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

| | | | ROBBINS MERC Year 201 | ER | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| | | | | <u>nce Indicat</u> port (Colle | | · August 7 | 016) |
| Percent of | youth with a regular | IEPs grad | | | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| Data Colle | | | | | | | |
| NA – Indi | cates not | a High Sc | hool Distr | ict | 98.3% | 78.0% | Y |
| | | | | n ce Indica Date: June | | - | |
| Percent of school | youth with | IEPs drop | ping out of | f high | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| Data Colle | s no report ection cates not a | | | | | 13.0% | v |
| INA – IIIuli | | a nigh Sc | | ICI | 0% | 13.0% | Y |
| Data Sour B. Particip accommod assessme | dations; reg nt against g | or children gular asses grade level | v Data with IEPs sment with standards | Indicator in a regula n accommo s; alternate | dations; a | lternate | |
| alternate a | chievemer | nt standard | | | | | |
| Subject | LEA Data | State Target | Met State Target | Subject | LEA Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| LAL | 85.8% | 95.0% | Ν | Math | 86.7% | 95.0% | |
| | ncy rate fo chievemer | | | igainst grad | de level sta | indards an | d |
| Subject LAL | LEA Data | LEA Target | Met LEA Target | Subject MATH | LEA Data | LEA Target | Met LEA Target |

| Grade 3 | 00.49/ | 65.4% | NI | Grade 3 | 40.0% | 70.3% | N | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Grade 3 | 23.1% | 60.5% | N | Grade 3 | 19.2% | 66.1% | N | |
| Grade 4 Grade 5 | 40% | | N | Grade 4 Grade 5 | 25.7% | 66.1% | N N | |
| Grade 5 Grade 6 | 20% | 60.5% | N | | 20% | | N | |
| | 17.1% | 60.5% | N | Grade 6 | 20% | 66.1% | | |
| Grade 7 | 22.2% | 60.5% | N | Grade 7 | 38.9% | 66.1% | Ν | |
| Grade 8 | 15.4% | 60.5% | N | Grade 8 | 7.7% | 66.1% | N | |
| Grade HS | 27.6% | 60.5% | N | Grade HS | 9.3% | 66.1% | N | |
| | | | | for participat | | | | |
| at grad - No tar ** No da | de level get as the d ta reported | district has n | o minir | num 'N' size | for previou | is year | | |
| Data Sour | 4A: <u>Suspe</u> ce: Electro ne 30, 201 | nic Violence | e and V | Performane andalism Re | porting Sy | or stem(July | 1, | |
| | - | - | State as | s having a si | nificant di | screpancy | | |
| | | | | ns of childre | | | Ν | |
| greater the | an 10 days in a school year? | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Compliance | | | | |
| 2014 - Ju | ne 30, 201 | 5) | | andalism Re | | | 1, | |
| | | | | liscrepancy, l | | | | |
| | | sions and ex en with IEPs | | s of greater | than 10 da | ys in a | Ν | |
| 2 | | | • | contribute to | h the eignif | oont | | |
| | | | | uirements rel | | | | |
| | | | | s, the use of | | | Ν | |
| interventio | ons and sup | ports, and p | rocedu | iral safeguar | ds. | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | nance Indica | | | | |
| Data Sour | ce: <u>Annual</u> | Data Report | (Collect | ion Date: Oct | <u>ober 15, 20</u> | <u>15)</u> | | |
| * Indicate | s no report | ed data on C | October | 15th collect | ion | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| * Indicate | s no report | ed data on 6 | 5-21 ag | e group | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | for public re ublic School | | were collecto | ed on Octo | ber 15 201 | 5 and | |
| | | | | | | | 5 and Met | |
| | | | | | Local | State | Met State | |
| | | | | | | | Met | |
| do not inc A. Percen | lude Non-P t of childrer | | studer | nts. through 21 | Local | State | Met State | |

| B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. | 14.6% | 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. | 5.2% | 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. | 24% | 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 | 76% | 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 |
|--|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 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. The percent of children who were functioning | NIC | 67.0% | NIC |
| 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 | 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 | 89.5% | 85.0% | Y |
| Indicator 9: <u>Disproportionality - Compliance Indic</u> Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2013, 2014, 20 (October 2013, October 2014, October 2015) | | 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 |
| | icator | | |

| Has the district been identified with disproportionate 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 | 90.7% | 100.0% | N |
| 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, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third | in the pub | lic reportin | |
| birthdays. * 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 | 1009/ | 100.0% | v |
| Indicator 13: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u> Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System | 100% | 100.076 | 1 |
| 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 | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| 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 | NIC | 100.0% | NIC |

| <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% |