Local District Special Education Public Report for 2014-2015

A description of how data were calculated regarding the performance of each local school district, for each of the SPP/APR indicators, can be found by clicking the name of the indicator.

Data Notes:

NA: This element is not applicable to this district for these grade levels. N: NO $\;$ Y: YES

			MAHWAI BERG Year 201	EN			
				nance India port (Colle		: August 2	014)
Percent of		IEPs grad			Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle	ction	ed data on		e Year			
NIC Indica	ites "Not in	Graduatio	n Cohort"		86.2%	75.0%	Y
				ce Indicator			
school		IEPs drop		0	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year Data Collection NIC Indicates "Not in Graduation Cohort"			7.4%	14.0%	Y		
		ment - Per Accountabi		Indicator			
accommoo assessme	dations; reg nt against g	gular asses	sment wit	in a regula h accommo s; alternate	dations; a	lternate	
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	87.5%	95.0%	N	Math	87.4%	95.0%	N
		r children v nt standard		against grad	le level sta	andards and	d

Subject LAL	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target	Subject MATH	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target
Grade 3	35.3%			Grade 3	50%		
Grade 4	40.9%			Grade 4	18.2%		
Grade 5	36.4%			Grade 5	27.3%		
Grade 6	17.6%			Grade 6	29.4%		
Grade 7	25.9%			Grade 7	7.4%		
Grade 8	26.8%			Grade 8	24.4%		
HS	35.9%			HS	13.3%		
*** No dat Indicator Data Sour		nsion/Expo onic Violen	ulsion - Pe	rformance ndalism Re		/stem(July	, 1 ,
Was the d in the rate greater tha	istrict ident s of susper an 10 days	ified by the nsions and in a schoo	expulsion: bl year?	having a sig s of childre mpliance Ir	n with IEP:		N
Data Sour 2013 - Ju Does the c in the rate	ce: Electro ne 30, 201 district have	nic Violen 4) e: (a) a sig sions and e	nificant dis	ndalism Re crepancy, I of greater	eporting Sy	ethnicity,	v 1 ,
(b) policies discrepand developme	s, procedur cy and do r ent and imp	res or prac not comply plementation	tices that c with requirent on of IEPs,	contribute to rements rel the use of al safeguare	lating to the positive be	e	N
Data Sour	ce: <u>Annua</u>	l Data Rep	ort (Colled	ance Indica ction Date: 15th collec	October 1	<u>5, 2014)</u>	
- Indicates	s no report	ed data on	6-21 age	group			
	LRE data ude Non-P			vere collecto s.	ed on Octo	ber 15 20′	14 and

	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.	52.1%	48.5%	Y
B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	10.8%	16.0%	Y
C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	7.6%	7.4%	N
Indicator 6: <u>Pre-School LRE - Performance Indicato</u> Data Source: <u>Annual Data Report (Collection Date:</u> ** Indicates no reported data on October 15th collection	October 1	<u>5, 2014)</u>	
 - : Indicates suppressed for minimum "n" size of 10 NA: Indicates not a pre-school district Note: The LRE data for public reporting were collected on to include Non-Public School students. 		ber 15 201	4 and
	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
A. 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) divided by the (total # of children aged 3			
through 5 with IEPs)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)]	56.6%	43.0%	Y
times 100	11.3%	35.5%	Y
Indicator 7: <u>Pre-School Outcomes - Performance In</u> Data Source: BDI-2 Data Manager NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" NA: Indicates not a pre-school district - Indicates the number of survey responses were interpretation of the data Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills		yield mear State Target	ningful Met State Target
(including social relationships) 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the	NIC	72.0%	

of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities times	Data	Target	Target
Indicator 8: <u>Parent Involvement - Performance Inc</u> Data Source: Survey Report Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means	Local	State	Met State
		00.070	
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program.	NIC	59.0%	NIC
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.	NIC	70.0%	NIC
Outcome C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program.	NIC	51.0%	NIC
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.	NIC	66.0%	NIC
Outcome B: 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)	Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program.	NIC	77.0%	NIC
percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. 2. The percent of children who were functioning			

racial and ethnic groups in special education and related the result of inappropriate identification?	presentation technologies ated service		N
Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indi	cator		
Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1			
Has the district been identified with disproportionate i			
racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorie	es that is tl	ne result	Ν
of inappropriate identification?			
Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part E	Child Fin	d	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015)			uly 1,
Percent of children who were evaluated within the			Met
State established time line of receiving parental	Local	State	State
consent for initial evaluation or, if the State	Data	Target	Targe
establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation			
must be conducted, within that timeframe			
* Indicates no reported data on November 15 th			
collection			
*** 0 students received parental consent to			
evaluate	97.8%	100.0%	Ν
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition - Compliand			
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015)	015 for th	e period Ji	JIV 1,
		- p	• •
,			
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this		that were	
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected	in the pub	that were lic reportin	g.
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve	in the pub	that were lic reportin	g.
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission.	in the pub	that were lic reportin	g. Ily and
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3,	in the pub rification p	that were lic reportin urposes or	g. Ily and Met
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an	in the pub rification p Local	that were lic reportin urposes or State	g. Ily and Met State
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. 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	in the pub rification p	that were lic reportin urposes or	g. Ily and Met State
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. 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	in the pub rification p Local	that were lic reportin urposes or State	g. Ily and Met State
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. 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.	in the pub rification p Local	that were lic reportin urposes or State	g. Ily and Met State
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve- were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection	in the pub rification p Local	that were lic reportin urposes or State	g. Ily and Met State
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve- were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable"	in the pub rification p Local	that were lic reportin urposes or State	g. Ily and Met State
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B	in the pub rification p Local Data	that were lic reportin urposes or State Target	g. Ily and Met State Targe
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B	in the pub rification p Local	that were lic reportin urposes or State	g. Ily and Met State
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve- were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B **** No Eligible students	in the pub rification p Local Data	that were lic reportin urposes or State Target	g. Ily and Met State Targe
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data vere were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B **** No Eligible students Indicator 13: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u>	in the pub rification p Local Data	that were lic reportin urposes or State Target	g. Ily and Met State Targe
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B **** No Eligible students Indicator 13: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u> Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System	in the pub rification p Local Data	that were lic reportin urposes or State Target	g. Ily and Met State Targe
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data vere were not for revising the original data submission. 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. * Indicates no reported data on November 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B **** No Eligible students Indicator 13: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u>	in the pub rification p Local Data	that were lic reportin urposes or State Target	g. Ily and Met State Targe

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. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.			
NIC: Indicates "Not in Cohort"	NIC	100.0%	NIC
Indicator 14: Post Secondary Transition Outcomes Data Source: Post School Outcome Survey NIC: Indicates "Not in Cohort" -: Indicates did not meet minimum "n" size of 10 NA: Indicates "Not Applicable" (Not High School distr	rict)		
	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of 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) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.	63%	48.0%	Y
B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth 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) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.	88.9%	75.0%	Y
respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left	88.9%	75.0%	Y

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) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in		
secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time		
they left school)] times 100.		