

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Plan Indicators	State target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Plan 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	96.4%	70.3%	NO	100.0%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.66%	64.2%	YES	62.5%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	2.8%	13.9%	NO	0.0%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.46%	11.9%	NO	7.8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	95%	42%	NO		YES	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.20%	1.2%	YES	0.0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement	Reading 95% Math 95%	Reading 99% Math 99%	Reading YES Math YES	Reading 100.0% Math 100.0%	Reading YES Math YES	6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers	Reporting Timeline To Be Determined by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs				
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards	Reading 60% Math 50%	Reading 62% Math 50%	Reading YES Math YES	Reading 60.0% Math 52.0%	Reading YES Math YES	7A: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Reporting Timeline To Be Determined by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs				
4A: Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year	0%	0.2%	NO		YES	7B: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Reporting Timeline To Be Determined by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs				
4B: Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity	Removed by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs					7C: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Reporting Timeline To Be Determined by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs				
						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	72%	72%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data reported at regional level	

* = no data available

** = LEA did not meet minimum N size for reporting 3A

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

Texas Education Agency | Division of IDEA Coordination
2009 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators
Federal Fiscal Year 2007-08

Region 11
County District No 126904
District _____
GRANDVIEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Plan Indicators	State target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Plan Indicators	State target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	77%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals	100%	67%	NO		YES
11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline)	100%	89%	NO		YES	14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school	82%	82%	YES		Due to small numbers, district level data reported at regional level

About the District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

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

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

The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year can be found on the TEA website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/spp/methodologies.html>.

Notes: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4, 9 and 10 reflect that data are not reported, only performance against the state target. Not all districts report data for Indicators 8, and 14 for a given year (depends on whether or not they have been included in the reporting sample). Due to small numbers, district level data reported at regional level at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/spp/distreports.html>. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with "****" in the "LEA Met State Target?" column.

* = no data available

** = LEA did not meet minimum N size for reporting 3A