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

			NSFIELD 1 BURLING Year 201				
				nce Indicat		: August 2	2016)
Percent of school with					State Target	Met State Target	
** Indicate Data Colle	s no report	ed data on	End of the	e Year			
NA – Indi	cates not	a High Sc	hool Distr	ict	NA	78.0%	NA
				n ce Indica Date: June			
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						12.00/	
NA – Indicates not a High School District					NA	13.0%	NA
	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; a	lternate)
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	95.4%	95.0%	Y	Math	95.4%	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

Grade 3	57.1%	65.4%	N	Grade 3	35.7%	70.3%	N
Grade 4	25%	60.5%	N	Grade 4	25%	66.1%	
Grade 5	50%	60.5%	N	Grade 5	43.8%	66.1%	
Grade 6	45%	60.5%	N	Grade 6	30%	66.1%	N
Grade 7	43 %	60.5%	NA	Grade 7	30 %	66.1%	NA
Grade 8		60.5%		Grade 8		66.1%	
Grade	NA	00.576	NA	Grade	NA	00.170	NA
HS	NA	60.5%	NA	HS	NA	66.1%	NA
at grad - No tar ** No da Indicator Data Sour 2014 - Jun Was the d in the rate	de level get as the o ta reported 4A: <u>Suspe</u> ce: Electro ne 30, 201 istrict ident s of susper	district has nsion/Exp nic Violenc 5)	no minin ulsion - ce and Va State as expulsion	for participation num 'N' size Performance andalism Re having a signs of childre	for previou ce Indicato porting Sy gnificant di	is year or ystem(July screpancy	
2014 - Ju Does the o in the rate	ne 30, 201 district have of suspens	5) e: (a) a sign	ificant di xpulsion	andalism Re screpancy, l s of greater	by race or	ethnicity,	1, N
discrepan developm	cy and do r ent and imp	not comply volumentatio	with requ n of IEPs	contribute to lirements rel s, the use of ral safeguar	ating to the positive be	Э	N
Data Sour Indicate Indicate Note: The	s no report s no report s no report	Data Report ed data on ed data on for public re	<u>Collecti</u> October 6-21 age	were collect	<u>ober 15, 20</u> on		5 and
do not incl	ude Non-P	ublic Schoo	ol studen	its.	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
		n with IEPs ss 80% or r	-	-	47.7%	49.0%	N

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	10.5%	15.5%	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.	7%	7.4%	Y

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.	50%	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)]		07 00/	
times 100	0%	35.0%	Y
Data Source: BDI-2 Data Manager NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" - Indicates the number of survey responses were interpretation of the data	too low to	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.	-	72.0%	-
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program.	-	77.0%	-

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.		67.0%	
 The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. 	-	51.0%	-
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.	-	70.0%	-
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program.	-	59.0%	-
Indicator 8: <u>Parent Involvement - Performance Ind</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 respondent parents of children with disabilities times	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
 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)	cator 015) and F	all Surveys	5
Has the district been identified for disproportionate re racial and ethnic groups in special education and rela			N
the result of inappropriate identification?			

Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories			N
of inappropriate identification?			
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 Targe
 Indicates no reported data on November 15th collection *** 0 students received parental consent to evaluate 	100%	100.0%	Y
2015 to June 30, 2016) Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this 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,	l in the pub rification p	olic reportin urposes or	Ny and Met
who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Local Data	State Target	State Targe
 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 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	NA	100.0%	NA

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"			
Indicator 14: Post Secondary Transition Outcome Data Source: Post School Outcome Survey NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort"	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.	ΝΑ	46.5%	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. 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 and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100. 	NA	86.0%	NA