## 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

			SALEM SALE Year 201	EM			
				nance India port (Colle		: August 2	2014)
Percent of		IEPs grad			Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle	ction	ed data on		e Year		== 00/	
		Graduation	n Conort"		60.6%	75.0%	N
				ce Indicator			
Percent of school	youth with	IEPs drop	ping out o	f high	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle	ction	ed data on Graduatio		e Year	26.9%	14.0%	N
Data Sour	ce: <u>ESEA A</u>	ment - Per	lity Data	Indicator	r assassm	ont with no	
accommoo assessme	dations; reg nt against g	gular asses	sment wit	h accommo s; alternate	dations; a	lternate	
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	79.6%	95.0%	Ν	Math	84%	95.0%	N
		r children v nt standard		against grad	de level sta	andards and	d

Subject LAL	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target	Subject MATH	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target
Grade 3	-			Grade 3	0%		
Grade 4	0%			Grade 4	0%		
Grade 5	0%			Grade 5	0%		
Grade 6	6.2%			Grade 6	5.9%		
Grade 7	5.9%			Grade 7	6.2%		
Grade 8	0%			Grade 8	0%		
HS	0%			HS	0%		
*** No dat Indicator Data Sour		nsion/Expu	ulsion - Pe	rformance I ndalism Re		ystem(July	<i>ı</i> 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: bl year?	having a sig s of childre mpliance Ir	n with IEP:		N
Data Sour 2013 - Ju Does the c in the rate	ce: Electro ne 30, 201 district have of suspens	<b>nic Violen 4)</b> e: (a) a sig sions and e	nificant dis	ndalism Re crepancy, I of greater t	porting Sy	ethnicity,	<b>1,</b>
(b) policies discrepand developme	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
				ance Indica ction Date:		<u>5, 2014)</u>	
** Indicate	es no repoi	rted data o	n October	15th collec	tion		
- Indicates	s no report	ed data on	6-21 age	group			
	LRE data ude Non-P			vere collecte s.	ed on Octo	ber 15 20′	14 and

15.3% 12.7%	48.5%	N
12.7%	16.0%	V
		Ý
11.1%	7.4%	N
	<u>5, 2014)</u>	
C	11.1% Dctober 1 On	October 15, 2014)

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.	27.3%	43.0%	N
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	22.7%	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?			Ν
Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indi	icator		
Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 1			
Has the district been identified with disproportionate		tion of	
racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categori			Ν
of inappropriate identification?			
Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part E Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015)	015 for th	e period Ju	uly 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	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	86.7%	100.0%	Ν
Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2014 to June 30, 2015) Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this	s indicator	that were	ıly 1,
submitted after October 15, 2015 cannot be reflected Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve			0
Resubmissions that were requested were for data ve were not for revising the original data submission.			ly and
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,	rification p	urposes or	ly and Met
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			Met State
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	rification p	urposes or State	Met State
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.	rification p	urposes or State	Met State
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.	rification p	urposes or State	Met State
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.	rification p	urposes or State	ly and
Resubmissions that were requested were for data vere 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	rification p	urposes or State	Met State
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	rification p	urposes or State	Met State
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	rification p Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
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	rification p Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
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: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u> Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System	rification p Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
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: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u>	rification p 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"	33.3%	100.0%	N
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
<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.			State
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	Data	Target	State Target

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.		