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

			ND BROOF SOMER Year 201		Η		
				nce Indicat		•: August 2	2016)
					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	82.1%	78.0%	Y
				nce Indica Date: June			
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school					Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
Data Colle						40.00(
INA – INdi	cates not	a High Sc	nooi Distr	ICt	0%	13.0%	Y
Data Sour	3: Assess ce: ESEA A	ccountabilit	<u>y Data</u>	Indicator	r assessm	ent with no	
accommoo assessme	dations; reg	gular asses grade level	sment with standards	accommo ; alternate	odations; a	lternate	
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	95.2%	95.0%		Math	95.3%	95.0%	
	ncy rate fo achievemer			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

		0- 404					
Grade 3	0%	65.4%	0	Grade 3	16.7%	70.3%	
Grade 4	9.1%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 4	8.7%	66.1%	
Grade 5	12.5%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 5	12.5%	66.1%	
Grade 6	0%	60.5%	0	Grade 6	0%	66.1%	0
Grade 7	0%	60.5%	0	Grade 7	0%	66.1%	0
Grade 8	11.1%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 8	11.8%	66.1%	N
Grade HS	13.7%	60.5%	N	Grade HS	0%	66.1%	N
at grad - No tar ** No da Indicator Data Sour 2014 - Ju	de level get as the o ta reported 4A: <u>Suspe</u> rce: Electro ne 30, 201	district has r nsion/Expu nic Violence 5)	no minin I <mark>lsion -</mark> e and V	for participat num 'N' size Performanc andalism Re	for previou ce Indicato porting Sy	is year <u>or</u> rstem(July	
greater tha	an 10 days	in a school	year?	ns of childre			N
Data Sour 2014 - Ju	ce: Electro ne 30, 201	nic Violenco 5)	e and V	Compliance andalism Re iscrepancy, I	porting Sy	stem(July	1,
in the rate	of suspens	., .	pulsion	is of greater	•		N
discrepan developm	cy and do n ent and imp	not comply work of the second se	ith requ	contribute to uirements rel s, the use of ral safeguare	ating to the positive be	Э	N
Data Sour * Indicate	r 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	Met State
	t of childrer				Data	i ai yet	Target

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	13%	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.	15.7%	7.4%	Ν

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

they exited the program.

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.	38.5%	43.5%	Ν
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	57.7%	35.0%	N
	01.170	001070	N
Indicator 7: <u>Pre-School Outcomes - Performance</u> Data Source: BDI-2 Data Manager NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" - Indicates the number of survey responses were interpretation of the data		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
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time		77.00/	

77.0% NIC

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?			Ν
Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Ind			

Has the district been identified with disproportionate racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories for the second statements of the			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
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,	in the pub rification p	lic reportin	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	NIC	100.0%	NIC

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"	<u>s</u> Local	State	Met
	Data	Target	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.	40%	46.5%	N
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.		75.5%	
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	90%	10.0%	Y