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

	CAPE N	IAY COUN	TY VOCATI CAPE I Year 201	YAN	IOOL DISTR	RICT	
	1: <u>Graduat</u>				tor ection Date	· August 7	016)
Percent of	youth with a regular	IEPs grad			Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle	s no report ection cates not a				97.1%	78.0%	v
Indicator	2: <u>Drop-Or</u> ce: <u>End of \</u>	ut Rates -	Performa	nce Indica	tor	1 10.070	
school	youth with			U	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle	s no report ection cates not a				0%	13.0%	Y
Data Sour B. Particip accommod assessme	dations; reg nt against g	or children gular asses	y Data with IEPs ssment with standards	in a regula	ir assessm odations; a assessme	lternate)
alternate a	LEA Data	nt standard State Target	s. Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	98.5%	95.0%	Y	Math	98.4%	95.0%	
	ncy rate fo chievemer			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	NA	65.4%	Y	Grade 3	NA	70.3%	NA
Grade 4	NA	60.5%	NA	Grade 4	NA	66.1%	NA
Grade 5	NA	60.5%	NA	Grade 5	NA	66.1%	NA
Grade 6	NA	60.5%	NA	Grade 6	NA	66.1%	NA
Grade 7	NA	60.5%	NA	Grade 7	NA	66.1%	NA
Grade 8	NA	60.5%	NA	Grade 8	NA	66.1%	NA
Grade HS	15.4%	60.5%	N	Grade HS	1.6%	66.1%	N
at grad - No tar ** No da Indicator Data Sour 2014 - Jun Was the d	de level get as the o ta reported 4A: <u>Suspe</u> ce: Electro ne 30, 201 istrict ident	district has nsion/Exp nic Violenc 5) ified by the	no minin ulsion - e and V State as	for participat num 'N' size Performand andalism Re	for previou ce Indicato porting Sy gnificant di	is year or ystem(July screpancy	
greater tha Indicator	an 10 days 4B: <u>Suspe</u>	in a school	year? ulsion -	ns of childre	e Indicato	[N
	ce: Electro ne 30, 201		e and V	andalism Re	porting Sy	stem(July	1,
Does the o	district have of suspens	e: (a) a sign	xpulsion	iscrepancy, l s of greater	•	•	N
discrepan developm	cy and do r ent and imp	not comply working	with requin of IEP	contribute to uirements rel s, the use of ral safeguare	ating to the positive be	Э	N
Data Sour * Indicate	s no report	<u>Data Report</u>	<u>(Collecti</u> October	nance Indica on Date: Oct 15th collecti e group	<u>ober 15, 20</u>	<u>15)</u>	
		for public re ublic Schoo		were collectonts.	ed on Octo Local	ber 15 201 State	Met
					Data	Target	State Target
		n with IEPs ss 80% or r	-	-	100%	49.0%	Y

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	0%	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.	0%	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.	NA	43.5%	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	35.0%	NA
	NA	55.070	NA
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.	NA	72.0%	NA
 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	67.0%	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%	
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: <u>Parent Involvement - Performance In</u> 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	85.0%	NIC
Indicator 9: <u>Disproportionality - Compliance Indic</u> Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2013, 2014, 20 (October 2013, October 2014, October 2015)		all Surveys	5
			N
Has the district been identified for disproportionate re racial and ethnic groups in special education and rela the result of inappropriate identification?	ated servic		

epresenta es that is th	tion of ne result	N
		uly 1,
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
100%	100.0%	Y
in the pub	lic reportin	
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
NA	100.0%	NA
NA ndicator	100.0%	NA
	100.0% State Target	NA Met State Targe
	2/Child Fin 016 for th Local Data 100% ance Indic 016 for th a indicator in the pub rification p Local	J/Child Find 016 for the period Junc Local Data State Target 100% 100.0% ance Indicator 100.0% one indicator that were in the public reporting rification purposes or State Local State Local State State State 100% State

<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%