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

Hatikvah International CS CHARTERS	6		
Year 2014-2015			
Indicator 1: <u>Graduation Rates - Performance Indicator</u> Data Source: High School Graduation Report (College)		v August 2	014)
		. August z	Met
Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	Local	State	State
	Data	Target	Target
** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year	Data	rarget	raryet
Data Collection			
NIC Indicates "Not in Graduation Cohort"	NIC	75.0%	NIC
INIC Indicates Not in Graduation Condit	NIC	75.0%	NIC
Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates - Performance Indicator			
Data Source: End of Year Report (Collection Date: June	2014)		•
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high			Met
school	Local	State	State
	Data	Target	Target
** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year			
Data Collection			
NIC Indicates "Not in Graduation Cohort"	NIC	14.0%	NIC

Indicator 3: Assessment - Performance Indicator Data Source: ESEA Accountability Data

B. 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 standards.

Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	
LAL	-	95.0%	-	Math	-	95.0%	-	

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards

Subject LAL	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target	Subject MATH	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target
Grade 3	-			Grade 3	-		
Grade 4	75%			Grade 4	33.3%		
Grade 5	50%			Grade 5	40%		
Grade 6	NA			Grade 6	NA		
Grade 7	NA			Grade 7	NA		
Grade 8	NA			Grade 8	NA		
HS	NA			HS	NA		

- Did not meet the state "n" size of 40 for participation
- Did not meet the state "n" size of 10 at grade level

NA Not applicable at grade level

*** No data reported

Indicator 4A: <u>Suspension/Expulsion - Performance Indicator</u>
Data Source: Electronic Violence and Vandalism Reporting System(July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014)

Was the district identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year?

Ν

Indicator 4B: <u>Suspension/Expulsion - Compliance Indicator</u>

Data Source: Electronic Violence and Vandalism Reporting System(July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014)

Does the district 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

N

(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.

N

Indicator 5: School Age LRE - Performance Indicator

Data Source: Annual Data Report (Collection Date: October 15, 2014)

- ** Indicates no reported data on October 15th collection
- Indicates no reported data on 6-21 age group

Note: The LRE data for public reporting were collected on October 15 2014 and do not include Non-Public School students.

	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.	100%	48.5%	Y
B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	0%	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	00/	7.40/	V
placements.	0%	7.4%	Y

Indicator 6: Pre-School LRE - Performance Indicator

Data Source: Annual Data Report (Collection Date: October 15, 2014)

** Indicates no reported data on October 15th collection

- : 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 October 15 2014 and do not include Non-Public School students.

	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.	NA	43.0%	NA
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	NA	35.5%	NA

Indicator 7: <u>Pre-School Outcomes - Performance Indicator</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 too low to yield meaningful interpretation of the data

Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the	NIC	72.0%	NIC

percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.			
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program.	NIC	77.0%	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 Target
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
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
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 Target
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
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
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement - Performance Inc Data Source: Survey Report	<u>dicator</u>		
Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.			
NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" - Indicates the number of survey responses were too low to yield meaningful interpretation of the			
data	NIC	84.5%	NIC

Indicator 9: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator
Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2012, 2013, 2014) and Fall Surveys
(October 2012, October 2013, October 2014)

racial and ethnic groups in special education and rela	epresentation		N	
racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is				
the result of inappropriate identification?				
Indicator 40. Dispuss outless lite. Compulators Ind				
Indicator 10: <u>Disproportionality - Compliance Ind</u> Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1				
Has the district been identified with disproportionate		tion of		
racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categori			N	
of inappropriate identification?				
Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part E	3/Child Fin	nd_		
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015)			ıly 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 establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation	Data	Target	Targe	
must be conducted, within that timeframe				
mast be conducted, within that unioname				
* Indicates no reported data on November 15 th				
collection				
*** 0 students received parental consent to				
evaluate	81.2%	100.0%	N	
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition - Compliance	a Indianta			
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2			ıly 1,	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2			ıly 1,	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015)	015 for th	e period Ju	uly 1,	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015) Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this	:015 for th	e period Juthat were		
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 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 versions.	:015 for th s indicator I in the pub	e period Ju that were lic reportin	g.	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015) Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected	:015 for th s indicator I in the pub	e period Ju that were lic reportin	g.	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 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 vewere not for revising the original data submission.	:015 for th s indicator I in the pub	e period Ju that were lic reportin	g.	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 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 vewere not for revising the original data submission. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3,	:015 for th s indicator I in the pub	e period Ju that were lic reportin	g. Ily and Met	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 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 vewere 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	s indicator I in the pub rification p	e period Ju that were lic reportin urposes on	g. Ily and Met Stat	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 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 vewere 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	s indicator I in the pub rification p	that were lic reportinurposes on	g. Ily and Met Stat	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 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 verwere 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.	s indicator I in the pub rification p	that were lic reportinurposes on	g. Ily and Met Stat	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 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 vewere 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	s indicator I in the pub rification p	that were lic reportinurposes on	g. Ily and Met Stat	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 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 vewere 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	s indicator I in the pub rification p	that were lic reportinurposes on	g. Ily and	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 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 version 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"	s indicator I in the pub rification p	that were lic reportinurposes on	g. Ily and Met Stat	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 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 vewere 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 15th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B	s indicator I in the pub rification p	that were lic reportinurposes on	g. Ily and Met Stat	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 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 verwere 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 15th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B	s indicator I in the pub rification p Local Data	that were lic reportinurposes on State Target	g. Ily and Met Stat	
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 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 versive 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 15th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B	s indicator in the pub rification p Local Data	that were lic reportinurposes on State Target	g. ily and Me t Stat	

Met

State

State

Target Target

Local

Data

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP 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 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"	NA%	100.0%	NA

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 district)

	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.	NA%	48.0%	NA
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.	NA%	75.0%	
C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in	NA%	86.0%	NA

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.		