## 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

			ITGOMERY SOMER Year 201		Ρ		
				nce Indicat port (Colle		• August 2	2016)
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	97.1%	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						10.00/	
NA – Indi	cates not	a High Sc	hool Distr	ICt	0%	13.0%	Y
Data Sour B. Particip		or children	<u>y Data</u> with IEPs	in a regula			)
assessme		grade level	standards	; alternate			
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target
LAL	95.5%	95.0%	Y	Math	90.5%	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	0.4.0%	65.4%		Grade 3	00.5%	70.3%	N
	34.6%		N		38.5%		
Grade 4	24.1%	60.5%	N	Grade 4	20.8%	66.1%	
Grade 5	33.9%	60.5%	N	Grade 5	15.3%	66.1%	
Grade 6	21.6%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 6	19.6%	66.1%	
Grade 7	21.3%	60.5%	N	Grade 7	23.4%	66.1%	
Grade 8	21.4%	60.5%	N	Grade 8	17.1%	66.1%	N
Grade HS	33.1%	60.5%	N	Grade HS	04.00/	66.1%	N
				for participat	21.9%		
at grad - No tar ** No da	de level get as the d ta reported	district has n I	io minin	num 'N' size Performano	for previou	is year	
Data Sour	ce: Electro	nic Violence	and V	andalism Re	porting Sy	stem(July	1,
	ne 30, 201				ava ifi a ava to ali		
				s having a sig ns of childre			N
		in a school v	•		II WIUI ILI S	5 101	, n
9			/				
Indicator	4B: Suspe	ension/Expu	Ision -	Compliance	e Indicato	r	
Data Sour		nic Violence		andalism Re			1,
				iscrepancy, l			
				s of greater	than 10 da	ys in a	N
2		en with IEPs	•				
· / ·				contribute to uirements rel	Ų		
				s, the use of			Ν
				ral safeguar			
Indicator	5: School	Age LRE - F	Perforn	nance Indica	ator 🛛		
Data Sour	rce: <u>Annual</u>	Data Report	<u>(Collecti</u>	ion Date: Oct	<u>ober 15, 20</u>	<u>15)</u>	
* Indianta	a na ranart	ad data an (	Databar	1 Eth collecti	an		
indicate	s no report	eu uata on C	Jelober	15th collecti	UT		
* Indicate	s no report	ed data on 6	5-21 aqu	e aroup			
indioato	e no roport		ug	- 3 MP			
		for public rep Public School		were collectents.	ed on Octo	ber 15 201	5 and
					Local	State	Met
					Data	Target	State
							Target
A. Percen	t of childrer	າ with IFPs ຂ	h A hang	hrough 21		1	
		ss 80% or m	-	-	57.8%	49.0%	Y

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	5.3%	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.	6.9%	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

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.		43.5%	X
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)]	60%	43.376	Y
times 100	25.7%	35.0%	Y
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
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time			

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.			
<ul> <li>NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort"</li> <li>Indicates the number of survey responses were too low to yield meaningful interpretation of the</li> </ul>			
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			

		<u> </u>
<mark>/Child Fin</mark> 016 for th	<mark>ld</mark> e period Ju	uly 1,
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
99%	100.0%	N
in the pub	lic reportin	
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
100%	100.0%	Y
ndicator		
Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe
	Local Data 99% Ince Indic Dif for th indicator in the pub ification pub ification pub ificator in the fub ificator ndicator	Local DataState Target99%100.0%Indicator D16 for the period Juindicator that were in the public reportin ification purposes onLocal DataState Target100%100.0%indicatorLocal DataState Target

<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%