

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

| TEANECK BERGEN Year 2015-2016 | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Indicator 1: Graduation Rates - Performance Indicator | | | | | | | |
| Data Source: High School Graduation Report (Collection Date: August 2016) | | | | | | | |
| Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma | | | | | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| ** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year Data Collection NA – Indicates not a High School District | | | | | 92.4% | 78.0% | Y |
| Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates - Performance Indicator | | | | | | | |
| Data Source: End of Year Report (Collection Date: June 2015) | | | | | | | |
| Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school | | | | | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| ** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year Data Collection NA – Indicates not a High School District | | | | | 2.5% | 13.0% | 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 | 89.2% | 95.0% | N | Math | 89% | 95.0% | N |
| C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards | | | | | | | |
| Subject | LEA Data | LEA Target | Met LEA Target | Subject | LEA Data | LEA Target | Met LEA Target |
| LAL | 89.2% | 95.0% | N | MATH | 89% | 95.0% | N |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|---|----------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Grade 3 | 26.8% | 65.4% | N | Grade 3 | 35.7% | 70.3% | N |
| Grade 4 | 21.3% | 60.5% | N | Grade 4 | 13.1% | 66.1% | N |
| Grade 5 | 20.3% | 60.5% | N | Grade 5 | 20.3% | 66.1% | N |
| Grade 6 | 20.5% | 60.5% | N | Grade 6 | 12.3% | 66.1% | N |
| Grade 7 | 9.1% | 60.5% | N | Grade 7 | 4.6% | 66.1% | N |
| Grade 8 | 16.7% | 60.5% | N | Grade 8 | 18.2% | 66.1% | N |
| Grade HS | 12.3% | 60.5% | N | Grade HS | 6% | 66.1% | N |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did not meet the state "n" size of 40 for participation and 10 for performance at grade level - No target as the district has no minimum 'N' size for previous year ** No data reported | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion - Performance Indicator Data Source: Electronic Violence and Vandalism Reporting System(July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015) | | | | | | | |
| 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? | | | | | | | N |
| Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion - Compliance Indicator Data Source: Electronic Violence and Vandalism Reporting System(July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015) | | | | | | | |
| 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, 2015) | | | | | | | |
| * 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 2015 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. | | | | | 36.7% | 49.0% | N |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. | 32.6% | 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. | 6.5% | 7.4% | Y |
| Indicator 6: Pre-School LRE - Performance Indicator Data Source: Annual Data Report (Collection Date: October 15, 2015) | | | |
| * 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. | 14.1% | 43.5% | 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 | 0% | 35.0% | Y |
| Indicator 7: Pre-School Outcomes - Performance Indicator Data Source: BDI-2 Data Manager | | | |
| NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" - 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 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: Parent Involvement - Performance Indicator | | | |
| Data Source: Survey Report | | | |
| 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 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 | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| | NIC | 85.0% | NIC |
| Indicator 9: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2013, 2014, 2015) and Fall Surveys (October 2013, October 2014, October 2015) | | | |
| Has the district been identified for disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification? | | | N |
| Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 15, 2015) | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification? | | | | N |
| Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find | | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2016 for the period July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016) | | | | |
| 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 15 th collection *** 0 students received parental consent to evaluate | 58.3% | 100.0% | N | |
| Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition - Compliance Indicator | | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2016 for the period July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016) | | | | |
| Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this indicator that were submitted after October 15, 2016 cannot be reflected in the public reporting. Resubmissions that were requested were for data verification purposes only and 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. | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target | |
| | | | | |
| * 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 | 66.7% | 100.0% | N | |
| Indicator 13: Secondary Transition - Compliance Indicator | | | | |
| Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System | | | | |
| 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 | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target | |
| | | | | |
| | NIC | 100.0% | NIC | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <p>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.</p> <p>NIC: Indicates "Not in Cohort"</p> | | | |
| <p>Indicator 14: <u>Post Secondary Transition Outcomes</u> Data Source: Post School Outcome Survey</p> <p>NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort"</p> | | | |
| | <p>Local Data</p> | <p>State Target</p> | <p>Met State Target</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>NIC</p> | <p>46.5%</p> | <p>NIC</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>NIC</p> | <p>75.5%</p> | <p>NIC</p> |
| <p>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 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.</p> | <p>NIC</p> | <p>86.0%</p> | <p>NIC</p> |