

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## Grade 3 Reading

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
All Students	2007-08	82	90	92	>99%	18	68	15
	2008-09	91	90	93	99	9	67	24
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	94	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	94	*	*	*	*
Asian	2007-08	*	*	97	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	97	*	*	*	*
Black	2007-08	*	*	89	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	88	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	2007-08	82	90	90	>99%	18	68	14
	2008-09	91	90	91	99	9	67	24
White	2007-08	*	*	97	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	97	*	*	*	*
Female	2007-08	89	91	94	>99%	11	77	13
	2008-09	91	92	94	>99%	9	68	23
Male	2007-08	76	89	91	>99%	24	60	16
	2008-09	91	88	92	98	9	66	25
Special Education	2007-08	56	71	78	>99%	44	*	*
	2008-09	75	76	85	>99%	25	63	13
LEP	2007-08	81	90	88	>99%	19	71	10
	2008-09	90	90	89	99	10	71	19
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	84	90	89	>99%	16	70	13
	2008-09	91	90	90	99	9	68	23

(Continued)

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

**Grade 3 Reading**

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
Migrant	2007-08	60	86	84	>99%	40	40	20
	2008-09	88	86	84	94	13	69	19

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## Grade 3 Mathematics

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
All Students	2007-08	54	81	82	>99%	46	47	7
	2008-09	62	81	83	>99%	38	43	19
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	83	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	86	*	*	*	*
Asian	2007-08	*	*	94	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	95	*	*	*	*
Black	2007-08	*	*	71	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	74	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	2007-08	54	81	80	>99%	46	47	7
	2008-09	62	81	80	>99%	38	43	19
White	2007-08	*	*	90	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	91	*	*	*	*
Female	2007-08	54	81	82	>99%	46	48	6
	2008-09	55	82	83	>99%	45	34	21
Male	2007-08	54	81	83	>99%	46	46	7
	2008-09	68	80	84	>99%	32	51	17
Special Education	2007-08	44	65	68	>99%	56	*	*
	2008-09	38	69	74	>99%	63	25	13
LEP	2007-08	53	80	78	>99%	47	48	5
	2008-09	57	81	79	>99%	43	43	15
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	54	81	77	>99%	46	48	6
	2008-09	62	81	78	>99%	38	43	19

(Continued)

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

**Grade 3 Mathematics**

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
Migrant	2007-08	*	79	73	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	60	75	75	>99%	40	*	*

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## Grade 4 Reading

Student Groups	Year	Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
All Students	2007-08	76	76	82	>99%	24	66	10
	2008-09	70	77	84	98	30	57	13
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	84	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	86	*	*	*	*
Asian	2007-08	*	*	93	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	93	*	*	*	*
Black	2007-08	*	*	74	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	77	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	2007-08	76	76	77	>99%	24	66	10
	2008-09	70	77	80	98	30	57	13
White	2007-08	*	*	91	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	92	*	*	*	*
Female	2007-08	78	78	84	>99%	22	65	14
	2008-09	75	82	86	>99%	25	56	19
Male	2007-08	74	75	80	>99%	26	67	7
	2008-09	65	72	81	96	35	58	8
Special Education	2007-08	73	72	63	>99%	27	53	20
	2008-09	36	67	69	>99%	64	*	*
LEP	2007-08	63	66	69	>99%	37	59	4
	2008-09	64	72	74	97	36	52	12
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	74	76	75	>99%	26	64	10
	2008-09	70	77	78	98	30	57	13

(Continued)

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

**Grade 4 Reading**

Student Groups	Year	Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Migrant	2007-08	75	70	67	>99%	25	67	8
	2008-09	50	73	72	75	50	33	17

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## Grade 4 Mathematics

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
All Students	2007-08	75	79	83	>99%	25	60	14
	2008-09	64	80	85	>99%	36	52	12
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	83	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	85	*	*	*	*
Asian	2007-08	*	*	95	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	95	*	*	*	*
Black	2007-08	*	*	73	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	76	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	2007-08	76	79	80	>99%	24	61	14
	2008-09	64	80	83	>99%	36	52	12
White	2007-08	*	*	90	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	91	*	*	*	*
Female	2007-08	73	79	83	>99%	27	51	22
	2008-09	56	81	85	>99%	44	44	13
Male	2007-08	76	80	83	>99%	24	67	9
	2008-09	72	79	85	>99%	28	60	11
Special Education	2007-08	73	67	63	>99%	27	60	13
	2008-09	64	67	71	>99%	36	*	*
LEP	2007-08	65	69	75	>99%	35	54	11
	2008-09	61	75	79	>99%	39	55	7
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	73	79	78	>99%	27	58	14
	2008-09	64	80	80	>99%	36	52	12

(Continued)

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

**Grade 4 Mathematics**

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
Migrant	2007-08	58	73	74	>99%	42	50	8
	2008-09	33	80	78	>99%	67	*	*

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## Grade 5 Reading

Student Groups	Year	Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
All Students	2007-08	83	85	89	>99%	17	66	16
	2008-09	83	83	89	>99%	17	72	11
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	91	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	89	*	*	*	*
Asian	2007-08	*	*	95	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	95	*	*	*	*
Black	2007-08	*	*	85	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	85	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	2007-08	83	84	86	>99%	17	66	16
	2008-09	83	83	85	>99%	17	72	12
White	2007-08	*	*	95	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	83	95	*	*	*	*
Female	2007-08	87	87	90	>99%	13	67	20
	2008-09	88	84	90	>99%	12	73	15
Male	2007-08	78	82	88	>99%	22	65	13
	2008-09	80	83	88	>99%	20	71	9
Special Education	2007-08	78	62	69	>99%	22	*	*
	2008-09	71	83	78	>99%	29	65	6
LEP	2007-08	59	69	72	>99%	41	54	5
	2008-09	72	69	72	>99%	28	66	6
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	83	85	84	>99%	17	67	17
	2008-09	83	83	84	>99%	17	73	10

(Continued)

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

**Grade 5 Reading**

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
Migrant	2007-08	72	80	76	>99%	28	56	17
	2008-09	83	79	76	>99%	17	*	*

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## Grade 5 Mathematics

Student Groups	Year	Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
All Students	2007-08	84	83	88	>99%	16	60	24
	2008-09	95	86	90	>99%	5	54	41
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	89	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	88	*	*	*	*
Asian	2007-08	*	*	96	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	97	*	*	*	*
Black	2007-08	*	*	80	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	83	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	2007-08	84	83	85	>99%	16	60	24
	2008-09	95	86	87	>99%	5	54	41
White	2007-08	*	*	94	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	95	*	*	*	*
Female	2007-08	81	82	88	>99%	19	57	25
	2008-09	93	84	90	>99%	7	62	31
Male	2007-08	87	85	87	>99%	13	63	24
	2008-09	96	87	90	>99%	4	48	48
Special Education	2007-08	67	62	64	>99%	33	*	*
	2008-09	81	78	78	>99%	19	56	25
LEP	2007-08	57	65	74	>99%	43	49	9
	2008-09	88	73	78	>99%	12	73	15
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	84	84	83	>99%	16	59	25
	2008-09	96	86	86	>99%	4	57	38

(Continued)

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

**Grade 5 Mathematics**

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
Migrant	2007-08	94	80	78	>99%	6	69	25
	2008-09	*	87	81	>99%	*	*	*

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## Grade 5 Science

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
All Students	2007-08	67	74	78	>99%	33	45	21
	2008-09	86	75	82	99	14	62	24
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	83	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	85	*	*	*	*
Asian	2007-08	*	*	89	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	92	*	*	*	*
Black	2007-08	*	*	67	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	73	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	2007-08	66	74	73	>99%	34	45	21
	2008-09	86	75	77	99	14	61	25
White	2007-08	*	*	89	*	*	*	*
	2008-09	*	*	92	*	*	*	*
Female	2007-08	64	70	76	>99%	36	43	21
	2008-09	83	70	80	>99%	17	63	20
Male	2007-08	69	78	81	>99%	31	46	22
	2008-09	89	80	84	98	11	60	28
Special Education	2007-08	33	50	55	>99%	67	22	11
	2008-09	80	54	61	94	20	67	13
LEP	2007-08	29	50	54	>99%	71	*	*
	2008-09	81	55	61	97	19	74	6
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	66	74	71	>99%	34	45	21
	2008-09	85	75	75	99	15	62	23

(Continued)

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08, 2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

**Grade 5 Science**

		Campus % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	District % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	State % of Students Met Standard (Proficient) and Commended (Advanced)	% Tested (In Campus)	Percent of Students in Campus at Each Achievement Level		
						% Not Meeting Standard (Basic)	% Met Standard (Proficient)	% Commended (Advanced)
Student Groups	Year							
Migrant	2007-08	63	68	63	>99%	38	31	31
	2008-09	80	74	67	91	20	50	30

**Part I -- Campus Level: Student performance for each district and campus compared to the state as a whole, % of Students Tested, Student Achievement by Proficiency Level, 2007-08,~\_2008-09, For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

## **Footnotes**

Student Achievement results are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Special formats ('\*', >99%, <1%, 'n/a') are used in order to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). For detailed information, please see the **Explanation of NCLB School Report Card Data Masking Rules**.

## **Contact Information**

Questions regarding Part I of the No Child Left Behind School Report Card should be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting. Contact us at (512) 463-9704 or [performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us).

**Part II a. -- Campus Level: Comparison between student achievement in the LEA as a whole and for each campus within the LEA and the State's academic expectations in reading/language arts and mathematics, and information on the other academic indicators used for AYP determinations**  
**For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

11:29 Monday, February 8, 2010

		Reading/Language Arts					
		Percent Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met Standard (Proficient) & Commended (Advanced)	Percent Met Standard (Proficient) & Commended (Advanced)	Percent Met Standard (Proficient) & Commended (Advanced)
		Target: 95%	Target: 95%	Target: 95%	'08 Target: 60% '09 Target: 67%	'08 Target: 60% '09 Target: 67%	'08 Target: 60% '09 Target: 67%
		Campus	District	State	Campus	District	State
Student Groups	Year						
All Students	2007-08	>99%	99	99	81	83	88
	2008-09	99	99	99	83	81	88
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	99	*	*	90
	2008-09	*	*	99	*	*	91
Asian	2007-08	*	*	>99%	*	*	95
	2008-09	*	*	99	*	*	95
Black	2007-08	*	*	>99%	*	*	83
	2008-09	*	*	>99%	*	*	84
Hispanic	2007-08	>99%	99	99	81	83	84
	2008-09	99	99	99	83	81	85
White	2007-08	*	>99%	>99%	*	>99%	94
	2008-09	*	>99%	>99%	*	83	94
Female	2007-08	>99%	99	>99%	87	86	90
	2008-09	>99%	99	99	86	84	90
Male	2007-08	>99%	99	99	77	80	86
	2008-09	98	99	99	81	78	86
Special Education	2007-08	>99%	98	99	72	56	62
	2008-09	>99%	98	99	61	57	65
LEP	2007-08	>99%	98	99	80	75	76
	2008-09	99	98	98	81	73	76
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	>99%	99	99	81	83	83
	2008-09	99	99	99	83	81	83
Migrant	2007-08	>99%	99	99	80	81	76
	2008-09	92	99	98	83	77	76

**Part II a. -- Campus Level: Comparison between student achievement in the LEA as a whole and for each campus within the LEA and the State's academic expectations in reading/language arts and mathematics, and information on the other academic indicators used for AYP determinations**  
**For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

11:29 Monday, February 8, 2010

		Mathematics					
		Percent Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met Standard (Proficient) & Commended (Advanced)	Percent Met Standard (Proficient) & Commended (Advanced)	Percent Met Standard (Proficient) & Commended (Advanced)
		Target: 95%	Target: 95%	Target: 95%	'08 Target: 50% '09 Target: 58%	'08 Target: 50% '09 Target: 58%	'08 Target: 50% '09 Target: 58%
		Campus	District	State	Campus	District	State
Student Groups	Year						
All Students	2007-08	>99%	>99%	>99%	71	76	79
	2008-09	>99%	>99%	>99%	73	75	81
American Indian	2007-08	*	*	99	*	*	81
	2008-09	*	*	99	*	*	83
Asian	2007-08	*	*	>99%	*	*	94
	2008-09	*	*	>99%	*	*	94
Black	2007-08	*	*	99	*	*	68
	2008-09	*	*	>99%	*	*	70
Hispanic	2007-08	>99%	>99%	>99%	71	76	75
	2008-09	>99%	>99%	>99%	72	75	77
White	2007-08	*	>99%	>99%	*	82	88
	2008-09	*	>99%	>99%	*	78	89
Female	2007-08	>99%	>99%	>99%	70	76	80
	2008-09	>99%	>99%	>99%	66	75	81
Male	2007-08	>99%	>99%	>99%	72	76	79
	2008-09	>99%	>99%	>99%	78	74	81
Special Education	2007-08	>99%	98	99	66	50	50
	2008-09	>99%	99	99	68	55	57
LEP	2007-08	>99%	>99%	>99%	70	72	72
	2008-09	>99%	>99%	99	69	72	74
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	>99%	>99%	>99%	71	76	73
	2008-09	>99%	>99%	>99%	72	75	75
Migrant	2007-08	>99%	>99%	>99%	76	73	68
	2008-09	>99%	99	99	67	70	70

**Part II a. -- Campus Level: Comparison between student achievement in the LEA as a whole and for each campus within the LEA and the State's academic expectations in reading/language arts and mathematics, and information on the other academic indicators used for AYP determinations**  
**For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

11:29 Monday, February 8, 2010

		Additional Academic Indicators					
		Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate	Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate
		Target: 70%	Target: 70%	Target: 70%	Target: 90%	Target: 90%	Target: 90%
		Campus	District	State	Campus	District	State
Student Groups	Year						
All Students	2007-08	n/a	62.4	78.0	95.7	n/a	95.5
	2008-09	n/a	68.8	79.1	95.8	n/a	95.5
American Indian	2007-08	n/a	-	81.4	-	n/a	94.8
	2008-09	n/a	-	81.7	-	n/a	94.8
Asian	2007-08	n/a	-	91.5	-	n/a	97.5
	2008-09	n/a	-	91.2	-	n/a	97.5
Black	2007-08	n/a	-	70.7	*	n/a	95.0
	2008-09	n/a	*	71.8	*	n/a	95.1
Hispanic	2007-08	n/a	62.3	68.5	95.7	n/a	95.3
	2008-09	n/a	68.7	70.8	95.8	n/a	95.4
White	2007-08	n/a	83.3	88.2	*	n/a	95.7
	2008-09	n/a	*	88.8	*	n/a	95.6
Female	2007-08	n/a	63.9	80.3	95.8	n/a	95.5
	2008-09	n/a	72.0	81.4	96.0	n/a	95.5
Male	2007-08	n/a	61.1	75.8	95.7	n/a	95.5
	2008-09	n/a	66.0	76.8	95.6	n/a	95.5
Special Education	2007-08	n/a	54.2	70.3	94.1	n/a	94.0
	2008-09	n/a	54.8	69.8	95.0	n/a	94.0
LEP	2007-08	n/a	28.9	39.3	95.4	n/a	96.3
	2008-09	n/a	41.8	44.2	95.8	n/a	96.4
Economically Disadvantaged	2007-08	n/a	64.4	68.8	95.7	n/a	95.2
	2008-09	n/a	70.6	70.4	95.8	n/a	95.2
Migrant	2007-08	n/a	56.2	60.1	94.3	n/a	94.2
	2008-09	n/a	60.1	66.3	94.8	n/a	94.1

***Part II a. -- Campus Level: Comparison between student achievement in the LEA as a whole and for each campus within the LEA and the State's academic expectations in reading/language arts and mathematics, and information on the other academic indicators used for AYP determinations  
For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )***

11:29 Monday, February 8, 2010

## **Footnotes**

Student Achievement results are rounded to the nearest whole percent. Additional Academic Indicators (Graduation and Attendance Rate) are rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a percent (one decimal place).

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is measured for the following student groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Other student groups are shown for informational purposes only.

Special formats ('\*', >99%, <1%, 'n/a') are used in order to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). For detailed information, please see the **Explanation of NCLB School Report Card Data Masking Rules**.

## **Contact Information**

Questions regarding Part II a. of the No Child Left Behind School Report Card should be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting. Contact us at (512) 463-9704 or [performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us).

**Part III -- Additional accountability information for schools receiving Title I, Part A funds**  
**For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

11:29 Monday, February 8, 2010

<b>Year</b>	<b>Met AYP</b>	<b>SIP</b>
2007-08	Meets AYP	NONE
2008-09	Meets AYP	NONE

**Contact Information**

Questions regarding Part III of the No Child Left Behind School Report Card should be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting. Contact us at (512) 463-9704 or [performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us).

**Part IV - Teacher Quality**

**a. Professional qualifications of all public elementary and secondary teachers, as defined by the state (Teacher Degree), for the campus**

**For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

11:30 Monday, February 8, 2010

Year	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
2007-08	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
2008-09	93.5	4.3	2.2

**Footnotes**

Percent of Teachers are rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a percent (one decimal place).

Percentages reported by Teacher Degree may not sum to 100% either or due to rounding or because the category “teachers with no degree” is not reported.

**Contact Information**

Questions regarding Part IV a. of the No Child Left Behind School Report Card should be directed to the Division of Performance Reporting. Contact us at (512) 463-9704 or [performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us).

**Part IV - Teacher Quality**

**b. Percentage of public elementary and secondary teachers with emergency/provisional credentials for the campus**

**For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

Year	%
2007-08	0.00
2008-09	0.00

**Footnotes**

Percent of Teachers are rounded to the nearest one-hundredth of a percent (two decimal places).

**Contact Information**

Questions regarding Part IV b. of the No Child Left Behind School Report Card should be directed to the Division of NCLB Program Coordination.

Contact us at (512) 463-9374 or [nclb@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:nclb@tea.state.tx.us).

**Part IV - Teacher Quality**

**c. Percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers of the ESEA (applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers who teach a core academic subject), in the aggregate for the campus**

**For LEO J LEO EL ( 108912106 )**

11:30 Monday, February 8, 2010

<b>Level</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	0.00
	<b>2008-09</b>	0.00

**Footnotes**

Percent of Classes are rounded to the nearest one-hundredth of a percent (two decimal places).

**Contact Information**

Questions regarding Part IV c. of the No Child Left Behind School Report Card should be directed to the Division of NCLB Program Coordination.

Contact us at (512) 463-9374 or [nclb@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:nclb@tea.state.tx.us).