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

			BURLINGT BURLING Year 201	GTON			
				<mark>ance Indic</mark> port (Colle		: August 2	(014)
Percent of	youth with n a regular	IEPs grad			Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle				e Year		-	
NIC Indica	ites "Not in	Graduation	n Conort"		81%	75.0%	Y
				ce Indicator			
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school					Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year Data Collection NIC Indicates "Not in Graduation Cohort"			e Year	16.2%	14.0%	N	
	3: Assess ce: <u>ESEA A</u>			Indicator			
accommod assessme	dations; reg	gular asses grade level	sment witl standards	in a regula n accommo s; alternate	dations; a	lternate	,
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	90%	95.0%	Ν	Math	89.8%	95.0%	N
	ncy rate fo achievemer			igainst grad	de level sta	indards an	d

Subject LAL	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target	Subject MATH	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target
Grade 3	16.7%			Grade 3	11.1%		
Grade 4	8.7%			Grade 4	8.3%		
Grade 5	9.5%			Grade 5	0%		
Grade 6	8.7%			Grade 6	0%		
Grade 7	0%			Grade 7	0%		
Grade 8	0%			Grade 8	3.7%		
HS	5.7%			HS	2.3%		
*** No dat		nsion/Expi	ulsion - Pe	rformance ndalism Re		(stop ())	, 1
in the rate greater tha Indicator	s of susper an 10 days 4B: <u>Suspe</u>	nsions and in a schoo nsion/Expr	expulsion: bl year? ulsion - Co	having a sig s of children mpliance Ir ndalism Re	n with IEP:	s for	N
2013 - Ju Does the o in the rate	ne 30, 201 district have	4) e: (a) a sig sions and e	nificant dis expulsions	crepancy, I of greater	by race or	ethnicity,	N
(b) policies discrepand developme	s, procedur cy and do r ent and imp	res or prac not comply plementatio	tices that c with requi on of IEPs,	contribute to rements rel the use of al safeguare	ating to the positive be	e	N
Data Sour	ce: <u>Annua</u>	l Data Rep	ort (Collec	ance Indica ction Date: 15th collec	October 1	<u>5, 2014)</u>	
	s no report						
	LRE data ude Non-P			vere collecte 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.	40.2%	48.5%	N
B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	36.2%	16.0%	N
C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital			
placements.	2.1%	7.4%	Y
Data Source: <u>Annual Data Report (Collection Date:</u> ** Indicates no reported data on October 15th collect - : Indicates suppressed for minimum "n" size of 10 NA: Indicates not a pre-school district Note: The LRE data for public reporting were collect do not include Non-Public School students.	tion		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.	48.4%	43.0%	Y
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)]			
times 100	48.4%	35.5%	N
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		State	ningful Met State
 improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) 1. Of those children who entered or exited the 	Data	Target	Target
program below age expectations in Outcome A, the	NIC	72.0%	NIC

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			

Has the district been identified for disproportionate re racial and ethnic groups in special education and rela the result of inappropriate identification?			N
Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indi Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1			
Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categori of inappropriate identification?			N
Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part E Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015)			uly 1,
Percent of children who were evaluated within the State established time line of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation	Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
must be conducted, within that timeframe			
 Indicates no reported data on November 15th collection *** 0 students received parental exponent to 			
*** 0 students received parental consent to evaluate	93.9%	100.0%	N
2014 to June 30, 2015) 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	l in the pub	lic reportin	
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.	Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
 Indicates no reported data on November 15th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" 			
** 0 students referred from Part C to part B**** No Eligible students	**	100.0%	**
Indicator 13: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u> Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System	Indicator		
Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and	Local Data	State Target	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	ict)		
	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. 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 at the time they left school and were 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 	NIC	48.0%	NIC
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			
respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.	NIC	75.0%	NIC
respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left	NIC	75.0%	NIC

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.		