## 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

			SPRINGI UNIC Year 201	N				
				nce Indicat port (Colle		: August 2	2016)	
Percent of school with	Data Source: High School Graduation Report (Colle Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma				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	94.9%	78.0%	Y	
	Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates - Performance Indicator Data Source: End of Year Report (Collection Date: June 2015)							
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								
NA – Indi	NA – Indicates not a High School District 0% 13.0% Y							
Indicator 3: Assessment - Performance Indicator Data Source: ESEA Accountability Data B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.								
Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	Subject	LEA Data	State Target	Met State Target	
LAL	94.3%	95.0%		Math	91.8%	95.0%	1	
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards								
Subject LAL	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target	Subject MATH	LEA Data	LEA Target	Met LEA Target	

Grade 3	24.5%	65.4%	N	Grade 3	27.00/	70.3%	N
Grade 3	34.5%	60.5%	N	Grade 3	37.9%	66.1%	
Grade 5	16.7%	60.5%	<u>N</u>	Grade 5	25%	66.1%	
Grade 5	35.7%	60.5%	<u>N</u>	Grade 5	21.4%	66.1%	N
	5.6%		N		5.6%		
Grade 7	22.7%	60.5%	N	Grade 7	9.1%	66.1%	
Grade 8	13.3%	60.5%	Ν	Grade 8	6.3%	66.1%	N
Grade HS	28.4%	60.5%	N	Grade HS	9.4%	66.1%	N
at grad - No tar ** No da Indicator Data Sour 2014 - Jun Was the d in the rate greater tha Indicator	de level get as the o ta reported 4A: <u>Suspe</u> ce: Electro ne 30, 201 listrict ident s of susper an 10 days 4B: <u>Susp</u> e	district has r msion/Expu- nic Violence 5) ified by the s in a school	io minin Ilsion - a and V State as expulsio year? Ilsion -	for participation for participation (N' size) Performance andalism Research (Strangle) S having a signs of childre Compliance	for previou ce Indicato porting Sy gnificant di n with IEPs e Indicato	screpancy	1, N
2014 - Ju Does the o in the rate	ne 30, 201 district have of suspens	<b>5)</b> e: (a) a signi	ficant d pulsion	iscrepancy, l s of greater	by race or	ethnicity,	1, N
(b) policies discrepand developme	s, procedur cy and do r ent and imp	res or praction not comply work to the second secon	ces that /ith requ	contribute to uirements rel s, the use of ral safeguar	lating to the positive <b>be</b>	e	N
				nance Indica ion Date: Oct		<u>15)</u>	
* Indicate	s no report	ed data on C	October	15th collect	ion		
* Indicate	s no report	ed data on 6	6-21 age	e group			
		for public re ublic Schoo		were collectonts.	ed on Octo	ber 15 201	
					Local Data	State Target	Met State Target
	t of childrer regular cla	n with IEPs a	-	through 21			

B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.	13.4%	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.	10.7%	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

**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.	77.1%	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	0%	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 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.			
<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 representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification?			
Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Ind			

Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result 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 Target	
<ul> <li>Indicates no reported data on November 15<sup>th</sup> collection</li> <li>*** 0 students received parental consent to evaluate</li> </ul>	90.7%	100.0%	N	
<b>Note:</b> 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	l in the pub rification p	lic reportin urposes or	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 Target	
<ul> <li>Indicates no reported data on November 15<sup>th</sup> collection</li> <li>NA Indicates "Not Applicable"</li> <li>*** 0 students referred from Part C to part B</li> </ul>				
**** No Eligible students Indicator 13: <u>Secondary Transition - Compliance</u> Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System	** Indicator	100.0%	**	
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 assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to	Local Data	State Target	Met State Targe	
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: <u>Post Secondary Transition Outcome</u> Data Source: Post School Outcome Survey NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort"	Local	State	Met
	Data	Target	State Target
<b>A.</b> 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.	75%	46.5%	Y
<b>B.</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	1370		
school)] times 100. <b>C.</b> 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%	75.5%	Y
they left school)] times 100.	90%	86.0%	Y