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

			EXANDRIA HUNTEF Year 201)		
				nce Indicat		· August 2	016)
Percent of school with						State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle							
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						13.0%	
NA – Indicates not a High School District					NA	13.0%	NA
Data Sour	3: Assess ce: <u>ESEA A</u>	ccountabilit	y Data				
accommoo assessme	dations; reg	gular asses grade level	sment with standards	in a regula n accommo ;; alternate	dations; a	lternate)
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	98.3%	95.0%	Y	Math	98.3%	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

Grade 3	_	65.4%	-	Grade 3	_	70.3%	-
Grade 4		60.5%	-	Grade 4	-	66.1%	
Grade 5	40%	60.5%	N	Grade 5	50%	66.1%	
Grade 6	0%	60.5%	0	Grade 6	15.4%	66.1%	
Grade 7	10%	60.5%	N	Grade 7	10%	66.1%	N
Grade 8	-	60.5%	-	Grade 8	-	66.1%	
Grade HS	NA	60.5%	NA	Grade 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> rce: Electro ne 30, 201 istrict ident	district has nsion/Exp nic Violenc 5) ified by the nsions and	no minim 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 /stem(July screpancy	
Data Sour 2014 - Jun Does the o in the rate	ce: Electro ne 30, 201 district have	nic Violend 5) e: (a) a sigr sions and e	ificant di	Compliance andalism Re screpancy, I s of greater	porting Sy	ethnicity,	1, N
(b) policies discrepand developme	s, procedur cy and do r ent and imp	es or practi not comply plementatio	ices that with requin of IEPs	contribute to irements rel s, the use of ral safeguare	ating to the positive be	e	N
Data Sour * Indicate * Indicate	r ce: <u>Annual</u> s no report s no report	<u>Data Report</u> ed data on ed data on	<u>Collecti</u> October 6-21 age	ance Indica on Date: Oct 15th collecti group were collecto	<u>ober 15, 20</u> on		5 and
	lude Non-P				Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
	t of childrer regular cla		-	-	87.3%	49.0%	

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	1.4%	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: 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.	87.5%	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	12.5%	35.0%	Y
 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			

Has the district been identified with disproportionate r racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categorie of inappropriate identification?			N
Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part E 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	93.3%	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 	1000/	100.0%	v
	100%	100.076	Y
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition - Compliance	Indicator		
Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System			Mot
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			

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