Local District Special Education Public Report for 2015-2016

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

			HARBOR ATLAN Year 201				
				nce Indicat port (Colle		• August 2	2016)
Percent of school with	youth with n a regular	IEPs grad diploma	uating fror	n high	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle							
NA – Indi	cates not	a High Sc	hool Distr	ict	92.7%	78.0%	Y
				n ce Indica Date: June			
Percent of school	youth with	IEPs drop	ping out of	f high	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle						10.00/	
INA – INdi	cates not	a High Sc	nooi Distr	ICt	2%	13.0%	Y
	3: Assess ce: <u>ESEA A</u>			Indicator			
accommoo assessme	dations; reg	gular asses grade level	sment with standards	in a regula n accommo s; alternate	dations; al	lternate)
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	92.5%	95.0%	N	Math	89.3%	95.0%	
	ncy rate fo achievemer			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

		05.404				70.00/	
Grade 3	25.3%	65.4%	Ν	Grade 3	25.3%	70.3%	
Grade 4	23.8%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 4	17.1%	66.1%	
Grade 5	13.2%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 5	6.6%	66.1%	
Grade 6	3.5%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 6	3.6%	66.1%	
Grade 7	1.8%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 7	0%	66.1%	0
Grade 8	7.9%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 8	14.3%	66.1%	N
Grade HS	4.1%	60.5%	N	Grade HS	2%	66.1%	N
at grac - No tan ** No da Indicator Data Sour	de level get as the o ta reported 4A: <u>Suspe</u> ce: Electro	district has r nsion/Expr nic Violenc	no minin ulsion -	for participat num 'N' size <u>Performan</u> andalism Re	for previou	is year	
Was the d in the rate	s of susper	ified by the	expulsio	s having a signs of childre			N
Data Sour 2014 - Jui	ce: Electro ne 30, 201	nic Violenc 5)	e and V	Compliance andalism Re	porting Sy	stem(July	1,
in the rate	of suspens		kpulsion	iscrepancy, l s of greater			N
discrepand	cy and do r ent and imp	not comply work of the second se	vith requ	contribute to uirements rel s, the use of ral safeguare	ating to the positive be	e	N
Data Sour	r ce: <u>Annual</u> s no report	<u>Data Report</u>	<u>(Collecti</u> October	nance Indica on Date: Oct 15th collecti e group	ober 15, 20	<u>15)</u>	
		for public re ublic Schoc		were collect	ed on Octo Local Data	ber 15 201 State Target	Met State
	t of childrer regular cla	with IEPs	-	-		49.0%	Target

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	19.3%	15.5%	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.	7.7%	7.4%	Ν

Indicator 6: <u>Pre-School LRE - Performance Indicator</u> Data Source: <u>Annual Data Report (Collection Date: October 15, 2015)</u>

* Indicates no reported data on October 15th collection NA: Indicates not a pre-school district

Note: The LRE data for public reporting were collected on October 15 2015 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.	44.9%	43.5%	Y
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	37.1%	35.0%	N
Indicator 7: Pre-School Outcomes - Performance Data Source: BDI-2 Data Manager NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" - Indicates the number of survey responses were interpretation of the data		yield mear	ningful
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 percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.	NIC	72.0%	NIC
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	67.0%	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: <u>Parent Involvement - Performance In</u> Data Source: Survey Report	dicator		
Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total number of	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
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	85.0%	NIC
Indicator 9: <u>Disproportionality - Compliance Indic</u> Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2013, 2014, 20 (October 2013, October 2014, October 2015)	ator (15) and F	all Surveys	5
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 Ind			

Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorie of inappropriate identification?			N
Indicator 11: <u>Effective General Supervision Part E</u> Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2 2015 to June 30, 2016)			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 must be conducted, within that timeframe	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
 Indicates no reported data on November 15th collection *** 0 students received parental consent to 			
evaluate	96.2%	100.0%	N
submitted after October 15, 2016 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 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	Indicator		
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 Target
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	100%	100.0%	Y

<u>S</u> Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Local		State
NIC	46.5%	NIC
NIC	75.5%	NIC
NIC	10.070	
	NIC	NIC 75.5%