

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**  
2012 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile  
of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets  
Federal Fiscal Year 2010 (2010-11)

Region 11  
County District No 184902

District SPRINGTOWN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	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	75%	74%	NO	79.2%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	68%	67%	NO	63%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	12%	12%	YES	12.5%	NO	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10%	13%	NO	19%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	29%	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%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.	Reporting Timeline To Be Determined by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs				
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 1	70%	79%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	Summary Statement 2	59%	61%	YES			
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 demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 1	69%	80%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
	80%	76%	NO	68%	NO		Summary Statement 2	55%	57%	YES	
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%	1%	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	64%	81%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
							Summary Statement 2	67%	72%	YES	
4B: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	TBD	TBD		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%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<i>9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification</i>	0%	0%	YES		YES	<i>13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs</i>	100%	99%	NO		YES
<i>10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification</i>	0%	0%	YES		YES	<i>14A: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</i>	27%	23%	NO		Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
<i>11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe</i>	100%	98%	NO		YES	<i>14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school</i>	60%	55%	NO		Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported
<i>12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays</i>	100%	98%	NO		YES	<i>14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</i>	73%	70%	NO		Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported

**About the 2012 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report**

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

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies 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 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 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 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.