Local District Special Education Public Report for 2019-2020

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

| Oceanport Boro Monmouth | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Year 2019-2020 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 1: <u>Graduation Rates - Performance Indicator</u> | uct 2010) | | | | | | |
| Data Source: High School Graduation Report (Collection Date: August 2019) Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and | | | | | | | |
| Secondary Education Act (ESSA)) Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular | | | Met State | | | | |
| diploma Local Data State Target Target | | | | | | | |
| ** Indicates no reported data on End of the Year Data CollectionNA – Indicates not a High School District | NA | 81.5% | NA | | | | |

Indicator 3: Assessment - Performance Indicator (State of New Jersey cancelled all statewide student

assessments for the 2020 testing window)

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.

| | LEA | State | Met State | | LEA | State | Met State |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Subject | Data | Target | Target | Subject | Data | Target | Target |
| LAL | - | - | - | Math | - | - | - |
| C. Proficiency | rate for childre | n with IEPs ag | ainst grade lev | el standards ar | nd alternate acl | nievement star | dards |
| Subject | LEA | LEA | Met LEA | Subject | LEA | LEA | Met LEA |
| LAL | Data | Target | Target | MATH | Data | Target | Target |
| Grade 3 | - | - | - | Grade 3 | - | - | - |
| Grade 4 | - | - | - | Grade 4 | - | - | - |
| Grade 5 | - | - | - | Grade 5 | - | - | - |
| Grade 6 | - | - | - | Grade 6 | - | - | - |
| Grade 7 | - | - | - | Grade 7 | - | - | - |
| Grade 8 | - | - | - | Grade 8 | - | - | - |

| Grade HS | - | - | - | Grade HS | - | - | - |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|---|
| *Did not meet | the state "n" siz | ze of 20 for par | rticipation and | "n" size of 10 fo | or performance | at Grade level | |
| **No data repo | orted | | | | | | |
| ***No eligible s | students | | | | | | |
| NA Not applica | able as grades | are not offered | ł | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 4A: | Suspension/E | xpulsion - Pe | rformance Ind | licator | | | |
| Data Source: | Electronic Vic | plence and Va | ndalism Repo | rting System(| July 1, 2018 - | June 30, 2019) | |
| Was the distric | ct identified by t | the State as ha | iving a significa | ant discrepancy | / in the rates of | suspensions | N |
| and expulsion: | s of children wi | th IEPs for grea | ater than 10 da | ays in a school | year? | | N |
| Indicator 4B: | Suspension/E | xpulsion - Co | mpliance Indi | <u>cator</u> | | | |
| Data Source: | Electronic Vic | plence and Va | ndalism Repo | rting System(| July 1, 2018 - | June 30, 2019) | |
| Does the distri | ct have: (a) a s | significant discr | epancy, by rac | e or ethnicity, i | in the rate of su | uspensions | N |
| and expulsion | s of greater tha | n 10 days in a | school year fo | r children with l | IEPs ; and | | N |
| (b) policies, pr | ocedures or pra | actices that cor | ntribute to the s | significant discr | repancy and do | o not comply | |
| with requireme | ents relating to | the developme | ent and implem | entation of IEP | s, the use of p | ositive | Ν |
| behavioral inte | erventions and | supports, and p | procedural safe | eguards. | | | |
| Indicator 5: S | <u>chool Age LR</u> | E - Performan | ce Indicator | | | | |
| Data Source: | NJSMART (Co | ollection Date: | : October 15, 2 | <u>2019)</u> | | | |
| **1 1' - | | 0.1.1 | | | | | |
| | • | on October 15t | | | | | |
| ***Indicates no | o reported data | on 6-21 age g | roup | | | | |

Note: The LRE data for public reporting were collected on October 15, 2016 and do not include Non-Public School students.

| | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. | 64.5% | 50.5% | Y |
| B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. | 1.9% | 14.0% | 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. | 0.9% | 6.9% | Y |
| Indicator 6: Pre-School LRE - Performance Indicator Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 15, 2019) *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, 20 students. | 016 and do not | include Non-Po | ublic School |
| | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |

| B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) | 50% | 34.0% | N |
| divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times | 0070 | 0 110 / 0 | |
| 100. | | | |
| Indicator 7: Pre-School Outcomes - Performance Indicator | | | |
| | | | |
| Data Source: Child Outcome Summary (COS) | | | |
| Data Source: Child Outcome Summary (COS) | | | |
| Data Source: Child Outcome Summary (COS) Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided | for this indicate | or. | |
| | for this indicate | or. | Met State |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided | for this indicate | or. State Target | Met State |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with | | | Met State Target |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills | | | |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). | | | |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). 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. | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided Outcome A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). 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. 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations | Local Data | State Target | Target |

| and skills (including early language/ communication and early | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|
| literacy). | | | |
| 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age | | | |
| expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased | NA | NA | NA |
| their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | | | |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations | NA | NA | NA |
| in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. | | | |
| Outcome C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with | | | Met State |
| IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| meet their needs. | | | Target |
| 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age | | | |
| expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased | NA | NA | NA |
| their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. | | | |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations | NA | NA | NA |
| in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. | | | |
| Indicator 8: Parent Involvement - Performance Indicator | | | |
| Data Source: Survey Report | | | |
| Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent | | | Met State |
| involvement as a means of improving services and results for children | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of | | | |
| children with disabilities times 100. | NIC | 86.0% | NIC |
| | NIC | 00.0 /0 | NIC |
| NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" | | | |

| *Indicates the number of survey responses were too low to yield | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| meaningful interpretation of the data. | | | |
| Indicator 9: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2017, 2018, 2019) and Fall Surv | eys (October : | 2017, October | 2018, |
| October 2019) | | | |
| Has the district been identified for disproportionate representation of racia | al and ethnic gr | oups in | N |
| special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate ic | dentification? | | N |
| Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 15, 2019) NJSMAR | RT (Collection | s 2017, 2018, 2 | 2019) and |
| Fall Surveys (October 2017, October 2018, October 2019) | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac | ial and ethnic (| groups in | N |
| specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identificatio | n? | | N |
| Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2020 for the perio | d July 1, 2019 | to June 30, 20 |)20) |
| Percent of children who were evaluated within the State established time | | | Met State |
| line of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, | | | |
| within that timeframe | | | |
| | 85.7% | 100.0% | Ν |
| **Indicates no reported data on October 15 th collection | | | |
| ***0 students received parental consent to evaluate | | | |

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition - Compliance Indicator

Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2020 for the period July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020)

Note: Corrections or additions to the numbers for this indicator that were submitted after October 15, 2018 cannot be reflected in the public reporting. Resubmissions that were requested were for data verification purposes only and were not for revising the original data submission.

| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found | | | Met State |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|
| eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| their third birthdays. | | | |
| *Indicates no reported data on October 15 th collection NA Indicates "Not Applicable" | 100% | 100.0% | Y |
| ***0 students referred from Part C to part B ****No Eligible students | | | |

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition - Compliance Indicator

Data Source: Special Education Monitoring System

| Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that | | | Met State |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|
| includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually | Local Data | State Target | Target |
| updated and 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 | NA | 100.0% | NA |
| goals related to the student's transition service needs. There also must | | | |
| be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where | | | |

| 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) | NA | 48.0 % | NA |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |
| Survey Response Rate | | NA | |
| *Indicates the number of survey responses were too low to yield | | | |
| NA : Not a High School District | | | |
| NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" | | | |
| Data Source: Post School Outcome Survey | | | |
| Indicator 14: Post-Secondary Transition Outcomes | | | |
| **No data | | | |
| NA: Not a High School | | | |
| NIC: Indicates "Not in Cohort" | | | |
| above)] times 100. | | | |
| the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and | | | |
| meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached | | | |
| a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team | | | |
| transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, | | | |

| 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. | | | |
| 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 | | 77.0% | |
| were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one | NA | | NA |
| 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 | NIA | 07.00/ | |
| education, or in some other postsecondary education or training | NA | 87.0% | NA |
| 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)] times 100. | | | |
| | | | |