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

e: August 2 State Target	2014) Met State Target
State	Met State
0.0.00	State
0.0.00	
larget	Target
75.0%	NIC
	Met
State	State
	Target
Target	
Target	
Target	
	0.00.00

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	-			Grade 4	-		
Grade 5	-			Grade 5	-		
Grade 6	-			Grade 6	-		
Grade 7	-			Grade 7	-		
Grade 8	-			Grade 8	-		
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

(b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the

(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

Ν

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.	86.7%	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			
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.	-	43.0%	-
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	-	35.5%	-

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)

Has the district been identified for disproportionate recacial and ethnic groups in special education and relative result of inappropriate identification? Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1) Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorism inappropriate identification? Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part For Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	icator .5, 2014) representaties that is the	tion of ne result	N N Met State Targe
ndicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1) Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorise inappropriate identification? Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part Foata Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	representates that is the state of the state	ne result od e period Ju State	uly 1, Met State
Pata Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1 Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorise inappropriate identification? Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part Foata Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	representates that is the state of the state	ne result od e period Ju State	uly 1, Met State
Pata Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1 Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorise inappropriate identification? Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part Foata Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	representates that is the state of the state	ne result od e period Ju State	uly 1, Met State
racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorial inappropriate identification? Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part Expansion Part Ex	3/Child Fin 2015 for th	ne result od e period Ju State	uly 1, Met State
Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part Foata Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	3/Child Fin 2015 for th Local	nd e period Ju State	uly 1, Met State
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	2015 for th Local	e period Ju State	Met State
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	2015 for th Local	e period Ju State	Met State
State established time line of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th			State
consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th			
establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe Indicates no reported data on November 15 th	Dutu	, raigor	i ai go
Indicates no reported data on November 15 th			
collection			
*** 0 students received parental consent to			
evaluate	25%	100.0%	N
"	1 12 4		
ndicator 12: Early Childhood Transition - Compliant Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2			ulv 1.
2014 to June 30, 2015)		о ролош о	, -,
Nata. Compostions on additions to the mumbers for thi	م امطامعات	4h a4a wa	
Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected			a
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,		-	Met
who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an	Local	State	State
EP developed and implemented by their third pirthdays.	Data	Target	Targe
initiacys.			
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	100%	100.0%	Y
THE Eligible olddorlio	10070	100.070	'
ndicator 13: Secondary Transition - Compliance	Indicator		
Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System			

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.		