES STEM SCHOOL

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 014909

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

District

TEMPLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators 54: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	84.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	57.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childrend program and receiving the service of th		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	27.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

12

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

12 014909

District

TEMPLE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 210904

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

District

TENAHA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: 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	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 65.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region County District No

07 210904

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

District

TENAHA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

18 022004

TERLINGUA CSD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t? State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early abilities of program and require the service of t		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 86.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 86.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No.

No 022004

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

District

TERLINGUA CSD

inty	DIS	STRICT INO	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	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 18 222901

District

TERRELL COUNTY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	42.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 29.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0 /0	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

18 County District No 222901

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

District

TERRELL COUNTY ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 10 County District No 129906

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

District

TERRELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	52.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	21.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early school the school and scho		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.3%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	9.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	TL3		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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)

Region County District No

10 129906

reported

Due to small

numbers, district

level data are not

reported

District

≥ 72%

69%

NO

TERRELL ISD

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

year of leaving high school

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

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

education or in some other postsecondary

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/.

State

Target

≥ 78%

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

LEA

Met

State

Target?

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region

LEA

Rate

80 019907

LEA Met

State

Target?

County District No

TEXARKANA ISD

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

District

State

Target

76.9%	NO	87.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	49.7%	NO
11.2%	NO	9.2%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.2%	NO
14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	53.3%	YES
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	30.0%	NO
Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	small
99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥61%	61.8%	YES	data are no	
Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to numbers, c	small
				demonstrate improved						

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

	278%	76.9%	NO	87.4%	TES	80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	49.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.2%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a senarate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	53.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	30.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VEC	NO YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· ·	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

on <u>08</u> No <u>019907</u>

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

District

TEXARKANA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

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

District

TEXAS CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	84.6%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	56.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	26.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 39.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 30.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VEC	YES 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	,	district level ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

04 084906

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

04 084906

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

District

TEXAS CITY ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

County District No

 Region
 14

 strict No
 221801

District TEXAS COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMIES

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.9%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≤ 17%	17%	YES	57.6%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 64.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	numbers,	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		VEC	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 14 County District No 221801

District TEXAS COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMIES

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

District

TEXAS EDUCATION CENTERS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	50.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 39.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 39.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TEO		TEO		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11 061802

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 061802

District

TEXAS EDUCATION CENTERS

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 220814

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

TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF THE ARTS District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 60.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VES		VES	YES 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		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 11 County District No 220814

District TEXAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF THE ARTS

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 227805

TEXAS EMPOWERMENT ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recein majority of special education	d program and receiving the of special education and related in the regular early childhood		31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs attending a separa	ducation class, separate school or		YES	N/A	N/A	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	93.0%	NO		Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved		≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with <i>IEPs</i>	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
							Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

13

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

13

County District No 227805

District

TEXAS EMPOWERMENT ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

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

District TEXAS JUVENILE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

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	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	0.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	77.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	88.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 36.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 24.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

13 227622

te Plan/ Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

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

County District No 227622

Region

13

District TEXAS JUVENILE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

15 226801

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

District

TEXAS LEADERSHIP

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	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early 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 sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 226801

15

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

District

TEXAS LEADERSHIP

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____1

District _____

TEXAS PREPARATORY SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula. childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 86.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

13 105802

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No

13 105802

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 13 County District No 22790 TEXAS SCH FOR THE BLIND & VISUALLY IMPAIRED 227905

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	0.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	100%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%/	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 13 County District No 227905 TEXAS SCH FOR THE BLIND & VISUALLY IMPAIRED

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

13 227906

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

District

TEXAS	SCH	FOR	THE	DEAF	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	0.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	100%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	100%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

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

District

Region 13 County District No 227906

TEXAS SCH FOR THE DEAF

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

TEXAS SERENITY ACADEMY

170801

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due t	o small
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	41.0%	NO	demonstrate improved						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	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

06

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) District Region 06 County District No 170801

TEXAS SERENITY ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

Target

0%

0%

0%

0%

YES

YES

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

IEPs

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

10 days in a school year for children with

4B: Percent of districts that have a

IEPs by race and ethnicity

significant discrepancy in the rate of

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

LEA

Met

State

Target?

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

TEXHOMA ISD

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

16 211901

LEA Met

State

Target?

numbers, district level

data are not reported

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

YES

YES

73.2%

77.6%

LEA

Rate

District

State

Target

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	92.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	75.0%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1		0.1.2,0	0		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 exculsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	o small

with IEPs who

meet their needs

demonstrate improved use

of appropriate behaviors to

for children with disabilities

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

Summary

Statement 2

≥ 72%

≥ 76%

YES

YES

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

16 211901

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

District

TEXHOMA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 16 County District No 056902

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

District

TEXLINE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

16 056902

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

District

TEXLINE ISD

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

<u>13</u> 227824

District THE EAST AUSTIN COLLEGE PREP ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	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		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 42.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 13 County District No 227824

District THE EAST AUSTIN COLLEGE PREP ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

0%

0%

YES

YES

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

Met

LEA

Region County District No

LEA

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

LEA Met

State

THE RHODES SCHOOL

State

Met

State

District

State

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	State Target?	Performance Report	Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regula	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	50.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	20070	01.270	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	50.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 37 70	50.978	1120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	163				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a						8: Percent of parents with a	•				Due tr	small

04 101861

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

04 County District No 101861

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

District

THE RHODES 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		
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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		

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

State Performance Plan/ Annual

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

LEA

Met

Region County District No

THE VARNETT PUBLIC SCHOOL

04 101814

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

State

State

LEA

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.1%	NO

Performance Report Indicators	State Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?	ete Performance Report Indic		State Target	Rate	Met Target?	Rate	State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early the set of the		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95% 98% YES 100% YES 6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	90.0%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	2 00 %	01.2%	TES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 90.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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 special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 101814

04

District

THE VARNETT PUBLIC SCHOOL

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

13 166905

THORNDALE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.5%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 42.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 34.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	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%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

egion <u>13</u> ict No **166905**

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

District

THORNDALE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 13 County District No 246912

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

District

THRALL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	48.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sci residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 33.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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 13 County District No 246912

District

THRALL ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

02 149902

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

District

THREE	RIVERS	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	55.6%	NO	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	44.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	21, served in separate school	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	37.5%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 149902

02

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

District

THREE RIVERS ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

11 072901

District

THREE WAY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 40.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	001	VEO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 072901

11

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

District

THREE WAY ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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

224901

THROCKMORTON ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1 : Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	5 570/	50.00/		,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	25.0%	NO	hanomougo una onno	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	TES		113	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	-	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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

09

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

09 County District No 224901

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

District

THROCKMORTON	חפו
	100

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

03 158902

TIDEHAVEN ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	25.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due tr	o small
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	42.0%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 35.0%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES Due t		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported			
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 158902

03

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

District

TIDEHAVEN ISD

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

4B: Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

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

0%

0%

YES

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

Region County District No

210905

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

TIMPSON ISD

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

LEA

District

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	6.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	85.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math		Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	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	84.0%	YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	% 0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported

meet their needs

YES

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

07

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

_ Region County District No

ion 07 No 210905

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

District

TIMPSON ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 091907

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

District

TIOGA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

10

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 10 County District No 091907

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

District

TIOGA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 11 County District No 111903

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

District

TOLAR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	84.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.8%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	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	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 77.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VEC	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Sta	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 11 County District No 111903

District

TOLAR ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 091918

10

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

District

TOM BEAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 59.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with JEDs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

____Region County District No

egion 10 ct No 091918

District

TOM BEAN ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 04 County District No 101921

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

District

TOMBALL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	76.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular 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	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 <i>majority of special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). <i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	3.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	15.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 68.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with JEDs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

04 101921

District

TOMBALL ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

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

District

TORNILLO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 <i>inajoing of special education and related</i> <i>services in the regular early childhood</i> <i>program; and (b).</i> <i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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 stit	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

19 071908

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

Region County District No

19 071908

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

TORNILLO ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

<u>12</u> 014802

District TRANSFORMATIVE CHARTER ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	11.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	160		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

erformance Plan/ Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

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

County District No

District TRANSFORMATIVE CHARTER ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region 12 strict No 014802

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

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

TREETOPS SCHOOL INTERNATIONAL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 73.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

11 220801

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 220801

TREETOPS SCHOOL INTERNATIONAL

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 14 County District No 221905

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

District

TRENT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VEC	YES	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		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	, .	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 14 County District No 221905

District

TRENT ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 074912

10

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

District

TRENTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	4.3%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 <i>majority of special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). <i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 61.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TEO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region County District No

10 074912

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

District

TRENTON ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____

07 107907

TRINIDAD ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 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	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	program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	7B : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to numbers, o	o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region County District No

07 107907

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

TRINIDAD ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

TRINITY BASIN PREPARATORY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	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
3C: 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	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	29.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	YES With IEP's who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

10 057813

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 057813

TRINITY BASIN PREPARATORY

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

13 046802

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

District

TRINITY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	25.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	75.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 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		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 41.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 25.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO Statement 2 YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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 13 County District No 046802

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 228903

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

District

TRINITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	≤ 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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	58.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	41.7%	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
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 49.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

06

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

06 228903

District

TRINITY ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 212904

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

District

TROUP ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.4%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	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	TA: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 07 County District No 212904

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

District

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

12 Region County District No 014910

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

District

TROY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	76.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	83.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	ES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 12 County District No

014910

District

TROY ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 16 County District No 219903

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

District

TULIA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	70.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	73.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	30.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	71.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 69.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	076	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 16 County District No 219903

.

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

02 178912

TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	96.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.2%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	39.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	21.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	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	54.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 57 78	50.976	1123		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEO		VEO	ES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 178912

02

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

16 096905

District

TURKEY-QUITAQUE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	86.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 88.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	YES demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2 ≥ 5	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TEO		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

16 County District No 096905

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

District

TURKEY-QUITAQUE ISD

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

Region04County District No101840

District TWO DIMENSIONS PREPARATORY ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 17.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	IES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region04County District No101840

District TWO DIMENSIONS PREPARATORY ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 212905

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

District

TYLER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance 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	77.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	8.2%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.6%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	6.7%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	34.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	29.1%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		NO	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

07

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 212905

District

TYLER ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

10 057845

District

UME PREPARATORY ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 76					Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 10 County District No 057845

District UME PRE

UME PREPARATORY ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

07 230908

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

UNION GROVE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 72.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 47.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statemen	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 230908

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

District

UNION GROVE ISD

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

State

Target

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

10 days in a school year of children with

IEPs by race and ethnicity

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

LEA

Met

State

Tormet?

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

LEA

Rate

230904

LEA Met

State

Target?

data are not reported

UNION HILL ISD

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

District

State

Target

			Target		Target?					Target		Target
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	50.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	50.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 75.0%	Math acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 0 ≥ 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	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 1 Summary Statement 2		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070					≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported	
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

07

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

on <u>07</u> No <u>230904</u>

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

District

UNION HILL ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

Target

0%

0%

YES

YES

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

4B: Percent of districts that have a

IEPs by race and ethnicity

significant discrepancy in the rate of

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Met

State

Target?

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region

LEA

Rate

240903

County District No

UNITED ISD

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

District

State

Target

≥ 76%

77.6%

YES

					-							
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	89.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.6%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	30.2%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	25.6%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to numbers, d	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	data are no	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to numbers, d	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 58.0%	Math NO	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are no		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	YES 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	Due to numbers, d	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0,0	0		0		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are no	

01

LEA Met

State

Target?

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

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

Region County District No

01 240903

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

District

UNITED ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

10 057808

District

UNIVERSAL ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 86.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 82.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	ES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		120		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 057808

10

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

District

UNIVERSAL ACADEMY

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

C

 Region
 04

 County District No
 101807

District UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 89.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	IES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a 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

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 04 County District No 101807

District UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CHARTER SCHOOL

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

13 Region County District No 227819 UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ELEMENTARY CHARTER SCHOOL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	91.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 94.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 76.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 13 County District No 227819 UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ELEMENTARY 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 Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they 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 13 County District No 227806 UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS UNIVERSITY 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	70.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	88.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	23.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.2%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 29.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	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 still for a still state of the	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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 227806 UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS UNIVERSITY 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 Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 10 County District No 057843

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - HAMPTON PREPARATORY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	, -	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 72.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	00/	001	VEO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 10 County District No 057843

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - HAMPTON PREPARATORY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 10 County District No 057803 UPLIFT EDUCATION - NORTH HILLS PREPARATORY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	92.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 73.0%	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 Sta children aged 3 through 5 Sta	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 10 County District No 057803 UPLIFT EDUCATION - NORTH HILLS PREPARATORY

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 057838

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

UPLIFT EDUCATION - PEAK PREPARATORY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	93.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.9%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early oblidhead program and provide the service of the		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading		r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	40.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	Tesidential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 86.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
	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		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

10

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 10 County District No 057838

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - PEAK PREPARATORY

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

 Region
 10

 strict No
 057842

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - WILLIAMS PREPARATORY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	92.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early abildhood program and vocibility the server and vocibility of the server and vo		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 42.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 10 County District No 057842

District UPLIFT EDUCATION - WILLIAMS PREPARATORY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)
 Region
 11

 County District No
 220816

 UPLIFT EDUCATION-SUMMIT INTERNATIONAL

 District
 PREPARATORY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	80.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.2%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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/	VEO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 11 County District No 220816 UPLIFT EDUCATION-SUMMIT INTERNATIONAL PREPARATORY

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 212804

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

District

UT	TYLER	INNOVATION	ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators t? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childbood program and receiving the 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	, , , , ,		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 33.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0 /0				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 212804

07

District UT TYLEI

UT TYLER INNOVATION ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 20 County District No 232904

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

District

UTOPIA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	43.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		00/	VEC		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

 Region
 20

 strict No
 232904

District

UTOPIA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State Performance Report Indicators arget?		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 232903

District

UVALDE CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	6.1%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	3.7%	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	12.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

232903

20

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

UVAL	.DE	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		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region ______

VALENTINE ISD

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

District

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

18 122902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 122902

18

District

VALENTI

VAL	ENT	INE	ISD	

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

12 018904

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

District

VALLEY MILLS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual te Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.2%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	1.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	9.4%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	83.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TEO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

12 County District No 018904

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

District

VALLEY MILLS ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____1

01 108916

District

VALLEY VIEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et ate performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators get? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	93.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	 5C: Percent of children with 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	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	31.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

n <u>01</u> o **108916**

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

District

VALLEY VIEW ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

11 049903

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

District

VALLEY VIEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.9%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 73.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

n <u>11</u> o **049903**

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

District

VALLEY VIEW ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

10 091908

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

District

VAN ALSTYNE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 64: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.4%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	85.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 79.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	076	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

10 County District No 091908

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

District

VAN ALSTYNE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 234906

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

District

VAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	95.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	11.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 64.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 234906

District

VAN ISD

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

03 158906

VAN VLECK ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	88.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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			NE0			7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 158906

03

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

District

VAN VLECK ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

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

District

VANGUARD ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 74.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 76	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

01 108808

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 108808

01

VAN

District

VANGUARD ACADEMY

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 16 County District No 180902

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

District

VEGA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.6%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 95.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 95.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 16 County District No

180902

District

VEGA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 11 County District No 126908

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

District

VENUS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	93.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	83.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.5%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.4%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	92.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 54.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 61.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region <u>11</u> County District No 126908

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

District

VENUS ISD

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

15 226908

District

VERIBEST ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 53.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 59.0%	Math NO	IO demonstrate improved ath acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that plvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

15 226908

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

District

VERIBEST ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

09 244903

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

District

VERNON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	6.9%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	10.0%	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	13.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 66.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____

egion 09 ct No 244903

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

District

VERNON ISD

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

03 235902

VICTORIA 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	72.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	18.7%	NO	5B: 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	with IEPs attending a regular early		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	54.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	8.6%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	-	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 52.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 47.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

gion 03 t No 235902

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

District

VICTORIA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

04 101865

District

VICTORY PREP

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 21, served in separate schools, residentia facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading			≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 28.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 76	110		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	, -	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

_ Region County District No

gion 04 t No 101865

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

District

VICTORY PREP

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

05 Region County District No 181907

District

VIDOR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	89.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	50.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.2%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	21.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	22.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	34.1%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region 05 County District No 181907

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

VIDOR ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 071809

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

VISTA DEL FUTURO CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 25.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	001	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

19

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 19 County District No 071809

District VISTA DEL FUTURO CHARTER SCHOOL

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No

03 143904

District

VYSEHRAD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	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
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

03 143904

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

District

VYSEHRAD ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

12 161801

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

WACO 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 Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	43.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	92.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 36.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 27.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
		0 70			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

Region County District No 161801

12

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 12 County District No 161914

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

District

WACO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	69.3%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	21.6%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	18.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	45.0%	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	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 36.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 29.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		UNU	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		NO	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region <u>12</u> County District No 161914

District

WACO ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No ____

13 089905

District

WAELDER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 74.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

089905

13

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

District

WAELDER ISD	

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No C

16 059902

District

WALCOTT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 83.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

16 059902

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

District

WΔI	COTT.	ISD	

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 101864

WALIPP-TSU PREPARATORY ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	TEO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

04

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit:

http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 101864

District WALIPP-TSU PREPARATORY ACADEMY

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

15 Region County District No 226906

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

District

WALL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	20.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	100%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 89.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	001	VEC		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 15 County District No

226906

District

WALL ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 237904

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

District

WALLER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	14.5%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	32.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		VES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivir special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

04

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

04 County District No 237904

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

11 049908

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

District

WALNUT BEND ISD

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

n <u>11</u> D **049908**

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

District

WALNUT BEND ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

018905

WALNUT SPRINGS ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.5%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	12.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due tr	o small
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	78.0%	YES	demonstrate improved					numbers, c	
	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	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES	11.070	YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	120		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receivin special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

12

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

12 County District No 018905

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

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No 22

05 229904

County District No

District

WARREN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	74.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy 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 ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	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
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 78				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

County District No 229904

05

District

WARREN ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

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

District

WASKOM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	87.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	12.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.7%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 63.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

07 102903

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

Region _

County District No 102903

07

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

District

WASKOM ISD

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

15 226905

District

WATER VALLEY 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	33.3%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	51.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	22.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	11.4%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 Bernald and the regulation and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≤ 17%	17%	YES	60.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 81.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /0			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

15 226905

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

District

WAIER	VALLEY ISD)

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

Region10County District No070801

District WAXAHACHIE FAITH FAMILY ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

For information about the State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report, Public Reporting, Targets, visit: of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

10

County District No 070801

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

10 070912

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

District

WAXAHACHIE 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	75.8%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	63.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.6%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.6%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	9.2%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.8%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved		YES	,	district level ot reported		
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

n <u>10</u> o **070912**

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

District

WAXAHACHIE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

11 184903

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

District

WEATHERFORD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	97.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.5%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	36.8%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	2.9%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 58.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 184903

11

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

District

|--|

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 01 County District No 240904

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

WEBB 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	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	66.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	33.3%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	65.0%	NO	Knowledge and skins	Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

01 240904

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

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

District WEIMAR ISD

LEA State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State LEA Met Met State Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State **Performance Report Indicators** Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class ≥ 78% NO 100% YES ≥ 68% NO YES 76.9% 66% 76.0% 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES ≤ 9% 11.2% NO 0.0% NO 6.0% YES ≤ 10% 14% than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO 100% 14.3% NO facilities, or homebound/hospital ≤ 1% 0.0% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the ≥ 30% 31% YES 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 95.0% YES ≤ 17% 17% YES YES ≥ 95% 98% 0.0% education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 79% Math children aged 3 through 5 81.7% YES Math Math Math Math Statement 1 Due to small with IEPs who numbers, district level demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES YES ≥ 95% 99% YES 100% skills (including social ≥ 61% 61.8% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate children aged 3 through 5 ≥ 80% 81.2% YES Statement 1 achievement standards with IEPs who Due to small ≥ 75% 59% NO 75.0% YES demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary ≥ 57% YES 58.9% Statement 2 ≥ 75% 56% NO 64.0% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary ≥ 81% 82.7% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who YES YES 0% 0% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summary IEPs of appropriate behaviors to ≥ 72% 73.2% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small special education services who report that significant discrepancy in the rate of YES YES YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0% schools facilitated parent involvement as a ≥ 76% 77.6% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

03 045905

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

ct No 045905

03

District

WEIMAR ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

16 044902

District

WELLINGTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	7.9%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	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	22.2%	NO
	≥ 95% 98% YES 100% YES 6B : Percent of children aged 3 through with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.2%	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	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 90.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 89.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	y in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Sta	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level					
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0%	160		160	demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

16 County District No 044902

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

District

WELLINGTON ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

17 223904

WELLMAN-UNION CISD

District

	1									1		1
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	81.3%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95% 98% YES 100% YES Precent of children aged 3 through 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	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 82.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Math					· · ·	district level ot reported					
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	65.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		orroportou
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEC		VEO		Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	children with 0% 0% YES YES demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

17 County District No 223904

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

District

WELLMAN-UNION CISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 07 County District No 037909

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

District

WELLS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day	IEPs aged 6 – r class less	≤ 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		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 037909

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

WELLS ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No _____

01 108913

District

WESLACO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	81.8%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	66.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	3.8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	16.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5. 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	13.2%	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	22.8%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

01 108913

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

District

WESLACO ISD

WESL	ACO	ISD	

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

05 100908

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

WEST HARDIN COUNTY 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	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	75.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	71.4%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	14.3%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 47.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0 /0	123			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region

05

County District No 100908

District

WEST HARDIN COUNTY CISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 12 County District No 161916

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

District

WEST ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators t? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	5.4%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attonding a provider party. 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	55.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 40.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	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%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region 12 County District No

161916

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

District

WEST ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

05 181906

District

WEST ORANGE-COVE 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	78.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	61.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	21.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	72.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 41.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	076				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 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 181906

05

WEST ORANGE-COVE CISD

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

02 178915

WEST OSO 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	87.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	62.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	13.0%	NO			≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.0%	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 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.9%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	15.4%	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	15.4%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	≥ 75%	59%	NO	51.0%	NO	demonstrate improved						district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 53.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	S with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

______ County District No

gion 02 t No 178915

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

District

WEST OSO ISD

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

07 201914

District WEST RUSK COUNTY CONSOLIDATED ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recer majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 74.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	-	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	IES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 07 County District No 201914

District WEST RUSK COUNTY CONSOLIDATED ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 202905

WEST SABINE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	16.7%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular 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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	94.0%	NO	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 49.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of	≥ 75%	56%	NO	60.0%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	o small
suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 202905

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

District

WEST SABINE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

14 168903

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

District

WESTBROOK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	4.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	, .	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 85.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	120		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

14 County District No 168903

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

District

WESTBROOK ISD

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

062905

WESTHOFF ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: 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 knowledge and skills	Summary	> 570/	50.00/	VE0	,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	100%	YES		Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

03

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

03 County District No 062905

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

District

WESTHOFF ISD	

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 11 County District No 220810

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

District WESTLAKE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	90.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 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	09/	09/	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

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

2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13) Region 11 County District No 220810

District WESTLAKE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

LEA

Region County District No

12 073904

WESTPHALIA ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: 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	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	9.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 57.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

12 County District No 073904

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

District

WESTPHALIA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 001908

WESTWOOD ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	44.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	12.0%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy 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 ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	33.3%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	44.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 68.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 61.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

No 001908

07

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

District

WESTWOOD ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No 24

03 241904

District

	.,			
WHAF	кто	N IS	D	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	72.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children agec with IEPs attending a regula. childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	16.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	16.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 56.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	163		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

03 County District No 241904

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

District

WHARTON ISD	
WHARTONISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education 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 242903

District

WHEELER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	50.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with a 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	50.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate 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 sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 86.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 86.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 76				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent 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

______ County District No

rict No 242903

16

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

District

WHEELER ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

16 033904

District

WHITE DEER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual e Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	3.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 64.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

16 County District No 033904

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

District

WHITE DEER ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region ____ County District No

07 092908

District

WHITE OAK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	56.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.3%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		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	6.7%	NO
	≥ 95% 98% YES 100% YES 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	20.0%	NO				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	TA: Percent of preschool Summary Math children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95% 99% YES 98.0% YES skills	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	social-emotional Summary cluding social Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported					
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 67.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2			YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	or children with 0% 0% TES TES demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

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

District

WHITE OAK ISD

County District No	09

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 11 County District No 220920

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

District

WHITE SETTLEMENT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	78.2%	YES	5A : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	7.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.4%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	16.5%	NO
	≥ 95% 98% YES 99.0% YES 99.0% for the second secon		ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	11.4%	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 si	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported						
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math Math ≥ 75% 56%	Math NO	Math 51.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported	
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	09/	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%			o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 220920

WHITE SETTLEMENT ISD

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

17 040902

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

District

WHITEFACE CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	95.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reported 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 76.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 50.0%	Math NO	S demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0 76				S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

17 040902

District

WHITEFACE 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.		27%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

212906

WHITEHOUSE 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	95.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.3%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	13.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district lev data are not reporte 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 76.0%	Math YES	demonstrate improved		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	 numbers, district lev data are not reporte 	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

on <u>07</u> No <u>212906</u>

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

District

WHITEHOUSE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region ____ County District No

10 091909

District

|--|

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	27.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	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 lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reported 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 61.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	 numbers, district lev data are not reporte 	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	163			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 091909

10

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

District

WHITESBORO ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region ____ County District No 10 091910

District

WHITEWRIGHT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.0%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reported 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 72.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 66.0%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reported 	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool 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	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are not reporte	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 091910

10

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

District

WHITEWRIGHT ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region ____ County District No

17 110908

District

WHITHARRAL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	85.7%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reported 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 73.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0 /0	115			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region

County District No 110908

17

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

W

WHITHARRAL ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

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

WHITNEY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.9%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	54.7%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	14.9%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	16.7%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	22.2%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district lev data are not reporte 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	_	
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	64.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved						o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	56.0%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0 76	123		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region _____ County District No

rict No 109911

12

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

District

WHITNEY ISD

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

243905

WICHITA FALLS ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	93.1%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	72.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	1.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	11.2%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, 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 regula. childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	15.5%	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	21.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		listrict level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 50.0%	Reading NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) 7 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 49.0%	Math NO	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		listrict level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	Constraints Revealed and skills Constraints Constraints Constraints Constrain	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

n 09 o 243905

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

District

WICHITA FALLS ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

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

District

WILDORADO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with <i>i</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	early ving 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 sci residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163		160		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

jion <u>16</u> No **180904**

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

District

WILDORADO ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 170904

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

District

WILLIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	93.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	19.9%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	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 receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	18.8%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	10.4%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 59.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	knowledge and skills 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

06 170904

District

WILLIS ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region _____ County District No _____

10 234907

District

WILLS POINT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	86.4%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	67.1%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	9.1%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.1%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	47.1%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 47.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

10 234907

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

District

WIL	LS.	POIN	1T IS	SD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

State

Target

≥ 78%

State

Rate

76.9%

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating

from high school with a regular diploma

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6

80% or more of the day

through 21, served inside the regular class

LEA

Met

State

Target?

NO

State

Met

Target?

NO

LEA

Rate

0.0%

Region County District No 153907

LEA

Rate

92.9%

WILSON ISD

State

Rate

66%

State

Met

Target?

NO

17	
153907	

LEA Met

State

Target?

YES

2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	
	≥ 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	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	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, o data are n	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 69.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				numbers, o data are n	
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	69.0%	NO		Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	
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	data are n	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	Due to numbers, o data are n	distr

District

State

Target

≥ 68%

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

17 153907

District

WILSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13 : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	2% 69% NO Due to si numbers, c level data a reporte		s, district a are not	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No

13 105905

County District No WIMBERLEY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	84.6%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	69.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	15.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	13.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	7.1%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	42.9%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 70.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
			-			demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						district level ot reported
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	001	VEO		YES	S 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		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

13 County District No 105905

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

District

WIMBERLEY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9 : Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 25%	27%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
11 : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.6%	NO		YES	14B : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	≥ 57%	59%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.7%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	≥ 72%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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

WINDTHORST ISD

09 005904

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	83.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	40.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	15.6%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 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). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 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	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 71.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	≥ 75%	56%	NO	70.0%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		or reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VEQ	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%	160			YES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	 numbers, district lev data are not reporte 		
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

09 005904

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

District

WINDTHORST ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 225905

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

District

WINFIELD ISD

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

State

Target

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education

9: Percent of districts with

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 225905

08

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

District

WINFIELD ISD

State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to most these postneored or work.	100%	99.3%	NO		YES

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No 057828

WINFREE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOLS District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e State Performance Plan/ Anne Performance Report Indicato		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	30.4%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	34.2%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	84.0%	NO			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	91.0%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 35.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0%	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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

Performance Plan/ 2014 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

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

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

County District No 057828

Region

10

District WINFREE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOLS

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

18 248902

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

District

WINK-LOVING ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a senarate special 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	96.0%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	 numbers, district leve data are not reported 	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 48.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 31.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

on <u>18</u> lo **248902**

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

District

WINK-LOVING ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

250907

WINNSBORO ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	43.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	12.5%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95% 98% YES 100% YES 6B : Percent of children aged 3 through with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	10.0%	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%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 65.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	for children with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	ot reported					
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

07 250907

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

District

WINNSBORO ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

07 Region County District No 212910

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

District

WINONA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	64.6%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.1%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.0%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	36.4%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Statement 2		≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 63.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small 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		00/	VEO		VE0	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summa	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 212910

District

WINONA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 200904

15

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

District

WINTERS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	70.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early o program; and (b).	r early ving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	0.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children ageo with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	97.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 26.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 34.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region _____ County District No

ct No 200904

15

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

District

WINTERS ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 174906

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

District

WODEN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	91.7%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	53.3%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	8.3%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	30.0%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 85.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 80.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	VES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

07

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 174906

District

WODEN ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 116909

10

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

District

WOLFE CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.6%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		YES	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	91.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 91.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 86.0%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

10 116909

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

District

	CITY ISD
WOLFE	CITTISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

03 196902

District

WOODSBORO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	71.4%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.6%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regula childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate so residential facility	ate special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 80.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 55.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

County District No 196902

03

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

District

WOODSBORO ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

09 224902

Dist	rict		WOODSON	ISD	
ual rs	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
d 6 class	≥ 68%	66%	NO	36.4%	NO

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	0.0%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	36.4%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6A: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b).	r early iving the and related	≥ 30%	31%	YES	75.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending a separa education class, separate sc residential facility	te special	≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 91.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		≥ 81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	160		TEO	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

09 County District No 224902

reported

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

District

WOODSON ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

05 229903

WOODVILLE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	55.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	23.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	5.0%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	98.0%	YES	program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	35.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		
achievement standards	≥ 75%	59%	NO	72.0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	- 00,0	011270	120		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 60.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a	27570	30%		00.078		7C: Percent of preschool	Summary	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	children aged 3 through 5	Statement 1	20170	02.770	123		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	data are n	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

on 05 No 229903

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

District

WOODVILLE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No 081905

12

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

District

WORTHAM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with <i>I</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	79.2%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	18.8%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 47.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 45.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	00/	VEO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	YES		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Region

County District No 081905

12

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

District

WORTHAM ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 10 County District No 043914

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

District

WYLIE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	81.3%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	10.4%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.8%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.2%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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 service program. 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	10.0%	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	18.7%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 75.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 71.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	076	160			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 10 County District No 043914

District

WYLIE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 14 County District No 221912

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

District

WYLIE 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	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	68.8%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	5.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular 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	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoof facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 77.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 73.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TES		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 14 County District No 221912

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

District

WYLIE ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region _____ County District No 25

07 250905

District

YANTIS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	66.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	78.9%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	33.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	10.5%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 67.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES YES	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		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

07 250905

District

YANTIS ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

04 101845

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

District

YES PREP PUBLIC SCHOOLS INC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	41.7%	NO	5A: Percent of children with 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	8.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate 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	 <i>majority of special education and related</i> services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). <i>6B:</i> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	N/A	N/A
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	N/A	N/A
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 54.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 78	0 76				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and 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 101845

04

YES PREP PUBLIC SCHOOLS INC

District

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No 00

03 062903

County District N YOAKUM 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	91.7%	YES	5A: 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	8.3%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	17.6%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements 6A: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early 		≤ 1%	1%	YES	1.8%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b).		≥ 30%	31%	YES	6.3%	NO
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES	program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small listrict level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	98.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 56.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		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	55.0%	NO		Statement 2	2 37 /0	30.978	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	TES		TEO		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small listrict level ot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region _____ County District No

ion 03 No 062903

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

District

YOAKUM ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

03 062904

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

District

YORKTOWN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	82.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	3.6%	NO
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	50.0%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	95.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	95.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 78.0%	Reading YES	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 46.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	070					Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

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

Region

03 County District No 062904

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

YORKTOWN ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region 19 County District No 071905

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

District

YSLETA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	68.3%	NO	5A: Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	65.8%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	13.3%	NO	5B: Percent of children with a 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		NO	5C: Percent of children with 1 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	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5		≥ 30%	31%	YES	43.7%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	99.0%	YES			≤ 17%	17%	YES	33.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 62.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 62.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0%	163				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region 19 County District No

071905

District

YSLETA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

01 253901

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

District

ZAPATA COUNTY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	90.5%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	77.0%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	4.8%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	10.7%	NO
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with a 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	 majority or special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	47.6%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	97.0%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summar Statement		≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	99.0%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 55.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 57.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	YES	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	076	TEO		163		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region

01 County District No 253901

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

District

ZAPATA COUNTY ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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

Region County District No

07 003906

District

ZAVALLA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	59.0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	2.6%	YES
3A : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	2.6%	NO
3B : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	100%	YES
	≥ 95%	98%	YES	100%	YES	6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility		≤ 17%	17%	YES	0.0%	YES
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 46.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 37.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		VES	NO 7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	078	123		TES		Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

gion 07

District

ZAVALLA ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

Region County District No

15 025906

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

District

ZEPHYR ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	87.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	 majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b). 6B: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 		≥ 30%	31%	YES	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	50.0%	NO
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES		o small district level
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	≥ 61%	61.8%	YES	,	ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 44.0%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 44.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0%	YES		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0%	163				Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES	,	ot reported
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0%	YES		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	≥ 76%	77.6%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

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

Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (2012-13)

Region County District No

ZEP

District

 Region
 15

 strict No
 025906

ZEPHYR ISD

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

About the 2014 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

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)

for children with disabilities

LEA

State

Region County District No

101850

LEA Met

State

District ZOE LEARNING ACADEMY

data are not reported

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	Met Target?	LEA Rate	State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	≥ 78%	76.9%	NO	N/A	N/A	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		≥ 68%	66%	NO	94.1%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	≤ 9%	11.2%	NO	N/A	N/A	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		≤ 10%	14%	NO	0.0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AMO objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	14.3%	NO		N/A	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		≤ 1%	1%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending a regular childhood program and recein majority of special education	d program and receiving the of special education and related in the regular early childhood		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	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	≥ 79%	81.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	≥ 95%	99%	YES	96.0%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		≥61%	61.8%	YES		ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading ≥ 75%	Reading 59%	Reading NO	Reading 43.0%	Reading NO	children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	≥ 80%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	Math ≥ 75%	Math 56%	Math NO	Math 52.0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	≥ 57%	58.9%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0%	0%	YES	6	YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 1	≥ 81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
		070					Summary Statement 2	≥ 72%	73.2%	YES		ot reported
4B : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with	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		≥ 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 _____

County District No 101850

04

District

ZOE LEARNING ACADEMY

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