## **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

HANOVER PARK REGIONA	<b>AL</b>		
MORRIS			
Year 2014-2015			
<b>Indicator 1: Graduation Rates - Performance Indicator</b>	cator		
Data Source: High School Graduation Report (Colle	ction Date	: August 2	(014)
Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high			Met
school with a regular diploma	Local	State	State
	Data	Target	Target
** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year			_
Data Collection			
NIC Indicates "Not in Graduation Cohort"	90.2%	75.0%	Υ
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"	0%	14.0%	Y
	•		

## 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	78.1%	95.0%	N	Math	80%	95.0%	N

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	NA			Grade 3	NA		
Grade 4	NA			Grade 4	NA		
Grade 5	NA			Grade 5	NA		
Grade 6	NA			Grade 6	NA		
Grade 7	NA			Grade 7	NA		
Grade 8	NA			Grade 8	NA		
HS	3.2%			HS	1.6%		

- 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.	65.6%	48.5%	Y
B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	5.7%	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.	459/	7.40/	N
ріасетіеті.	16%	7.4%	N

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	NA	72.0%	NA

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.	NA	77.0%	NA
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.	NA	66.0%	NA
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program.	NA	51.0%	NA
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.	NA	70.0%	NA
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program.	NA	59.0%	NA
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: <u>Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator</u>
Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2012, 2013, 2014) and Fall Surveys (October 2012, October 2013, October 2014)

Has the district been identified for disproportionate re racial and ethnic groups in special education and rela			N
the result of inappropriate identification?	2100 001 110	oo triat io	.,
Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indi	icator		
Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1	5, 2014)		1
Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories			N
of inappropriate identification?		ic result	
Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part E Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2	3/Child Fin 2015 for th	i <mark>d</mark> e period Ji	uly 1,
2014 to June 30, 2015) 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 <sup>th</sup> collection			
*** 0 students received parental consent to			
evaluate	50%	100.0%	N
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015)			
submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve	I in the pub	lic reportin	_
<b>Note:</b> 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.	I in the pub	lic reportin	ily and
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,	I in the pub rification p	lic reportin urposes or	Met
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	I in the pub	lic reportin	ily and
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	I in the pub rification p	lic reportin urposes or State	Met State
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 <sup>th</sup>	I in the pub rification p	lic reportin urposes or State	Met State
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 <sup>th</sup> collection	I in the pub rification p	lic reportin urposes or State	Met State
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	I in the pub rification p	lic reportin urposes or State	Met State
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	I in the pub rification p	lic reportin urposes or State	Met State
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  ***** No Eligible students  Indicator 13: Secondary Transition - Compliance	Local Data	lic reportin urposes or State Target	Met State Targe
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 <sup>th</sup> collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable"  ** 0 students referred from Part C to part B  ***** No Eligible students  Indicator 13: Secondary Transition - Compliance Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System	Local Data	lic reportin urposes or State Target	Met State Targe
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  ***** No Eligible students  Indicator 13: Secondary Transition - Compliance	Local Data	lic reportin urposes or State Target	Met Stat Targ

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
<b>A.</b> 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.	NIG	40.004	NIC
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.	NIC	48.0% 75.0%	
<b>C.</b> 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	NIC	86.0%	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.		