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

			DEPTFOR GLOUCE Year 201	STER			
				n <mark>ance Indio</mark> 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"		75%	75.0%	Y
				ce Indicator			
		IEPs drop			Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle	ction	ed data on Graduatio		e Year	9.3%	14.0%	Y
		ment - Per Accountabil		Indicator			
accommoo assessme	dations; reg nt against g	gular asses	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	71.5%	95.0%	Ν	Math	71%	95.0%	N
		r children v nt standard		igainst grad	de level sta	andards an	d

Subject LAL	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target	Subject MATH	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target
Grade 3	18.3%			Grade 3	24.2%		
Grade 4	25.4%			Grade 4	22.4%		
Grade 5	8.8%			Grade 5	15.8%		
Grade 6	11.8%			Grade 6	11.5%		
Grade 7	9.8%			Grade 7	9.5%		
Grade 8	4%			Grade 8	3.8%		
HS	8.5%			HS	0%		
*** No dat Indicator Data Sour		nsion/Expo onic Violen	ulsion - Pe	rformance ndalism Re		/stem(July	ı 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: ol year?	having a sig s of childre	n with IEP:		N
Data Sour 2013 - Ju Does the c	ce: Electro ne 30, 201 district have	onic Violen 4) e: (a) a sig	nificant dis	mpliance Ir ndalism Re crepancy, I of greater	eporting Sy	ethnicity,	, 1,
	ar for childr			5		,	
discrepand developme	cy and do r ent and imp	not comply plementation	with requi	contribute to rements rel the use of al safeguare	ating to the positive be	e	N
Data Sour	ce: <u>Annua</u>	I Data Rep rted data o	ort (Collec	ance Indica ction Date: 15th collec	October 1	<u>5, 2014)</u>	
Note: The		for public 1	reporting w	vere collecto	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.	49.7%	48.5%	Y
B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 nside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	17.5%	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.	11.1%	7.4%	N
** 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.		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.	15.5%	43.0%	N

	15.5%	43.0%	IN
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	18.3%	35.5%	Y

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

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: <u>Disproportionality - Compliance Ind</u> Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1			
Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorie of inappropriate identification?	representa		N
Indicator 11: <u>Effective General Supervision Part E</u> 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 consent to evaluate	97.4%	100.0%	N
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition - Compliance 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 ve were not for revising the original data submission.	015 for th s indicator l in the pub	e period J that were blic reportin	g.
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%	100.0%	Y
Indicator 13: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u> Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System		100.0%	1
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	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. 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 at the time they left school 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) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school). 	NIC	48.0%	NIC
school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left			
school)] times 100.	NIC	75.0%	NIC
•	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.		