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

Passaic City

Passaic

Year 2019-2020

Indicator 1: Graduation Rates - Performance Indicator

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 Collection NA – Indicates not a High School District | 77.7% | 81.5% | N |

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 children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards

| 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" si | ze of 20 for par | rticipation and | "n" size of 10 fo | or performance | at Grade level | |
| **No data repo | orted | | | | | | |
| ***No eligible | students | | | | | | |
| NA Not application | able as grades | are not offered | i | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 4A: | Suspension/E | xpulsion - Pe | rformance Inc | dicator example 1 | | | |
| Data Source: | Electronic Vic | olence and Va | ndalism Repo | orting System(| July 1, 2018 - | June 30, 2019) | |
| Was the distri | ct identified by | the State as ha | ving a significa | ant discrepancy | in the rates of | suspensions | N |
| and expulsion | s of children wi | th IEPs for gre | ater than 10 da | ays in a school | year? | | N |
| Indicator 4B: | Suspension/E | xpulsion - Co | mpliance Indi | <u>icator</u> | | | |
| Data Source: | Electronic Vic | olence and Va | ndalism Repo | orting System(| July 1, 2018 - | June 30, 2019) | |
| Does the distr | ict have: (a) a s | significant discr | epancy, by rac | ce or ethnicity, i | in the rate of su | spensions | N |
| and expulsion | s of greater tha | n 10 days in a | school year fo | r children with | IEPs ; and | | IN |
| (b) policies, pr | ocedures or pr | actices that co | ntribute to the | significant discr | repancy and do | not comply | |
| with requireme | ents relating to | the developme | ent and implem | entation of IEP | s, the use of po | ositive | N |
| behavioral inte | erventions and | supports, and _l | procedural safe | eguards. | | | |
| Indicator 5: S | chool Age LR | E - Performan | ce Indicator | | | | |
| Data Source: | NJSMART (Co | ollection Date | October 15, | <u>2019)</u> | | | |

**Indicates no reported data on October 15th collection

***Indicates no reported data on 6-21 age group

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. | 23.8% | 50.5% | N |
| B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. | 24.2% | 14.0% | N |
| C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. | 8.6% | 6.9% | N |

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, 2016 and do not include Non-Public School students.

| | 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) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100. | 32.2% | 34.0% | Y |
|--|-------|-------|---|
| 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. | 66.7% | 46.0% | Y |
| A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a | | | |

Indicator 7: Pre-School Outcomes - Performance Indicator

Data Source: Child Outcome Summary (COS)

Note: Due to the small sample size district-level data cannot be provided for this indicator.

| 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 |
|--|------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 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. | NA | NA | NA |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. | NA | NA | NA |
| Outcome B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge | Local Data | State Target | Met State Target |

| and skills (including early language/ communication and early | | | |
|---|------------|--------------|-----------|
| literacy). | | | |
| 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. | IVA | IVA | IVA |
| 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. | | | raiget |
| 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. | IVA | NA. | NA. |
| 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 |
| | 1410 | 00.070 | 1410 |
| NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort" | | | |

| *Indicates the number of survey responses were too low to yield meaningful interpretation of the data. | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| meaningful interpretation of the data. | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 9: <u>Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator</u> | | | | | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collections 2017, 2018, 2019) and Fall Surveys (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 in | dentification? | | IN | | | | |
| Indicator 10: Disproportionality - Compliance Indicator | | , | | | | | |
| Data Source: NJSMART (Collection Date: October 15, 2019) NJSMAI | RT (Collection | s 2017, 2018, 2 | 2019) and | | | | |
| Fall Surveys (October 2017, October 2018, October 2019) | | | | | | | |
| . a ca. voje (cotober 2011, cotober 2016, cotober 2016) | | | | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac | cial and ethnic (| groups in | . | | | | |
| | · | groups in | N | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac | · | groups in | N | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find | n? | | | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2020 for the period | n? d July 1, 2019 | | | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2020 for the period Percent of children who were evaluated within the State established time | n? d July 1, 2019 | | 020) | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2020 for the period Percent of children who were evaluated within the State established time line of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State | n? d July 1, 2019 | to June 30, 20 | 020) Met State | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2020 for the period 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, | n? d July 1, 2019 | to June 30, 20 | 020) Met State | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find Data Source: NJSMART (Collected on October 15, 2020 for the period 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, | n? d July 1, 2019 | to June 30, 20 | 020) Met State | | | | |
| Has the district been identified with disproportionate representation of rac specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification | n? d July 1, 2019 Local Data | to June 30, 20 State Target | 020) Met State Target | | | | |

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" ***0 students referred from Part C to part B ****No Eligible students | *** | 100.0% | *** |

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 | NIC | 100.0% | NIC |
| 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 | | | |

| 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" | | |
| NA: Not a High School | | |
| **No data | | |
| | I . | |

Indicator 14: Post-Secondary Transition Outcomes

Data Source: Post School Outcome Survey

NIC Indicates "Not in Cohort"

NA: Not a High School District

*Indicates the number of survey responses were too low to yield

| Survey Response Rate | NIC | | |
|--|------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | Local Data | State Target | Met 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) | NIC | 48.0 % | NIC |

| 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 | | 77.0% | |
| one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in | NIC | | |
| secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and | | | |
| were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one | | | NIC |
| 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 | NIC | 87.0% | |
| education or training program; or competitively employed or in some | | | NIC |
| 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 | | | NIC |
| 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. | | | |
| | | | |