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

			OOMFIELD ESSE Year 201				
				nce Indicat port (Colle		· August 2	016)
Percent of school with	youth with n a regular	IEPs grad diploma	uating fror	n high	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
** Indicate Data Colle	s no report	ed data on	End of the	e Year			
	cates not	a High Sc	hool Distr	ict	89.8%	78.0%	Y
				nce Indica Date: June			
Percent of school	youth with	IEPs drop	ping out of	f high	Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle							
INA – INdi	cates not	a nign Sc	nooi Distr	ICI	8.7%	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 ; alternate	odations; a	lternate)
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	88.4%	95.0%	Ν	Math	86.7%	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	21.9%	65.4%	Ν	Grade 3	34.4%	70.3%	
Grade 4	29.6%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 4	26.8%	66.1%	
Grade 5	17.5%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 5	37.1%	66.1%	N
Grade 6	9%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 6	10.6%	66.1%	N
Grade 7	25.4%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 7	7%	66.1%	N
Grade 8	12.3%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 8	13.8%	66.1%	N
Grade HS	12.4%	60.5%	N	Grade HS	4.6%	66.1%	N
at grad - No tan ** No da	de level get as the o ta reported 4A: <u>Susp</u>e	district has r	no minin Jision -	for participat num 'N' size Performant andalism Re	for previou	is year	
	ne 30, 201				porting by	stem(sury	- ,
				s having a si			
		isions and e in a school		ns of childre	n with IEPs	s tor	N
groator th			your.				ļ
2014 - Ju Does the o in the rate	ne 30, 201 district have of suspens	5) e: (a) a signi	ficant d	iscrepancy, l s of greater	by race or	ethnicity,	^r 1, N
(b) policies discrepand developme	s, procedur cy and do r ent and imp	es or praction not comply version	ces that vith requ	contribute to uirements rel s, the use of Iral safeguare	lating to the positive be	Э	N
Data Sour * Indicate	ce: <u>Annual</u> s no reporte	Data Report	<u>(Collect</u>) October	nance Indica ion 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 Data	ber 15 201 State Target	5 and Met State Target
		n with IEPs a ss 80% or m	-	-	61.2%	49.0%	

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	16.4%	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.	6.3%	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.	49.5%	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	39.6%	35.0%	N
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.	NIC	72.0%	NIC
 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?			N
Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Ind			

		N
<mark>/Child Fin</mark> 016 for th	<mark>ld</mark> e period J	uly 1,
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
90.8%	100.0%	N
in the pub	lic reportin	nly and
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
95 2%	100.0%	N
55.2 /0	100.070	
ndicator		
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
	90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8% 90.8%	DataTarget90.8%100.0%ance Indicator100.0%ance Indicator100.0%ance Indicator that were in the public reportinnification purposes orLocal DataState Target95.2%100.0%Indicator100.0%

<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%