

## **About the 2017 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report**

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year.

The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from:

- Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6A-B, 9 and 10;
- assessment data for Indicators 3A-C;
- annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and
- state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 5A-C, 6A-B, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from specified stakeholder groups.

The state targets for indicators 1, and 3 reflect established targets under the approved conditional Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) waiver for specific provisions. Specific to indicator 3A and in accordance with OSEP email correspondence to States dated December 22, 2015, the U.S. Department of Education is not requiring States to submit AMOs for school years 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 or to report performance against AMOs for the 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 school years.

The state targets for Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13).

The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at [http://tea.texas.gov/Curriculum\\_and\\_Instructional\\_Programs/Special\\_Education/Data\\_and\\_Reports/Local\\_Educational\\_Agency\\_Reports\\_and\\_Requirements/#LEA\\_Public\\_Reporting](http://tea.texas.gov/Curriculum_and_Instructional_Programs/Special_Education/Data_and_Reports/Local_Educational_Agency_Reports_and_Requirements/#LEA_Public_Reporting).

### **Note:**

Areas shaded within the "LEA Rate" and/or the "Performance Against the State Target" columns are due to one or more of the following conditions:

- district did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting in a given indicator
- not analyzed due to data availability
- district reported zero counts in the numerator and denominator in a given indicator

Additionally, cells designated with “ – ” in the “LEA Rate” and/or “LEA Met State Target” column are no longer applicable under federal requirements.

The asterisk notation in Indicator 2 indicates a measurement methodology change. The State has moved from utilizing longitudinal cohort data to the annual dropout rate in a single year.

### State Performance Plan Indicator Measurement Descriptions

Indicator		Measurement
1	Graduation	Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
2	Dropout	Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
3A	Annual Measurable Objectives	Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AMO targets for the disability subgroup. Not Required in 2014-15 or 2015-16
3B	Statewide Assessment Participation	Participation rate for children with IEPs.
3C	Statewide Assessment Proficiency	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.
4A	Suspension and Expulsion	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.
4B	Suspension and Expulsion	Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
5A	Educational Environment, Ages 6-21	Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.
5B	Educational Environment, Ages 6-21	Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.
5C	Educational Environment, Ages 6-21	Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.
6A	Educational Environment, Ages 3-5	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.
6B	Educational Environment, Ages 3-5	Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

7A	Early Childhood Outcomes	Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).
7B	Early Childhood Outcomes	Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy).
7C	Early Childhood Outcomes	Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
8	Parent Involvement	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.
9	Disproportionality	Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
10	Disproportionality	Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
11	Child Find	Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days or receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. <sup>1</sup>
12	Early Childhood Transition	Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part b, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
13	Secondary Transition	Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IPE that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service's needs.
14A	Post-School Outcomes	Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
14B	Post-School Outcomes	Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
14C	Post-School Outcomes	Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

<sup>1</sup> The State established timeframe prior to September 1, 2013 was 60 calendar days. Beginning on September 1, 2013 [Senate Bill 816](#) established a new State evaluation timeframe.