

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2024**

New Jersey



PART B DUE February 2, 2026

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

In accordance with Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), New Jersey's SPP/APR includes the following information:

- Introduction;
- attached narratives for general supervision, technical assistance/professional development, and stakeholder engagement (part 2) with accompanying accessibility reports;
- baseline data for Indicators 1 through 18;
- targets for Indicators 1 through 16, and 18 for each year reflected in the SPP;
- data from FFY 2024;
- acknowledgement of previously approved methodology descriptions via three sampling plans (Indicator 7, 8 and 14)
- an explanation of slippage on indicators where New Jersey did not meet its FFY 2024 targets;
- specific content describing Phase III (plan) activities of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as required by Indicator 17, as well as any updates to remaining planned activities for Phase III and a projected plan to transition to Phase IV, and;
- information to address any actions required by OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Additional information can be found in the stakeholder section of the introduction narrative and the accompanying part 2 narrative.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

652

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

In accordance with OSEP QA 23-01, issued by the United States Department of Education in July 2023, the Office of Special Education (OSE) initiated a new cycle of special education program monitoring in which all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) across the State are monitored. This cycle is designed to ensure OSE meets its General Supervision responsibilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Under the six-year monitoring cycle, each LEA will participate in comprehensive monitoring once every six years, with approximately 125 LEAs engaged annually in Tier One Desk Monitoring and 15 LEAs participating in Tier Two Onsite Monitoring.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified noncompliance.

As part of Tier One Desk Monitoring, LEAs review a total of 31 student records. This includes 25 student records selected by the Office of Special Education (OSE) and 6 records chosen by the LEA. Forty-five student records are reviewed in LEAs selected for Tier Two Onsite Monitoring. OSE uses the statewide data system to select student records for monitoring activities. These records are chosen to ensure the review includes students from a variety of eligibility categories, ages, placements, and programs.

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

Data sources include the NJDOE's statewide student data system (NJ SMART), the Student Safety Data System (SSDS), and data collected during the monitoring process. For the purposes of the SPP/APR, the data is from the prior school year, unless the indicator uses lag data. The most recent IEP, assessments, and associated documents are reviewed as part of both Tier One Desk Monitoring and Tier Two Onsite Monitoring.

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

The state issues finding for both Individual instances of noncompliance as well as systemic instances of noncompliance.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

Not applicable.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

In the event the LEA is unable to effectively address noncompliance within a year from the date of the report, the OSE imposes sanctions on the LEA. These sanctions include:

- Impact on annual LEA determinations;
- Additional corrective action;
- Provision of targeted technical assistance;
- Withholding of IDEA funds, in whole or in part, until the noncompliance is corrected;

- Conditions placed on federal funds;
- Designating funds for specific activities;
- Referral to the New Jersey Attorney General's Office;
- Request of an audit of the LEA's financial records; and,
- Other sanctions, as appropriate.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

The OSE utilizes a matrix to make annual determinations. Determinations are awarded based on a predetermined set of nine factors, including the eight (8) required factors and an additional performance indicator (e.g., alternate assessment participation rate). The matrix includes a four-point scale, where districts are awarded points aligned with the results consistent with the FFY reporting year. LEA determinations are calculated based on the number of points earned divided by the number of points possible. LEAs are then ranked by their percentages, with the bottom 5th percentile of the state identified as "Needs Assistance" and LEAs that receive "Needs Assistance" for three or more consecutive years may receive "Needs Intervention" or "Needs Substantial Intervention". The determinations rubric, found on the website listed below, includes required information such as: (1) performance on compliance indicators; (2) valid, reliable and timely data; (3) correction of identified noncompliance; and, (4) other data available to ensure LEA's compliance with IDEA, including any relevant audit findings in its description of the criteria. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are notified of their determination results via memo and within their public determinations dashboard. Notification occurs within 120 days of the state SPP/APR submission, in alignment with the local special education data release schedule.

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

Monitoring, Accountability, and Quality Improvement URL: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/accountability/>

Determinations URL: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/accountability/determinations.shtml>

General Policy and Procedural URL: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/policy/index.shtml>

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance, and support to LEAs.

Please see the attached document for more information.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

Please see the attached document for more information.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

9

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Throughout the 2024-2025 council year, the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC) meetings included a stakeholder portion that focused on a group of SPP/APR indicators. Parent members were integral to reviewing this information, discussing alignment and implementation of NJDOE partnerships and projects, and providing input on the targets set within the SPP/APR. In alignment to the structure of the Local Education Agencies' public Special Education Profile, the council has focused on receiving data presentations and facilitating discussions around the following topic areas: (a) Achievement for Students with Disabilities (Indicators 3 and 7); (b) Least Restrictive Environment (Indicators 5 and 6); (c) Post-Secondary Success (Indicators 1, 2, and 14); (d) Parent Involvement (Indicator 8); (e) Equity (Indicators 4a, 4b, 9 and 10); and (d) Compliance (Indicators 11, 12, and 13); and, (f) State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP; Indicator 17).

The Office of Special Education's stakeholder engagement demonstrates equitable representation across a variety of demographic indicators. Nine out of the fifteen members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC) identify as parents of children with disabilities. The advisory panel consists of members who are representative of the State's population and who are involved in, or concerned with, the education of children with disabilities, including: (i) parents of children with disabilities; (ii) individuals with disabilities; (iii) teachers; (iv) representatives of institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel; (v) State and local education officials; (vi) administrators of programs for children with disabilities; (vii) representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; (viii) representatives of private schools and public charter schools; (ix) at least one representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; and (x) representatives from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, these members are representative across the three primary regions of New Jersey.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

In April 2024, the OSE conducted a survey of the active SSEAC members to update and ensure demographic representation across: regions of the state, roles within school districts, parent/family status, racial/ethnic groups, gender, LEA type, disability status, and advocacy group. This matrix informs future applications and appointments to the SSEAC. A similar survey was conducted in 2025 in order to update the information gathered regarding our SPP/APR stakeholder group. When gaps in representation are identified, the OSE intends to engage professional organizations and advocacy groups to increase awareness of opportunities for stakeholder participation and to encourage participation. The OSE's Federal Reporting and Stakeholder Engagement Specialist takes lead in organizing and enhancing SSEAC meetings and stakeholder activities.

At the conclusion of the council year, resources from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) and State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) in May of 2025 were used, to administer the Agency Capacity Assessment/State Capacity Assessment (ACA/SCA). This evidence-based tool was used to "assess the impact and presence of efforts to build strong foundations needed to adopt, sustain and scaled effective practices to which an agency invests in and aligns system components to support use of best practices, which includes support and development of implementation teams within and across all levels of the system." NJ-SSEAC members completed a survey designed to gather feedback on leadership, infrastructure, resources, communication, and engagement. The OSE compares the results from year to year, both qualitative and quantitative, to ensure that activities to support areas of continued strength and weakness are addressed prior to the council's 1st public meeting and through consultation with the executive committee of the council, one being a parent representative.

The OSE also partners with the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN) to provide support and training to LEA parent advisory groups across the state. Several training slots are allocated to engage with schools identified as "Targeted" or "Comprehensive" under the Every Student Succeeds Act due to special education concerns. These training sessions focus on increasing the number of underserved families provided with in-person support and building the knowledge and skills of families and youth to improve self-advocacy regarding inclusion and transition to adult life.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Throughout the 2024-2025 council year, the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC) meeting included a stakeholder portion that focused on a group of SPP/APR indicators. Parent members were an integral part of reviewing this information, discussing alignment and implementation of NJDOE partnerships and projects, and providing input toward the targets set within the SPP/APR. In alignment with the structure of the Local Education Agencies' public Special Education Profile, the council has focused on receiving data presentations and facilitating discussions around the following topic areas: (a) Achievement for Students with Disabilities (Indicators 3 and 7); (b) Least Restrictive Environment (Indicators 5 and 6); (c) Post-Secondary Success (Indicators 1, 2, and 14); (d) Parent Involvement (Indicator 8); (e) Equity (Indicators 4a, 4b, 9 and 10); (d) Compliance (Indicators 11, 12, and 13); and, (e) State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP; Indicator 17). For a formal review of presentations, topics discussed, and a summary of input provided, please review the 2024-2025 State Special Education Advisory Council Annual Report.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

A portion of each meeting is dedicated to addressing questions and concerns from the previous meeting, including the provision of requests for additional data or data analyses.

Additional technical tools for distance engagement, such as Mentimeter and JamBoard, were used to encourage participants to continue to provide feedback or suggestions after meetings had concluded. Any email received by the SSEAC prior to or during a monthly meeting was read to the group during the public portion of the meeting, and an appropriate response was provided following the meeting. Additionally, the minutes to all SSEAC and Stakeholder meetings are posted on the NJDOE website.

<https://www.nj.gov/education/sseac/agenda/>

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2023 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2023 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2023 APR in 2025, is available.

NJDOE posted the 2023-2024 local district profiles by June 1, 2025. (see <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources/index.shtml>)

Consistent with the requirements established in the IDEA, NJDOE made New Jersey's FFY 2023 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report available to the public as indicated below. The NJDOE will use the same mechanisms to report annually to the public on the FFY 2024 SPP/APR regarding the State's progress in meeting the measurable and rigorous SPP targets.

Public Means, Including Posting on the Website of the State Education Agency (SEA):

The FFY 2023 SPP/APR was posted on the New Jersey Department of Education's website following the submission to USDE with the requested clarifications. The SPP/APR was posted at: <http://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources.shtml>. The FFY 2024 SPP/APR will be posted at the same website after the submission to USDE with any requested clarifications.

NJDOE also posted the USDE response to the SPP/APR FFY 2023 submission that included USOSEP's determination regarding the State's compliance with the requirements of Part B of the IDEA at <http://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources.shtml>. The USOSEP's response to the NJDOE's SPP/APR FFY 2023 submission will again be posted at: <http://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources.shtml>.

Distribution to the Media:

Annually, upon submission to USOSEP, the NJDOE makes the SPP/APR available to the media through the NJDOE website and refers the press to the SPP/APR website when press inquiries are relevant to the SPP indicators. They also leverage the use of social media to report the findings to the public through various platforms such as X, Facebook, Instagram, and Threads. Additionally, the OSE is actively curating landing pages, specific to each of the indicators. In 2024, the OSE released and maintained the following indicator landing pages:

- Indicators 11, 12, 13 (Compliance)- URL: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/accountability/>
- Indicator 7 - URL: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/preschooloutcomes.shtml>
- Indicator 8 - URL: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/parentsurvey.shtml>
- Indicator 14 - URL: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/postschooloutcomes.shtml>
- Transition Toolkit to Address Successful Post-School Outcomes: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/programs/njtransition/>
- Indicator 4, 9 and 10 - URL: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/policy/dispro/>
- About LEA Determinations - URL: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/accountability/determinations.shtml>
- Individual Indicator One-Pagers - URL: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources/>

Distribution to Public Agencies:

Members of the NJ-SSEAC as well as SPP/APR stakeholders participated in a meeting in September 2025 (conducted via web conference). The participants were informed of the posting of the SPP/APR on the NJDOE website. The stakeholders were informed of the USOSEP determination regarding the FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission and the posting of the determination letter from the USOSEP as well. The USOSEP Response table was discussed in detail with the stakeholders. Information regarding the submission of the SPP/APR and the state's determination is also annually discussed with county special education specialists who communicate the information to local special education directors at their monthly meetings.

Additionally, the Director of the OSE presented at events across the state to communicate the results of the public reports. In addition to an internal agency presentation with other divisions and offices, the OSE presented publicly to county specialists who govern over 660 local education agencies at the New Jersey Principal and Supervisors Association (NJPSA), and at the NJ-SSEAC meeting. The OSE's federal reporting and engagement specialist supplemented the presentation by conducting five statewide, virtual professional development sessions as well as a data action learning group. The series was referred to as the "Special Education Data 360 Series: Actionable Insights". (For more information visit the URL: <https://www.nj.gov/education/broadcasts/2024/sept/11/2024SpecialEducationData360SeriesActionableInsights.pdf>). An additional presentation was provided to the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network, New Jersey's parent training information center, during a roundtable event in June of 2025.

Regarding the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, NJDOE will distribute a memo to school districts, agencies, organizations, and individuals concerned with special education, in accordance with the NJDOE's broadcast procedures. The memorandum will provide information regarding the posting of the SPP/APR, the federal determination regarding the State's implementation of the IDEA, the requirements for State determinations of local districts, and the requirements for annual public reporting of local districts' performance and the posting of local district profiles.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachments complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Professional Development System attachments included in the State's FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachments available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

The PDF of the FY23 SPP/APR has been posted to the website with all required attachments. It can be found here:
<https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/spp/index.shtml>

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED^{Facts} file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	91.42%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	81.50%	91.50%	91.50%	91.75%	91.75%
Data	83.83%	91.42%	75.93%	47.15%	92.20%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	92.00%	92.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State’s SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State’s SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE’s consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	15,214
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	257
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	31
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	897

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
15,214	16,399	92.20%	92.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

New Jersey issues one high school diploma for all students, including students with disabilities. In order to graduate with a regular diploma in New Jersey, students must satisfy several requirements. Students must participate in a course of study consisting of a specified number of credits in courses designed to meet all of the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. State regulations at N.J.A.C. 6A:8-5.1(a)1 delineate minimum required credit totals for language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, health and physical education, visual or performing arts, world languages, technological literacy, and career education. Methods for meeting the minimum credit requirements are also set forth in Title 6A, Chapter 8 of the New Jersey Administrative Code, which concerns standards and assessments. Local attendance and other locally-established requirements must also be met in order to receive a State-endorsed diploma, as well as all statutorily-mandated requirements. In accordance with State law, students with disabilities may have graduation requirements waived or modified through the Individualized Education Program (IEP) and receive a state-endorsed diploma. As the result of a 2019 Performance Review conducted by the United States Department of Education, New Jersey has revised the methodology it is using to calculate the ACGR. Students with disabilities who have had graduation requirements waived per their IEPs will no longer be included in the numerator for the ACGR.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2024 graduation rate data (SY 2023–24) contain a methodological error that overstated the reported rate. Following the reinstatement of graduation assessment requirements after the FFY 2023 (SY 2022-2023) waiver, the state did not update its EdFacts reporting methodology to incorporate the ELA and Math Graduation Pathway fields in NJ SMART. As a result, students with disabilities whose IEPs specified alternate graduation assessment requirements were not correctly identified.

Approximately 5,243 students with IEPs who met alternate assessment requirements were incorrectly reported as earning a regular high school diploma rather than receiving a certificate for federal reporting purposes. This error inflated the reported Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate from the accurate rate of 60.8% to an incorrect rate of 92.8%.

Corrected Counts (FFY 2024)

Regular high school diploma: corrected from 15,214 to 9,971

Received a certificate: corrected from 257 to 5,500

Other exit categories were unaffected

Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate: corrected from 92.8% to 60.8%

The error was identified during preparation of the SY 2024–25 EdFacts FS009 submission. The state has corrected the reporting methodology for all future submissions and included a data note in the SY 2024–25 FS009 file documenting the issue and its impact on year-to-year comparability. Although the previously submitted SY 2023–24 EdFacts file cannot be revised, the state updated publicly posted data and recalculated FFY 2024 Indicator 1 results for local districts using the corrected data.

The corrected graduation rate of 60.8% represents the accurate FFY 2024 baseline and should be used for all future trend analyses.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable because the State reported alternate data for this indicator. The State reported, "The FFY 2024 graduation rate data (SY 2023–24) contain a methodological error that overstated the reported rate." Additionally, the State reported, "This error inflated the reported Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate from the accurate rate of 60.8% to an incorrect rate of 92.8%." However, OSEP cannot accept the State's alternate data because, as noted in the Measurement Table, the data source for this indicator is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009. As noted in the 2025 IDEA Part B Determinations letter, the 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data, including Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009), submitted as of the due date is being used for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR and the 2026 IDEA Part B Results Matrix. Indicators 1 and 2 are prefilled using the State-level exiting special education data submitted as of the due date for EDFacts exiting files. For the school year (SY) 2023-24 exiting data, the due date for these files was March 5, 2025. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	8.38%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	6.00%	8.30%	8.25%	8.25%	8.00%
Data	10.28%	8.38%	5.38%	7.43%	6.35%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	8.00%	7.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	15,214
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	257
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	31
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	897

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
897	16,399	6.35%	8.00%	5.47%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

In New Jersey, "drop outs" are defined as students who were enrolled at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period and did not exit special education through any other means. This includes dropouts, runaways, status unknown, students who moved but are not known to be continuing in another educational program.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDEFACTS file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 C.F.R. §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	96.21%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	94.89%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	95.05%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	96.29%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	95.19%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	94.98%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 882, 883)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	19,407	17,694	17,500
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,817	1,868	2,421
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	13,259	13,711	12,677
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,832	1,487	1,540

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 880, 881)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	19,421	17,698	17,429
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,487	1,359	1,600
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	13,604	14,183	13,319
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,828	1,492	1,527

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row A for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,908	19,407	97.32%	95.00%	97.43%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17,066	17,694	96.21%	95.00%	96.45%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	16,638	17,500	94.82%	95.00%	95.07%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,919	19,421	97.27%	95.00%	97.42%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17,034	17,698	96.00%	95.00%	96.25%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	16,446	17,429	94.07%	95.00%	94.36%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

NJ Department of Education - Special Education Assessment Data Reports: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/ideapublicdata/index.shtml> and <https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/index.shtml>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	23.16%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	20.39%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	17.30%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	24.77%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	13.21%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	9.20%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	24.50%	24.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	21.50%	21.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	18.50%	18.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	26.00%	26.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	14.50%	14.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	10.50%	10.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	17,076	15,579	15,098
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,935	638	420
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,955	2,297	1,571

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	17,091	15,542	14,919
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,822	415	235
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,842	1,231	1,003

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Gr ou p	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,890	17,076	21.38%	24.50%	22.78%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,935	15,579	15.68%	21.50%	18.84%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,991	15,098	19.20%	18.50%	13.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage in high school reading and mathematics proficiency for students with IEPs reflects persistent challenges in accessing consistent, evidence-based instruction aligned to grade-level standards, along with variability in the effective use of accommodations. These outcomes may be influenced by the cumulative impact of prior instructional disruptions (i.e., COVID-19), which disproportionately affect secondary students who require sustained, intensive supports. In response, New Jersey is strengthening targeted professional development and technical assistance focused on inclusive, standards-aligned instruction through its tiered system of supports, professional learning communities, and statewide initiatives. This includes the launch of the New Jersey Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Innovation Network, which will support districts in improving instructional design and implementation to increase access to grade-level content and improve high school outcomes for students with disabilities.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Gr ou p	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,664	17,091	20.79%	26.00%	21.44%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,646	15,542	9.87%	14.50%	10.59%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,238	14,919	8.79%	10.50%	8.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Slippage in high school reading and mathematics proficiency for students with IEPs reflects persistent challenges in accessing consistent, evidence-based instruction aligned to grade-level standards, along with variability in the effective use of accommodations. These outcomes may be influenced by the cumulative impact of prior instructional disruptions (i.e., COVID-19), which disproportionately affect secondary students who require sustained, intensive supports. In response, New Jersey is strengthening targeted professional development and technical assistance focused on inclusive, standards-aligned instruction through its tiered system of supports, professional learning communities, and statewide initiatives. This includes the launch of the New Jersey Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Innovation Network, which will support districts in improving instructional design and implementation to increase access to grade-level content and improve high school outcomes for students with disabilities.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

NJ Department of Education - Special Education Assessment Data Reports: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/ideapublicdata/index.shtml> and <https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/index.shtml>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	30.12%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	37.44%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	30.55%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	36.05%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	17.16%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	9.94%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	31.25%	31.25%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	38.50%	38.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	31.75%	31.75%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	37.25%	37.25%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	18.25%	18.25%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	11.00%	11.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings

also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,832	1,487	1,540
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	296	475	518

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,828	1,492	1,527
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	680	197	507

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	296	1,832	21.50%	31.25%	16.16%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	475	1,487	28.50%	38.50%	31.94%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	518	1,540	35.89%	31.75%	33.64%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Performance trends for students participating in the DLM reflect ongoing variability in instructional quality and alignment to alternate academic achievement standards across specialized and inclusive settings. While many districts continue to expand inclusive opportunities, data indicate a need to strengthen the effectiveness and intentionality of instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities, particularly through consistent use of evidence-based practices and meaningful access to grade-aligned content. In response, the NJDOE has prioritized targeted technical assistance and professional development focused on quality program indicators, Universal Design for Learning, and high-leverage instructional practices to improve instructional coherence and outcomes for this population. These efforts align with the State Systemic Improvement Plan's focus on early literacy and are designed to build district capacity to ensure that inclusion is paired with high-quality, individualized instruction that meaningfully engages students with significant cognitive disabilities across content areas.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	680	1,828	38.96%	37.25%	37.20%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	197	1,492	15.09%	18.25%	13.20%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	507	1,527	35.94%	11.00%	33.20%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Performance trends for students participating in the DLM reflect ongoing variability in instructional quality and alignment to alternate academic achievement standards across specialized and inclusive settings. While many districts continue to expand inclusive opportunities, data indicate a need to strengthen the effectiveness and intentionality of instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities, particularly through consistent use of evidence-based practices and meaningful access to grade-aligned content. In response, the NJDOE has prioritized targeted technical assistance and professional development focused on quality program indicators, Universal Design for Learning, and high-leverage instructional practices to improve instructional coherence and outcomes for this population. These efforts align with the State Systemic Improvement Plan's focus on early literacy and are designed to build district capacity to ensure that inclusion is paired with high-quality, individualized instruction that meaningfully engages students with significant cognitive disabilities across content areas.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Performance trends for students participating in the DLM reflect ongoing variability in instructional quality and alignment to alternate academic achievement standards across specialized and inclusive settings. While many districts continue to expand inclusive opportunities, data indicate a need to strengthen the effectiveness and intentionality of instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities, particularly through consistent use of evidence-based practices and meaningful access to grade-aligned content. In response, the NJDOE has prioritized targeted technical assistance and professional development focused on quality program indicators, Universal Design for Learning, and high-leverage instructional practices to improve instructional coherence and outcomes for this population. These efforts align with the State Systemic Improvement Plan's focus on early literacy and are designed to build district capacity to ensure that inclusion is paired with high-quality, individualized instruction that meaningfully engages students with significant cognitive disabilities across content areas.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with

disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

NJ Department of Education - Special Education Assessment Data Reports: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/ideapublicdata/index.shtml>
and <https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/index.shtml>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates For Children with IEPs and All Students Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDEfacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	31.03
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	38.92
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	38.14
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	25.00
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	32.81
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	24.83

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	30.50	30.50
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	38.25	38.25
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	37.50	37.50
Math	A <=	Grade 4	24.25	24.25
Math	B <=	Grade 8	32.25	32.25
Math	C <=	Grade HS	24.25	24.25

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	93,574	98,335	98,821
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	17,076	15,579	15,098
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	46,665	51,793	46,023
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,437	4,358	3,354
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,935	638	420
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,955	2,297	1,571

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	94,866	99,411	99,561

b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	17,091	15,542	14,919
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	41,140	36,040	29,568
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,183	2,573	2,155
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,822	415	235
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,842	1,231	1,003

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	22.78%	53.54%	29.39	30.50	30.76	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	18.84%	57.10%	37.22	38.25	38.26	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	13.19%	49.97%	38.39	37.50	36.78	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Persistent proficiency gaps between students with IEPs and their nondisabled peers reflect longstanding inequities in access to high-quality, grade-level instruction and consistent implementation of inclusive instructional practices. Trend data indicate that, while overall student performance has stabilized or improved, gains for students with IEPs have not occurred at the same rate, particularly in general education settings where instructional capacity to support diverse learners varies. These gaps are driven in part by inconsistent use of Universal Design for Learning, High-Leverage Practices, and tiered interventions by general education educators, limiting opportunities for students with IEPs to fully access and engage with core instruction. In response, the NJDOE is strengthening statewide professional development and targeted technical assistance to build general education teacher capacity in inclusive, evidence-based instructional practices through structured UDL initiatives, communities of practice, and alignment with the State Systemic Improvement Plan, with a focus on improving instructional equity and accelerating outcomes for students with disabilities.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Persistent proficiency gaps between students with IEPs and their nondisabled peers reflect longstanding inequities in access to high-quality, grade-level instruction and consistent implementation of inclusive instructional practices. Trend data indicate that, while overall student performance has stabilized or improved, gains for students with IEPs have not occurred at the same rate, particularly in general education settings where instructional capacity to support diverse learners varies. These gaps are driven in part by inconsistent use of Universal Design for Learning, High-Leverage Practices, and tiered interventions by general education educators, limiting opportunities for students with IEPs to fully access and engage with core instruction. In response, the NJDOE is strengthening statewide professional development and targeted technical assistance to build general education teacher capacity in inclusive, evidence-based instructional practices through structured UDL initiatives, communities of practice, and alignment with the State Systemic Improvement Plan, with a focus on improving instructional equity and accelerating outcomes for students with disabilities.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.44%	46.72%	24.15	24.25	25.28	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	10.59%	38.84%	28.31	32.25	28.25	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.30%	31.86%	22.80	24.25	23.56	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Persistent proficiency gaps between students with IEPs and their nondisabled peers reflect longstanding inequities in access to high-quality, grade-level instruction and consistent implementation of inclusive instructional practices. Trend data indicate that, while overall student performance has stabilized or improved, gains for students with IEPs have not occurred at the same rate, particularly in general education settings where instructional capacity to support diverse learners varies. These gaps are driven in part by inconsistent use of Universal Design for Learning, High-Leverage Practices, and tiered interventions by general education educators, limiting opportunities for students with IEPs to fully access and engage with core instruction. In response, the NJDOE is strengthening statewide professional development and targeted technical assistance to build general education teacher capacity in inclusive, evidence-based instructional practices through structured UDL initiatives, communities of practice, and alignment with the State Systemic Improvement Plan, with a focus on improving instructional equity and accelerating outcomes for students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NJ Department of Education - Special Education Assessment Data Reports: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/ideapublicdata/index.shtml> and <https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/index.shtml>

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	5.88%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	0.90%	0.80%	0.80%	5.90%	5.80%
Data	0.76%	0.30%	Not Valid and Reliable	5.88%	33.59%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	5.80%	5.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

New Jersey's n size of 20 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 3 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA. The threshold is 2.5x the state rate.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The n and cell size were determined to be reasonable after reflecting on the scenarios and implications of the changes, including the percentage of LEAs that would be included in the calculation, the number of LEAs that would be identified based-on the proposed calculations, feedback from stakeholders, and the state agency's capacity to provide meaningful support to the identified LEAs. These options were presented to the state special education advisory council (NJ-SSEAC) and approved via a formalized voting process as reflected in the NJ-SSEAC minutes from November 2024, available at the following website: <https://www.nj.gov/education/sseac/minutes/>.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

The n and cell size were not changed since the last reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

N/A

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n/cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

532

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
49	126	33.59%	5.80%	38.89%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

New Jersey experienced slippage with Indicator 4A in the SPP/APR due to changes in the minimum n-size and cell size criteria made in FY23, submitted February 1, 2025. These adjustments resulted in more districts being included in the analysis, increasing the likelihood of identifying districts with discrepancies in their suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities. This outcome, while contributing to a broader and more inclusive evaluation process, was not unexpected.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

New Jersey has established a minimum "n" size of 20. For indicator 4A, "n" size refers to the total enrollment of students with disabilities in the LEA.

New Jersey has established a minimum cell size of 3. For indicator 4A, cell size refers to the number of students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA who were removed from school for more than 10 days.

In sum, an LEA must serve at least 20 children with disabilities and must remove at least 3 children with disabilities from school via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in a school year to be included in calculations of significant discrepancy.

"Significant Discrepancy" is defined as a suspension rate of children with disabilities that is greater than two-point five (2.5) times the statewide average. In FFY22, the NJDOE determined the statewide rate of out-of-school suspensions of greater than 10 days for children with disabilities to be 0.02%. The NJDOE multiplied that outcome, 0.57%, by two-point five (2.5) to determine the cutoff for an LEA to be identified for significant discrepancy as 1.425%.

Methodology: The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) determines whether significant discrepancies occurred in each LEA by comparing the proportion of children with disabilities who were removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in an LEA to 2.5 times the statewide rate at which children with disabilities were removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in that school year.

When the LEA's rate exceeds 2.5 times the statewide rate, the LEA is identified as significantly discrepant. The NJDOE relies on 618 data reported via EdFacts file FS006, Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions, for these calculations. Data from the Report of Children with Disabilities

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023-2024 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year participate in a targeted review process. The process includes a self-assessment, which is verified by OSE monitors, and/or desk audit and/or an onsite review of discipline requirements, including policies, procedures and practices regarding development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards. The targeted review may include: (a) record reviews; (b) interviews with general and special education staff members; (c) review of written policies, procedures and practices; and (d) review of LEA discipline and suspension data. LEA data, reported through the Student Safety Data System (SSDS), are reviewed and analyzed to identify the specific schools within the identified LEAs where most suspensions over 10 days occurred. School-based discipline practices and tracking data are analyzed to identify noncompliance and

patterns of suspension. LEAs, where data, interviews and record review indicated that policies, procedures and practices were not consistent with IDEA and N.J.A.C. requirements related to suspension and expulsion are identified as noncompliant, findings are issued, and corrective action is required.

Technical assistance is provided, as needed, with regard to policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. LEAs are provided with resources, as needed, for additional information on compliant policies, procedures and practices related to positive behavioral interventions and supports, school-wide behavioral systems and federal and state regulations. A brochure outlining the IDEA and N.J.A.C. requirements related to suspension/expulsion, developed by the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), is also disseminated to LEA staff.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2023 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.91%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State’s n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State’s cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

New Jersey’s n size of 20 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State’s cell size of 3 represents the number of children with disabilities in specific racial/ethnic groups who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA. The threshold is 2.5x the state rate.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The n and cell size were determined to be reasonable after reflecting on the scenarios and implications of the changes, including the percentage of LEAs that would be included in the calculation, the number of LEAs that would be identified based-on the proposed calculations, feedback from stakeholders, and the state agency’s capacity to provide meaningful support to the identified LEAs. These options were presented to the state special education advisory council (NJ-SSEAC) and approved via a formalized voting process as reflected in the NJ-SSEAC minutes from November 2024, available at the following website: <https://www.nj.gov/education/sseac/minutes/>.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

The minimum n and cell size do not represent a change from the last reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
61	0	89	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

New Jersey has established a minimum "n" size of 20. For indicator 4B, "n" size refers to the total enrollment of students with disabilities in the LEA.

New Jersey has established a minimum cell size of 3. For indicator 4B, cell size refers to the number of students with disabilities in each racial/ethnic group who were enrolled in the LEA and removed from school for more than 10 days.

In sum, an LEA must serve at least 20 children with disabilities and, for each racial/ethnic group, must remove at least 3 children with disabilities from school via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in a school year to be included in calculations of significant discrepancy for that racial/ethnic group.

"Significant Discrepancy" is defined as a suspension rate of of children with disabilities in a specific racial/ethnic group that is 2.5 times the statewide average for all students with disabilities.

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) determines whether there was a significant discrepancy in the suspension rate of children with disabilities for each racial/ethnic group in each LEA by comparing the rate at which children with disabilities from that racial/ethnic group were removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days to 2.5 times the statewide rate at which all children with disabilities were removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in that school year. When the LEA's rate for a racial/ethnic group exceeds 2.5 times the statewide rate for all children with disabilities, the LEA is identified as significantly discrepant for that racial/ethnic group.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023-2024 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year participate in a targeted review process. The process includes a self-assessment, which is verified by OSE monitors, and/or desk audit and/or an onsite review of discipline requirements, including policies, procedures and practices regarding development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards. The targeted review may include: (a) record reviews; (b) interviews with general and special education staff members; (c) review of written policies, procedures and practices; and (d) review of LEA discipline and suspension data. LEA data, reported through the Student Safety Data System (SSDS), are reviewed and analyzed to identify the specific schools within the identified LEAs where most suspensions over 10 days occurred. School-based discipline practices and tracking data are analyzed to identify noncompliance and patterns of suspension. LEAs, where data, interviews and record review indicated that policies, procedures and practices were not consistent with IDEA and N.J.A.C. requirements related to suspension and expulsion are identified as noncompliant, findings are issued, and corrective action is required.

Technical assistance is provided, as needed, with regard to policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. LEAs are provided with resources, as needed, for additional information on compliant policies, procedures and practices related to positive behavioral interventions and supports, school-wide behavioral systems and federal and state regulations. A brochure outlining the IDEA and N.J.A.C. requirements related to suspension/expulsion, developed by the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), is also disseminated to LEA staff.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2019	Target >=	50.50%	45.00%	45.00%	45.50%	45.50%
A	44.64%	Data	44.64%	45.23%	44.20%	44.32%	44.78%
B	2019	Target <=	14.00%	14.75%	14.75%	14.50%	14.50%
B	14.98%	Data	14.98%	15.60%	15.48%	15.06%	14.98%
C	2019	Target <=	6.90%	6.75%	6.75%	6.50%	6.50%
C	6.78%	Data	6.78%	6.62%	6.11%	6.19%	6.32%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	46.00%	46.00%
Target B <=	14.25%	14.25%
Target C <=	6.25%	6.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed

the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	242,134
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	109,309
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	36,529
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	14,247
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	294
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	797

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	109,309	242,134	44.78%	46.00%	45.14%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the	36,529	242,134	14.98%	14.25%	15.09%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
regular class less than 40% of the day							
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	15,338	242,134	6.32%	6.25%	6.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	Target >=	46.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.50%	47.50%
A	Data	44.82%	45.14%	45.10%	45.49%	47.50%
B	Target <=	34.00%	38.75%	38.75%	38.25%	38.25%
B	Data	41.14%	40.91%	42.17%	41.03%	40.11%
C	Target <=		0.19%	0.19%	0.18%	0.18%
C	Data		0.19%	0.25%	0.12%	0.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings

also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baselines and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e., separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	44.82%
B	2019	41.14%
C	2020	0.19%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	48.00%	48.00%
Target B <=	37.75%	37.75%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.17%	0.17%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/30/2025

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	6,650	9,490	596	16,736

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,028	5,019	316	8,363
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,506	3,004	172	5,682
b2. Number of children attending separate school	209	290	45	544
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	0	0	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	14	10	1	25

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	8,363	16,736	47.50%	48.00%	49.97%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	6,228	16,736	40.11%	37.75%	37.21%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	25	16,736	0.15%	0.17%	0.15%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A1	2013	Target >=	73.00%	72.75%	72.75%	73.00%	73.00%
A1	72.60%	Data	25.00%	88.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	89.48%	87.01%

A2	2013	Target >=	78.50%	76.50%	76.50%	76.75%	76.75%
A2	76.25%	Data	40.00%	42.31%	Not Valid and Reliable	40.07%	37.20%
B1	2013	Target >=	70.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.50%	67.50%
B1	66.67%	Data	50.00%	73.91%	Not Valid and Reliable	88.12%	86.86%
B2	2013	Target >=	54.00%	48.50%	48.50%	48.75%	48.75%
B2	48.25%	Data	20.00%	34.62%	Not Valid and Reliable	38.97%	39.75%
C1	2013	Target >=	71.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.50%	55.50%
C1	70.29%	Data	50.00%	79.17%	Not Valid and Reliable	90.31%	86.61%
C2	2013	Target >=	61.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.50%	56.50%
C2	56.00%	Data	40.00%	46.15%	Not Valid and Reliable	49.63%	44.01%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	73.25%	73.25%
Target A2 >=	77.00%	77.00%
Target B1 >=	68.00%	68.00%
Target B2 >=	49.00%	49.00%
Target C1 >=	56.00%	56.00%
Target C2 >=	57.00%	57.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,477

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	71	2.04%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	387	11.13%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,924	55.34%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	968	27.84%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	127	3.65%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,892	3,350	87.01%	73.25%	86.33%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,095	3,477	37.20%	77.00%	31.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	65	1.87%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	332	9.55%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,923	55.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,030	29.62%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	127	3.65%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. 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 turned 6 years of	2,953	3,350	86.86%	68.00%	88.15%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,157	3,477	39.75%	49.00%	33.28%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	64	1.84%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	361	10.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,658	47.68%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,214	34.92%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	180	5.18%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,872	3,297	86.61%	56.00%	87.11%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,394	3,477	44.01%	57.00%	40.09%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	The percentage of preschool children meeting age expectations in positive social-emotional skills decreased from 37.20% to 31.49%. This decrease is primarily attributed to the 309.6% expansion in the reporting population and participating LEAs, increased variability associated with statewide implementation of the Child Outcome Summary (COS) process, and differences in local rating practices affecting entry and exit scores. Results also reflect the inclusion of children with more significant or progressive disabilities, variability in service duration and timing of ratings, and workforce shortages.
B2	The percentage of preschool children functioning within age expectations in social-emotional skills declined from 39.75% to 33.28%. This decrease is primarily attributed to the 309.6% expansion in the reporting population and participating LEAs, increased variability associated with statewide implementation of the Child Outcome Summary (COS) process, and differences in local rating practices affecting entry and exit scores. Results also reflect the inclusion of children with more significant or progressive disabilities, variability in service duration and timing of ratings, and workforce shortages.
C2	The percentage of preschool children functioning within age expectations in appropriate behaviors to meet their needs declined from 44.01% to 40.01%. This decrease is primarily attributed to the 309.6% expansion in the reporting population and participating LEAs, increased variability associated with statewide implementation of the Child Outcome Summary (COS) process, and differences in local rating practices affecting entry and exit scores. Results also reflect the inclusion of children with more significant or progressive disabilities, variability in service duration and timing of ratings, and workforce shortages.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

To meet the requirements of Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes, New Jersey implemented a multi-year plan to utilize the Child Outcome Summary (COS) Process, a team-based method for synthesizing and summarizing information about a child's functioning across multiple sources. This strategic approach aligns with local, state, and national goals for improving student outcomes.

The process involves selecting a sample from the broader preschool population, which allows the state to make valid conclusions about the entire population without needing to study everyone. The Special Education Extracts from 2022, 2023, and 2024 are used to identify students aged 3-5 (or those entering kindergarten in Fall 2025) who will have received at least 6 months of special education by the end of FY 2024, using parental consent to implement IEPs as the start date. The Special Education Submission serves as the official data source for special education, and therefore, students should not be included in the indicator 7 data collection unless they are also included in the Special Education Submission.

The chosen sample reflects the population by gender, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, ensuring that the group represents the same proportion as the preschool population in New Jersey.

1) Identify eligible students: Use Special Education data from 2022, 2023, and 2024 to find students in pre-K (2023 or 2024) or Kindergarten (2025) who will have received at least 6 months of special education by the end of 2025. The start date for this is the parental consent date for the IEP.

2) Match with demographic data:

-Cross-check the students from Step 1 with NJSMART Fall 2025 data to gather demographic details.

-Include only students who are in Kindergarten in Fall 2025 but exclude those who were already in kindergarten at the end of 2023-2024.

-Include students in grade 1 in Fall 2025 if they were in pre-K at the end of 2024-2025.

3) Match with Indicator 7 data: Link the selected students to their Indicator 7 records using their SID (Student Identification Number).

4) Determine usable records: Review the Indicator 7 records to identify which ones are valid and usable for the sample.

In FFY 2022 the number of preschool children aged 3-5 years old with IEPs assessed was 544. In FFY 2023, the number of preschool children assessed was 2,113. This is an increase of 288.7%. In FFY 2024, the number of preschool children assessed was 3,470. This is an increase of 309%. By implementing a systematic sampling plan, NJDOE was able to address the potential problems related to our sampling. We increased the response rates and decreased prior missing data by avoiding any potential selection bias by enhancing the representativeness of our sample.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The indicator 7 process involves the Child Outcome Summary (COS) ratings, where teachers, service providers, and parents collaborate to assess each child's growth in these areas. The assessments are typically conducted at the child's entry into preschool and again at the exit to measure progress.

Indicator 7, Preschool Outcomes instruments included: (1) Child Outcome Summary (COS) forms: A tool used to assess and summarize the child's functioning across multiple developmental areas. (2) Data Collection Forms/Spreadsheets: Used by educators or evaluators to input data based on observations or assessments. (3) Special Education Extracts: Data extractions from NJ DOE Homeroom and NJ SMART databases that identify students eligible for the indicator, based on criteria like age, special education status, and time in service.

Indicator 7, Preschool Outcomes procedures included: (1) Parent Consent Procedures: Steps taken to obtain consent from parents to gather and report data about their child, consent for the implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) to length in preschool until exit to kindergarten. (2) IEP Implementation Tracking: A process for recording when a student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP) was implemented and how long they received services to ensure the student was in the program at a minimum of 6 months. (3) Data Entry Procedures: The method by which data is entered into the LEA spreadsheet system then submitted into NJ DOE Homeroom, reviewed for accuracy, and submitted for reporting.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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 # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and

contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	80.60%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	86.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.30%	85.30%
Data	84.92%	84.16%	83.33%	84.20%	82.98%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	85.60%	85.60%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
8,548	10,069	82.98%	85.60%	84.89%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The preschool data was collected using the same methodology that was used to collect the school age data; therefore, it is equally valid and reliable to the school age data. The methodology is described below.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

43,257

Percentage of respondent parents

23.28%

Response Rate

FFY	2023	2024
Response Rate	23.56%	23.28%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric to determine representativeness was +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to both the target group as well as the state special education population.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

When compared to other cohorts in the survey's 18-year history, Cohort 19 representativeness for many categories decreased from previous years and were overall less representative than in Cohort 18. Gender is the only main demographic area within the threshold (+/- 3.0%) for representativeness.

The detailed primary disability numbers for emotional disturbance (ED) and intellectual disability (ID) differ by absolute values between 0.06% and 0.09% in Cohort 19. Using +/- 3.0% as a guideline. Therefore, these two disability types meet the threshold for representativeness in the sample. The remaining disability groups do not meet the threshold for representativeness.

In Cohort 19, the representativeness for gender was about average for the history of the cohorts – under-representing females by 2.54%. This number is within the +/- 3.0% threshold for representativeness. In other years, female representation differed by absolute values ranging from 0.04% to 4.42%.

Until Cohort 15, minorities had always been under-represented by a percentage outside of the designated +/- 3.0% threshold for representativeness. Cohort 16 was just the second time that the proportion was within that representativeness threshold, only being under-represented by 2.15%. Beginning with Cohort 17, race/ethnicity was separated into 4 different categories – White, Black, Hispanic, and other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) – instead of just White and minority. For Cohorts 17 & 18, using these new categories, the group for Black respondents has been the only category outside of the +/-3 threshold, for both Cohort and state comparisons. Cohort 19 did not reach the threshold for representativeness for the Black and Hispanic groups, but the race/ethnicity group for Other was within the threshold, being overrepresented by 2.29%. White respondents are overrepresented in Cohort 19 when compared with the Cohort target but are within the +/-3 range when compared with the state target, which is the goal.

To compare Cohort 19 with cohorts before this change in race/ethnicity categorization, the historical “minority” group was still evaluated, and showed that minorities were under-represented by 8.40%. The minority under-representation has ranged from 0.16% to 10.71% in other years.

There are 6 lists below. The first 3 show how the Cohort 19 respondents compare to the Cohort 19 target population, and the next 3 how the Cohort 19 respondents compare to the special education population of the state. The goal of the sampling process is that each Cohort is representative of the demographic distribution of the special education population of the state. So, while we will compare the representativeness of the respondents against the Cohort they came from, ultimately, the goal is that the respondents be representative of the full special education population of the state.

The first three lists show how the Cohort 19 respondents compare to the Cohort 19 target population.

Cohort 19 (2024-25)

Target Population Respondent Representation
Cohort 19 Respondents Versus Cohort 19 Target

Target Demographic Representation

LD 32.09%
ED 3.16%
ID 2.77%
AO 61.98%
Male 64.82%
Female 35.14%
White 38.79%
Black 17.06%
Hispanic 35.61%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) 8.55%

Respondent Representation

LD 23.52%
ED 3.07%
ID 2.71%
AO 57.75%
Male 63.23%
Female 32.28%
White 42.21%
Black 11.85%
Hispanic 30.12%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) 10.84%

Difference

LD -8.57%
ED -0.09%
ID -0.06%
AO -4.23%
Male -1.59%
Female -2.86%

White 3.41%
Black -5.21%
Hispanic -5.48%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) 2.29%

The next three lists show how the Cohort 19 respondents compare to the Cohort 19 State Special Education population.

Cohort 19 (2024-25)

Cohort 19 Respondents Versus State Special Education Population

Target Demographic Representation

LD 29.94%
ED 2.99%
ID 2.54%
AO 64.52%
Male 65.12%
Female 34.82%
White 40.32%
Black 16.49%
Hispanic 34.57%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) 8.63%

Respondent Representation

LD 23.52%
ED 3.07%
ID 2.71%
AO 57.75%
Male 63.23%
Female 32.28%
White 42.21%
Black 11.85%
Hispanic 30.12%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) 10.84%

Difference

LD -6.42%
ED 0.08%
ID 0.17%
AO -6.77%
Male -1.89%
Female -2.54%
White 1.89%
Black -4.64%
Hispanic -4.44%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) 2.21%

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Categories for Black and Hispanic respondents were outside of the +/-3% threshold for representativeness both when compared to the Cohort and the state target. White respondents were overrepresented only when compared to the Cohort target, and as an overrepresentation, this does not facilitate

the need for additional outreach. New Jersey is analyzing parental response rates and facilitation scores by demographic subgroups. Below is a look at the response rates.

White: 25.10%
Black: 16.02%
Hispanic: 19.51%
Other: 29.25%

Black respondents had the lowest response rate compared to other racial demographic categories. Additional efforts will be made to improve that number. We will continue to monitor response rates by demographic categories as data is collected and increase the number of contacts made for underperforming groups. We also plan to work more closely with school districts that have a high number of underrepresented demographic groups to promote and stress the importance of parental participation. Additionally, we are always discussing and exploring new ways to increase response rates.

Black respondents were underrepresented in the data and also reported the third-lowest facilitation score among the different racial categories.

White: 82.5%
Black: 84.5%
Hispanic: 87.6%
Other: 85.1%

The potential for nonresponse bias in the final Indicator 8 measures does exist, however many steps are being implemented identify and mitigate this as much as possible. Below is a list of steps that are already being taken.

1) NJ uses a stratified sampling scheme to divide the state's special education population into 6 demographically representative cohorts. Beginning with Cohort 17 in the 2022-2023 year, the demographic categories used for sampling were expanded. For example, in prior years, race was divided into only White and Minority categories. For the new cycle beginning with Cohort 17, the sampling was expanded such that each annual survey cohort would be demographically representative for White, Black, Hispanic, and Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial) categories.

2) Once the survey is complete, a demographic analysis is performed which compares the proportions for the survey respondents against both the cohort sample targets as well as the whole special education population of the state for that given year. Shortcomings in response rate and facilitation score are identified so that measures to improve them can be taken.

3) Prior to the data collection process, NJ works with school districts to ensure sample accuracy as much as possible. We provide trainings, reference material, and data collection templates. We collect expected counts and follow-up on mismatches. We have multiple programs and error checking files to try to ensure accurate parental sample and contact information is collected.

4) In order to collect data from as many parents as possible, more steps have been added to the data collection process. Multiple survey modes are offered (mail and web). Survey invitations are also sent out through postal mail and email. Through these two mediums, about 10 contact attempts are made to invite parents to take the survey. Additionally, the survey is available in a total of 11 different languages.

5) To increase the representativeness through increasing the response rate, we have implemented live response rate monitoring by demographic characteristics and variable effort adjustment for underperforming groups. Additional survey invitations were sent via email to districts with under-represented demographics and to generally low-responding districts. These two email attempts resulted in about 400 additional responses from the target groups.

6) Work with school districts to promote and stress the importance of the survey beyond the initial letter notifying parents, particularly in underperforming districts. Social media materials were provided to all participating districts as an additional outreach option to parents.

After the decrease in representativeness for Cohort 19, we will continue to evaluate the survey process and discuss methods to increase the response rate from the underrepresented groups. Generally, some larger districts included in the survey have relatively lower response rates, and we have already started to discuss ways to involve their district staff more and increase accountability for districts' participation in notifying families about the survey.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

1. NJDOE will continue to work with the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN) and utilize their networking resources in order to promote and encourage parent participation and response to the survey.

2. In response to our stakeholders' recommendations NJDOE contracted with a vendor and now provides translated surveys in the top 10 spoken languages in addition to English in NJ including: Arabic, Bengali, Mandarin Chinese, Gujarati, Haitian Creole, Hindi, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish, and Urdu.

3. NJDOE will continue providing participating districts with suggestions to increase parent access to the survey such as distributing and collecting surveys at school events, using parent email addresses, and inviting parents into the school computer lab to complete the survey electronically.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The final Cohort 19 sample consists of parent contact information lines for which there is an address and up to two email addresses. All information was submitted directly from the sampled school districts. For the most part, the number of parent address lines reflects the number of students receiving Special Education Services in the Cohort. However, each year there are a small number of cases where there can be two lines for one student if there is a litigious situation that calls for both parents to be contacted.

To calculate the true response rate, the quality of the parent contact information is reviewed, and denominator reduction is applied based on those who we know we were unable to contact. Among all cases, both preschool and schoolage combined, 99.96% provided an apparent Postal mailing address. Of those that provided a Postal mailing address, 3.37% were found to be invalid, based on the number of cases where the letters were returned as undeliverable.

Potential contact by email is also taken into account. Along with mailing addresses, school districts are asked to submit contact email addresses (up to two per record) for all cases. Overall, 92.21% of the address lines had email address information. This is a slight decrease from last year's 94.98%. Through the email distribution system, "bounce-back" email addresses are tracked over the length of the survey fielding period. An email bounce-back is an error message sent by a server indicating that an email could not be sent or delivered. Overall, 2.05% of the cases that provided an email address had invalid information. This is an improvement from last year's 4.13% bounceback rate.

The combination of the results of the Postal and email address quality check identifies cases where all of the provided contact information was proven to be invalid – letters returned as undeliverable for Postal addresses and email bounce-backs for the email addresses that were provided. Overall, 0.50% of the Cohort 19 sample could not be contacted, which is a small increase from the 0.36% unable to contact from Cohort 18. For Cohort 19, 43,275 contact lines should have received a survey invitation and thus had "reasonable opportunity" to participate.

The breakdown of the type of survey returned – a paper survey from the first mailing, second mailing, or a survey completed on the web – shows that web is the more frequently used method of survey submission. For Cohort 19, more than three-quarters of all the submitted surveys were done online through the web survey (77.20%). This is a decrease from last year when 78.36% of the surveys were web responses and is also the eighth time that the majority of surveys were done electronically as opposed to on paper.

A number of returned surveys are declared "ineligible" based on less than 50% of the NCSEAM question set being answered or incorrect student age for the type (schoolage or preschool) or survey used. For Cohort 19, 5.08% of surveys were declared "ineligible" for these two reasons. The number of completed surveys once the ineligible surveys are removed from the number returned was 10,162. This is the eventual numerator in the response rates.

The base response rate is calculated using the number of completed surveys (10,162) divided by the number of cases in the final Cohort 19 sample (43,475). The final base response rate was 23.37%.

The adjusted response rate takes into account "reasonable opportunity" to participate. The denominator in the calculation is the number of "valid contact info" surveys (43,257) and excludes the cases where all contact information was invalid. The numerator in the calculation remains the same (10,162). This response rate accounts for the percentage of parents who responded based on the number we believe received an invitation – or at least no proof exists that they did not receive an invitation. The final adjusted response rate was 23.49%.

The administration schedule for Cohort 19 was similar to Cohort 18 and brought the survey back to its standard schedule used before 2020. Cohorts 14 and 15 had experienced significant schedule changes due to COVID-19 school closures, Cohorts 16-18 moved closer to the typical schedule by opening data collection in June and July, and Cohort 19 opened in May.

Cohort 19 had a similar timeframe for data collection to pre-2020 data collection. Data collection started at the end of the selected school year and closed before the start of the next. This helped ensure that surveys were not submitted with responses related to the incorrect school year.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

New Jersey decided to sample districts using a representative cohort method. This means that the entire population of parents with children receiving special education and related services are divided up into separate cohorts. Each cohort, or sample, was selected to be demographically representative of the entire state. In our trainings with school districts, we describe each of these cohorts as a "mini-New Jersey." The reason for the sampling is to counter attrition in survey participation due to fatigue. If the same parents get the survey every year, they won't participate as often.

The demographics included in the sampling frame include disability type, race/ethnicity status, and gender. NJDOE established a $\pm 3\%$ sampling error, i.e. the sample that is chosen will be representative of districts serving students with disabilities within the state at a level of error that will be plus or minus 3% -- an error band of 6%. Through the establishment of the $\pm 3\%$ sampling error and the use of a sampling calculator, selection bias should be prevented.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

This information is provided within the FFY 2024 responses for Indicator 8.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2025 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation”. Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

24

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	628	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The State uses the same calculation to identify significant disproportionality (CCEIS) and disproportionate representation (Indicators 9 and 10).

Disproportionate Representation is defined as a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for three consecutive years. The State applies a minimum 'n' size of 30 and a minimum cell size of 10.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state did not identify any districts with disproportionate representation this reporting period. However the process when districts are identified for disproportionate representation includes a review of their policies, procedures, and practices to determine whether they demonstrated noncompliance with requirements for identifying students with disabilities. This review, aligned with IDEA requirements identified by the USOSEP for Indicators 9 and 10, included an analysis of compliance indicators related to 34 CFR §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301–300.311. The findings are verified by OSE special education monitors.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation”. Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Data	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	1.57%	0.52%	0.90%
------	------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

28

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
25	4	624	0.90%	0%	0.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation". Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The State uses the same calculation to identify significant disproportionality (CCEIS) and disproportionate representation (Indicators 9 and 10).

Disproportionate Representation is defined as a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for three consecutive years. The State applies a minimum 'n' size of 30 and a minimum cell size of 10.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Districts identified for disproportionate representation engaged in a review of their policies, procedures, and practices to determine whether they demonstrate noncompliance with requirements for identifying students with disabilities. This review, aligned with IDEA requirements identified by the USOSEP for Indicators 9 and 10, included an analysis of compliance indicators related to 34 CFR §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301–300.311. The findings were verified by OSE special education monitors.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5		0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are grouped by finding to make findings at the LEA level. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance. To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a desk audit consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the LEAs indicating the dates of completion of evaluations, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the LEAs regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2024. Interviews conducted with special education directors indicated that root causes of delays continue to be vacancies and the unavailability of child study team or related services personnel. LEAs reported that, consistent with prior year findings, delays were at times due to difficulty scheduling specialists for additional evaluations. NJDOE has

provided technical assistance regarding communication with referring early intervention programs, registration strategies, maintaining and using data for Part B 63 oversight and reallocation of staff to meet district needs. NJDOE analyzes subsequent data submitted through NJSMART to determine whether each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The data must demonstrate 100% compliance. The amount of data reviewed varies based on the level of the noncompliance and the size of the LEA.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

- 1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
- 2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 2301.

All findings of noncompliance with Indicator 10 identified in FFY 2023 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that the five districts identified in FFY 2023 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2025 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2024 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.90%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	79.86%	90.07%	92.97%	92.64%	77.42%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
28,402	23,729	77.42%	100%	83.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

4,673

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Delay Code 01 – Incomplete Residency/Enrollment

1-5 days: 27

6-15 days: 36

16-31 days: 33

31-60 days: 23

61-90 days: 4

90-120 days: 4

120+ days: 4

Total: 131

Delay Code 02- Additional Evaluations Needed

1-5 days: 59

6-15 days: 78

16-31 days: 89

31-60 days: 70

61-90 days: 31

90-120 days: 18

120+ days: 14

Total: 359

Delay Code 03 – Specialized Evaluations Needed

1-5 days: 24

6-15 days: 43

16-31 days: 66

31-60 days: 51

61-90 days: 21

90-120 days: 9

120+ days: 11

Total: 225

Delay Code 06 – Vacancies of CST or Related Services Personnel

1-5 days: 14

6-15 days: 25

16-31 days: 30

31-60 days: 43

61-90 days: 19

90-120 days: 8

120+ days: 6

Total: 145

Delay Code 07 – CST or Related Services Personnel were Unavailable

1-5 days: 169

6-15 days: 208

16-31 days: 175

31-60 days: 136

61-90 days: 39
90-120 days: 17
120+ days: 26
Total: 770

Delay Code 09 – Late Referral (Fewer than 120 days for students turning age 3)

1-5 days: 6
6-15 days: 1
16-31 days: 6
31-60 days: 1
61-90 days: 1
90-120 days: 0
120+ days: 0
Total: 15

Delay Code 10- Delay in Receipt of Consent to Evaluate

1-5 days: 3
6-15 days: 8
16-31 days: 3
31-60 days: 6
61-90 days: 1
90-120 days: 0
120+ days: 0
Total: 21

Delay Code 11 – Mediation or Due Process Hearing Request

1-5 days: 0
6-15 days: 1
16-31 days: 0
31-60 days: 0
61-90 days: 0
90-120 days: 0
120+ days: 1
Total: 2

Delay Code 13 – Delay in Receipt of Consent to Implement IEP (Age 3)

1-5 days: 28
6-15 days: 39
16-31 days: 19
31-60 days: 19
61-90 days: 8
90-120 days: 2
120+ days: 1
Total: 116

Delay Code 14 – School Closure/Public Health Emergency

1-5 days: 4
6-15 days: 2
16-31 days: 1
31-60 days: 0
61-90 days: 0
90-120 days: 0
120+ days: 0
Total: 7

No Delay Code Provided

1-5 days: 999
6-15 days: 938
16-31 days: 462

31-60 days: 243
 61-90 days: 80
 90-120 days: 29
 120+ days: 131
 Total: 2882

Total for All Delay Reasons: 4673

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1)(ii) and 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1)(ii), New Jersey has established a timeline within which evaluations must be completed and has also established procedures by which eligibility is determined. New Jersey's system of evaluation and determination of eligibility includes the following procedures which must be completed within specific timelines from when a parent provides consent for evaluation, as detailed in New Jersey's special education regulations. These include providing written notice of a meeting; disseminating to the parents any evaluations or reports that will be used to determine eligibility, at least 10 days prior to the eligibility meeting; conducting the eligibility meeting; and if the student is eligible, conducting an IEP meeting; providing written notice of the IEP; obtaining consent to implement the IEP; and having a program that is in place for the student. To comply with the requirement to have the entire process completed within 90 days from the date parental consent is obtained, the data for this indicator are collected based on the requirement that evaluations and a written report must be completed no later than the 65th day from parental consent. The evaluation timeline set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) A child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability (34 CFR §300.301(d)). As a result, in accordance with the instructions for Indicator 11 in the USOSEP measurement table, these exceptions are not reflected in either the numerator or denominator in the calculation of data for Indicator 11. In addition, because there is an automatic stay-put whenever mediation or due process hearing is initiated, this was also determined by NJDOE to be a valid exception to the state established timeline [N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.6(d) 10 and N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.7(u)]. As instructed in the measurement table, evaluations that met this exception are included in the numerator and denominator. The NJDOE determined that all other reasons for a delay in timelines are either not valid or not permitted in regulation.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Statewide census data for this indicator are collected through the Annual Data Report which is now reported to NJDOE through the New Jersey Standards Measurement and Resource for Teaching (NJSMART) student level database on October 15th of each year. LEAs report dates of consent and dates for the completion of evaluations, by student. Reasons for any delays in meeting evaluation timelines are also reported by student. Data are aggregated to the district and state level for reporting in Indicator 11 and for analysis to identify and verify correction of noncompliance. Data for Indicator 11 represent evaluations conducted for the entire reporting year – July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 as reported by districts on October 15, 2025.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5,929	5,929		0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are reported in the SPP/APR, but are aggregated at the district level to identify LEA noncompliance. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance. To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. Achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and
2. Had conducted evaluations, although late, for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the districts indicating the dates of completion of IEP implementation, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the districts regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2023. NJDOE analyzes subsequent data submitted through NJSMART to determine whether each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The data must demonstrate 100% compliance. The amount of data reviewed varies based on the level of the noncompliance and the size of the LEA.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA

All findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	73.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	67.48%	70.19%	70.65%	70.79%	74.98%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,272
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	23
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,251
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	359
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,251	2,890	74.98%	100%	77.89%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

639

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Range of Days between 3rd Birthday and IEP Start Date

Delay Reason 01: Incomplete Residency

Between 1-5 Days: 4

Between 6-15 Days: 11

Between 16-30 Days: 14

Between 31-60 Days: 14

Between 61-90 Days: 3

Between 91-120 Days: 2

More than 120 Days: 4

Eligibility not determined: 2

TOTAL: 54

Delay Reason 02: Additional Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 0

Between 6-15 Days: 2

Between 16-30 Days: 1

Between 31-60 Days: 3

Between 61-90 Days: 0

Between 91-120 Days: 1

More than 120 Days: 1

Eligibility not determined: 0

TOTAL: 8

Delay Reason 03: Specialized Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 1

Between 6-15 Days: 1

Between 16-30 Days: 0

Between 31-60 Days: 1

Between 61-90 Days: 0

Between 91-120 Days: 0

More than 120 Days: 0

Eligibility not determined: 0

TOTAL: 3

Delay Reason 06: Vacancies of Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel

Between 1-5 Days: 2
Between 6-15 Days: 1
Between 16-30 Days: 2
Between 31-60 Days: 3
Between 61-90 Days: 1
Between 91-120 Days: 3
More than 120 Days: 2
Eligibility not determined: 0
TOTAL: 14

Delay Reason 07: Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel were Unavailable

Between 1-5 Days: 8
Between 6-15 Days: 12
Between 16-30 Days: 9
Between 31-60 Days: 12
Between 61-90 Days: 7
Between 91-120 Days: 10
More than 120 Days: 5
Eligibility not determined: 0
TOTAL: 63

Delay Reason 09: Late Referrals

Between 1-5 Days: 5
Between 6-15 Days: 7
Between 16-30 Days: 8
Between 31-60 Days: 14
Between 61-90 Days: 7
Between 91-120 Days: 2
More than 120 Days: 0
Eligibility not determined: 0
TOTAL: 43

No Delay Code or Invalid Delay Code

Between 1-5 Days: 74
Between 6-15 Days: 77
Between 16-30 Days: 77
Between 31-60 Days: 95
Between 61-90 Days: 62
Between 91-120 Days: 18
More than 120 Days: 12
Eligibility not determined: 39
TOTAL: 454

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Statewide census data for this indicator for the full reporting period are collected through the Special Education Collection which is reported to NJDOE through the student level database on October 15th of each year. LEAs report if the child was receiving services through the early intervention system (EIS), the date of IEP implementation and the reasons for any delays in implementing the IEP beyond the third birthday. Reasons for any delays in meeting evaluation timelines are also reported by student. Data are aggregated to the district and state level for reporting in Indicator 12 and for analysis to identify and correct noncompliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
826	826	0	0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are reported in the SPP/APR, but are aggregated at the district level to identify LEA noncompliance. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance. To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. Achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and
2. Had conducted evaluations, although late, for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 2301.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the districts indicating the dates of completion of IEP implementation, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the districts regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2023. NJDOE analyzes subsequent data submitted through NJSMART to determine whether each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The data must demonstrate 100% compliance. The amount of data reviewed varies based on the level of the noncompliance and the size of the LEA.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA

All findings of noncompliance with Indicator 12 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 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 transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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 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 transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	90.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.10%	92.86%	100.00%	100.00%	97.27%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
227	244	97.27%	100%	93.03%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage in Indicator 13 of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) review is attributed to noncompliance in 17 Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Specifically, this slippage stems from the failure to conduct age-appropriate transition assessments.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator were obtained through the comprehensive monitoring process. A sample of student files was collected from each LEA representing a variety of disability categories, racial/ethnic groups, grade levels and placements. The revised checklist, developed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), was used by state monitors to review each student file. Files were determined noncompliant if one or more of the 8 questions on the checklist received a response of "no." Targeted technical assistance was offered to all LEAs. A report of results, including findings of noncompliance, as needed, was issued to each of the LEAs participating in comprehensive monitoring

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6		0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance. To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a desk audit consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of revised IEPs and a sample of IEPs developed subsequent to FFY24. To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 2301.

All findings of noncompliance FFY23 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2025 on students who left school during 2023-2024, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2023-2024 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2009	Target ≥	48.00%	48.00%	48.00%	48.50%	48.50%
A	45.00%	Data	51.93%	49.57%	42.35%	52.35%	42.06%
B	2009	Target ≥	77.00%	74.00%	74.00%	74.50%	74.50%
B	74.00%	Data	80.12%	78.30%	79.81%	82.05%	72.79%
C	2009	Target ≥	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.50%	87.50%
C	84.00%	Data	87.15%	84.97%	87.15%	91.03%	84.70%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A ≥	49.00%	49.00%
Target B ≥	75.00%	75.00%
Target C ≥	88.00%	88.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State’s SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings

also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,549
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,582
Response Rate	62.06%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	682
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	642
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	90
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	72

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	682	1,582	42.06%	49.00%	43.11%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 + 2)	1,324	1,582	72.79%	75.00%	83.69%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively	1,486	1,582	84.70%	88.00%	93.93%	Met target	No Slippage

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2023	2024
Response Rate	54.07%	62.06%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness for each category was a +/-3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Representativeness: Using the NPSO Response Calculator, see below, the NJOSE calculated the representativeness of respondents to all student exiters from Cohort V districts (from the 2023-2024 school year). Representativeness is calculated for each demographic category by subtracting the percentage of respondents from the percentage of all student exiters for each category. A difference of $\pm 3\%$ is considered a statistical difference.

Comparison of Representativeness: Student exiters who responded to the survey were representative of all student exiters from 2023-2024 in three out of four disability categories (LD, ED, CI), gender, race/ethnicity* and OOD placement categories.

*When respondent groups were combined, minority (non-White) student exiters were underrepresented; when looking at all race/ethnicity respondent groups, student exiters who were Black, Hispanic, or of the other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, and Multiracial) non-White racial category were not underrepresented.

Student exiters who responded to the survey and were previously enrolled in a SDA (Former Abbott) district were under-represented, Student exiters who dropped out were also under-represented.

For accessibility purposes, the NPSO Response Calculator re: Representativeness (see Definition above) has been recreated below rather than attached:

Target Lever Representation

LD	37.54%
ED	6.16%
CI	2.51%
AO	53.79%
Female	33.70%
Minority	53.00%
Black	18.83%
Hispanic	26.68%

Other 7.49% (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Multiracial)

OOD 10.28%

Dropout 4.67%

Respondent Representation

LD 35.59%

ED 4.68%

CI 2.91%

AO 56.83%

Female 32.49%

Minority 49.18%

Black 15.99%

Hispanic 25.16%

Other 8.03%

OOD 8.41%

Dropout 1.45%

Difference

LD -1.96%

ED -1.48%

CI 0.40%

AO 3.04%

Female -1.21%

Minority -3.82%

Black -2.84%

Hispanic -1.52%

Other 0.53%

OOD -1.87%

Dropout -3.21%

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Discussions have already begun regarding changes to the way in which data is collected from student exiters. Currently almost all outreach takes place over the phone with calls being placed by district staff. Adding email outreach and updating the technical assistance sessions to highlight historically underrepresented groups will help to increase response rates and ensure representativeness.

NJ made changes to the process for verifying lists of expected exiters with school district staff this year. The previous process asked district staff to complete a Data Verification Form in advance of data collection. Starting with Cohort V, school district staff were asked to also submit an updated list of expected exiters at the time the Data Verification Form submission. This allowed NJDOE staff and their data contractor to have a better understanding of the number of expected exiters from each district and more accurately track response rates throughout data collection.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Adjustments to the technical assistance sessions provided to the participating districts to ensure greater data quality and encourage increased outreach to non-responders are important and were implemented this year leading to an overall increase in response rate (54.07% FFY23; 62.06% FFY24). The Bloustein Center at Rutgers University (BCSR) continues to work with the NJDOE Office of Special Education to analyze district data and demographic data to inform efforts towards increasing response rates such as increased TA and outreach to district directors of special education. The technical assistance sessions will continue to be updated to highlight which groups have been historically underrepresented in the data collection, particularly students who dropped out. These sessions will also place an emphasis on the importance of timely submission of district Data Verification Forms which NJ uses to confirm the target leaver group number. With the confirmed number and demographic data of target leavers before the start of data collection, NJ will monitor progress towards collection of data from historically underrepresented groups to ensure representativeness moving forward.

The NJDOE and BCSR are also considering additional outreach methods to collect data, including email. If this moves forward, an additional technical assistance session is likely to be held for all districts in NJ, not just those in the next data collection cohort to ensure that this information is being collected at the time a student exits. It is also recommended that districts report effort of level variables which will allow the SRA app to be more fully utilized moving forward.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response rates were analyzed using the SRA app from the IDEA Data Center. Response rates were calculated separately by race/ethnicity, exit manner, placement, gender, and disability type. This analysis found that students who dropped out were underrepresented in our respondent group. Analysis also found that responders within this group were less likely than other exiters to be engaged within one year of leaving high school. The

strategies being implemented to increase the response rate year over year will also assist in reducing bias, specifically using existing technical assistance sessions to highlight underrepresented groups and stress the importance of collecting data from these exiters. Changes will continue to be made to the timeline for confirming the demographics and eligibility of all target leavers. This will make it possible to monitor progress towards collection of data from students in SDA district and students who dropped out while data collection is ongoing. Additional follow-up was made with districts who submit respondent data for less than 50% of student exiters in these groups and the data collection timeframe was extended for these districts.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) is following the guidelines established by the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) Center for the sampling methodology, data collection procedures and data analysis for the purposes of developing and implementing a study to yield valid and reliable data as described in the SPP/APR. Consistent with New Jersey's (USOSEP approved) sampling plan, all districts in the state that have high school programs are participating in this study over a five year period. Using the NPSO sampling calculator, districts were randomly assigned to one of five cohorts. Each cohort consists of a representative sample of districts according to the demographic characteristics: district size; number of students with disabilities; disability type; race/ethnicity; gender (percentage of female students); ELL status; and dropout rate.

The sampling calculator developed by NPSO is based on a 5-way clustering process, which has as its basis a probability model. Using the calculator, data were entered for the sampling parameters listed above for all New Jersey school districts serving students with disabilities. The sampling calculator selects a representative sample for each of five years, reflecting the population of the State at a pre-set confidence level of plus or minus 3%. NJDOE established a +/- 3% sampling error, i.e. the sample that is chosen will be representative of districts serving students with disabilities within the state at a level of error that will be plus or minus 3% -- an error band of 6%. Through the establishment of the +/- 3% sampling error and the use of the NPSO sampling calculator, selection bias should be prevented.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2025 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specifications FS229.

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baselines or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Due Process Complaints (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	81
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Due Process Complaints (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	25

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	77.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	75.00%	77.00%-85.00%	77.00%-85.00%	77.25%-86.00%	77.25%-86.00%
Data	30.00%	14.91%	8.15%	14.46%	26.80%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	77.50%	77.50%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
25	81	26.80%	77.50%	30.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS228.

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baselines or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1 Mediations held	826
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	63
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	141

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and

contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	38.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	39.50%	38.00%	38.00%	38.25%	38.25%
Data	30.09%	24.44%	26.62%	22.91%	25.03%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	38.50%	38.50%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
63	141	826	25.03%	38.50%	24.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage, and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2025). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025–June 30, 2026) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

By 2027, New Jersey will increase, by at least 10 percentage points from baseline, the percentage of third-grade students with IEPs in Transformation Zone schools who score at or above benchmark on a district-selected early literacy assessment. The SiMR is operationalized using NJSLA literacy outcomes for students with IEPs in identified Transformation Zone districts as the common statewide data point, with local early literacy assessments used for progress monitoring and instructional decision-making.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

New Jersey's Transformation Zone districts were chosen based on a comprehensive analysis of targeted school data and stakeholder input. Selection criteria included targeted and comprehensive schools that were in status for the following: having schools below the 10th percentile in the statewide accountability system, a high percentage of students with disabilities (at least 20%), being on remote instruction in Spring 2021, and having a low graduation rate (bottom 10% statewide). All five selected districts met at least two of these criteria.

At the start of the initiative, four of five mutually selected districts committed to participating. However, one district rescinded participation due to competing priorities, leaving three districts actively participating. The demographic description of participating TZ districts, which is based on the most recent NJ School Performance Report, is as follows:

District 1, Asbury Park, located in Monmouth County, has 4 schools and serves approximately 1503 students. Currently, approximately 38.8% of students are identified as economically disadvantaged, 20.2% qualified for special education services, 14.6% are English Language Learners, and 5.3% are experiencing homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 2.5% White, 49.2% Hispanic, and 46.9% Black or African American.

District 2 Bridgeton, located in Cumberland County, has 8 schools and serves approximately 6132 students. Currently, approximately 83.3% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 9% qualified for special education services, 35.4% are English Language Learners, and 2.1% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 19.1% Black or African American, 2.2% White, and 76.8% Hispanic.

District 3, Willingboro, located in Burlington County, has 8 schools and serves approximately 3646 students. Approximately 63.8% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 18.7% qualified for special education services, 4.0% are English Language Learners, and 3.3% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 3.4% White, 19.7% Hispanic, and 71.8% Black or African American.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The State made minor revisions to the theory of action to make explicit the "if-then" chain from State strategies to LEA and student outcomes and to align it with five clearly defined infrastructure strategies (cross-divisional alignment, implementation science/NJTSS ER, coaching and technical assistance, screening and progress monitoring, and inclusive instructional environments). The updated theory of action more clearly connects these strategies to the SiMR by specifying short-, intermediate-, and long-term outcomes for LEAs and students with disabilities in the Transformation Zone.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The Theory of Action and Evaluation Plan have been added as attachments, along with accessibility reports, for review. Moving forward, this information will be available on our website. The information has been uploaded to the "Introduction" section of the attachments because there was no option available to select "Indicator 17".

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	4.31%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	10.00%	12.00%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Total Number of Students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone Scoring Proficient or Better on the NJSLA (Spring 2025)	Total Number of Students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone Who Took the NJSLA (Spring 2025)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
3	91	4.02%	10.00%	3.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Data reporting from one of the three TZ LEAs was not publicly reported due to a low sample size ($n < 10$), and no students performed at or above proficiency. Concerns about data quality have been discussed with the LEA, and adjustments are being made as NJ transitions to a new data collection system ahead of the 2026 NJSLA administration. NJSMART has been replaced by NJSLEDS, so to plan for data reporting errors and inconsistencies, the NJDOE OSE is asking each district to directly report its SSIP data at both the school and district levels to the SSIP coordinator for comparison with what is reported in NJSLEDS.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2024 data.

New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) literacy results for students with IEPs in participating Transformation Zone districts, drawn from the NJSMART Education Data System. In previous submissions (e.g., FFY 2022), the State used two data sources (Start Strong and NJSLA); however, because the Start Strong assessment program was discontinued beginning in fall 2023, FFY 2024 and future SSIP reporting will rely solely on NJSLA as the common summative measure for the SiMR, while local early literacy assessments and universal screeners continue to be used for formative and interim decision-making.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

NJSLA literacy data for students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone districts are collected through NJSMART, New Jersey's statewide longitudinal data system used for multiple SPP/APR indicators. The Office of Special Education and Office of LEAR extract SiMR-related data from NJSMART each year and calculate the percentage of students with IEPs in participating Transformation Zone districts who score proficient or better, comparing results to baseline and annual targets to determine progress or slippage. Results are disaggregated by district and cohort to identify trends and inform the intensity and focus of state-level coaching, technical assistance, and other supports provided to Transformation Zone districts.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, which affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

The revised evaluation plan has been provided as an attachment.

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

The NJDOE OSE had not previously submitted an evaluation plan, so this represents a completely new plan.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

NJDOE OSE had not previously developed or provided an evaluation plan, so this submission is entirely new and was developed to coincide with the revised theory of action.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period.

NJDOE focused on strengthening coaching and data-informed implementation in the current Transformation Zone districts and on tightening department-wide alignment of literacy work, so the planned second cohort of districts has been shifted to fall 2026 to support a more coherent, sustainable scale-up. Leadership turnover in several TZ districts required time to orient new leaders and rebuild implementation teams, so the District Capacity Assessment has been rescheduled for the 2025–2026 school year when teams are more stable and able to engage fully. Partnerships with Rowan University and William Paterson University continued to provide professional learning on evidence-based and inclusive practices, and the Educational Environment Dashboard is being used more deliberately as a planning tool to assess barriers and plan specific changes to placements and instructional supports for students with disabilities.

In addition, the State has continued the Office of Special Education, NJTSS ER, NJIP, and NJPIEP initiatives described in last year's SSIP, maintaining their focus on improving LRE, inclusive placement, and access to high-quality instruction for students with disabilities. The State also continues its partnership with the State Implementation and Scaling Up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center to build internal capacity to use implementation science to support improved outcomes for students with disabilities across the state. Since last year's submission, the State has refined the connection between these infrastructure improvements and the strategies in New Jersey's Theory of Action, so the work described below is now more clearly aligned with early literacy priorities. The following infrastructure improvement strategies build on prior commitments and are explicitly aligned with the five key strategies in the Theory of Action.

Strategy I: Align efforts across NJDOE divisions, including streamlining resources and supports.

During the reporting period, the Office of Learning Equity and Academic Recovery (LEAR) was formally established, and its leadership and core staffing were put in place, including the appointment of a director and the hiring of a data analyst, a literacy specialist, and an adult learning specialist to lead and operationalize the State's literacy agenda. LEAR then operationalized its role as the State's central hub for literacy and academic recovery by creating formal cross-divisional structures that connect curriculum, early childhood, special education, multilingual learner supports, assessment/data, and grants offices around a shared Literacy Framework. This alignment showed up in coordinated grant design (BRIDGE, FOCUS, COACH, IMPACT, LIFT, RISE) that uses common expectations for HQIM, universal screening, and evidence-based practices, as well as in shared guidance documents that present a unified message on universal screening, data use, intervention, and family engagement. NJDOE also launched the use of a centralized LMS to house and track literacy-related professional learning, enabling the State to monitor participation in required trainings under P.L. 2024, c.52 and to ensure that districts receive consistent, non-duplicative messages across initiatives, informed by feedback and recommendations from the Working Group on Student Literacy.

Strategy II: Use the Implementation Science Framework, NJTSS-ER resources, and evidence-based practices (EBP) to guide literacy initiatives

The NJDOE used an Implementation Science framework to stage the rollout of literacy initiatives, with explicit attention to implementation drivers (training, coaching, data systems) and improvement cycles. NJTSS ER resources, developed through a SPDG in partnership with Rutgers, served as the backbone for early reading work, providing action plans, practice profiles, and tools for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction that districts can adapt to local contexts. Evidence-based practices highlighted in the NJ Literacy Framework were integrated into RAPID modules, LEARning about Literacy sessions, and district-level coaching, so that professional learning, coaching scripts, and grant expectations all reinforce the same practices and fidelity criteria. Transformation Zone (TZ) districts, in particular, receive coaching and TA that explicitly use NJTSS ER tools and Implementation Science routines (e.g., implementation teams, data reviews) to support adoption and sustained use of evidence-based curricula and interventions.

Strategy III: Provide integrated coaching and technical assistance to Transformation Zone (TZ) districts in adopting and implementing evidence-based literacy curricula, interventions, and practices

During the reporting period, Transformation Zone (TZ) districts were awarded BRIDGE grants, which support Building Responsive Instruction through Data-Guided Evaluation by funding district literacy leadership teams to strengthen universal screening, progress monitoring, and data-informed early literacy instruction. Through BRIDGE and related RAPID-supported initiatives, state literacy specialists and consultants partner with TZ literacy leadership teams and K–3 educators to develop and refine districtwide systems for using assessment data to select and implement evidence-based early literacy curricula, strengthen Tier 1 instruction, and align Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with identified student needs.

This integrated support is delivered through recurring coaching cycles, creating a continuous improvement loop at the school and district levels. TZ teachers and leaders will transition into more focused coaching on early literacy best practices, including explicit training on the "big five" components of early literacy, with the goal of building internal capacity to sustain and expand these practices.

Strategy IV: Support districts in building their knowledge and capacity to select and implement appropriate screening and progress monitoring systems for data-driven decision-making

NJDOE prioritized building a coherent statewide screening infrastructure by requiring all K–3 LEAs to administer evidence-based universal literacy screeners and submit results through a secure NJDOE portal using standardized templates and timelines. To ensure districts could implement this requirement with quality, the state developed guidance documents and training on selecting appropriate screeners (including alignment with the Literacy Framework and dyslexia legislation), administering them with fidelity, interpreting results, and using data to drive instructional grouping and intervention decisions. RAPID, FOCUS, and BRIDGE grants provided structured professional learning on data literacy, goal setting, and differentiation, and supported the formation of district literacy leadership teams that oversee local screening and progress monitoring systems.

Strategy V: Support districts in building their capacity to create inclusive instructional environments that promote access to EBPs for all learners

NJDOE intentionally linked literacy infrastructure to inclusive practice so that students with disabilities receive high-quality, evidence-based literacy instruction within general education settings. The Literacy Framework's focus on HQIM, universal screening, and tiered interventions is paired with guidance and PD that emphasize inclusive classroom practices, family engagement, and alignment with NJSLS–ELA and dyslexia legislation, ensuring that supports are designed for all learners from the outset. Initiatives such as the New Jersey Inclusion Project and LRE-focused tools (e.g., the Educational Environment Dashboard and Action Learning Groups) complement the literacy-specific work by helping districts identify and address placement and access barriers, so that students with disabilities can fully participate in core literacy instruction and benefit from the evidence-based practices promoted through NJTSS ER, RAPID, and grant-funded coaching.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Strategy 1: During the reporting period, the Office of Special Education hired an Early Literacy Specialist who worked closely with staff in the Office of Learning Equity and Academic Recovery (LEAR) to align early literacy resources, professional learning, and technical assistance across divisions. The establishment and staffing of LEAR, along with new cross-divisional structures connecting curriculum, early childhood, special education, multilingual

learner supports, assessment/data, and grants around a shared Literacy Framework, expanded the number of NJDOE staff engaged in coordinated literacy planning. This coordination is evidenced by the joint design of literacy-related grants and shared guidance on high-quality instructional materials (HQIM), universal screening, data use, intervention, and family engagement.

These cross-divisional structures have increased the frequency of alignment meetings and supported joint decision-making about literacy resources and supports, as reflected in coordinated grant requirements, consolidated guidance, and the launch of a centralized learning management system (LMS) to house and track literacy-related professional learning. While formal inventories of duplicative resources and staff perception surveys are planned for future reporting cycles, the move toward common grant expectations, shared Literacy Framework guidance, and a single LMS indicates early reductions in duplication and increased internal coherence. Collectively, these governance and quality-standard improvements support progress toward the SiMR by providing districts with clear, unified expectations and supports, while also strengthening sustainability through institutionalized cross-divisional collaboration and shared infrastructure.

Strategy 2: The state used an Implementation Science framework to stage the rollout of literacy initiatives across the phases of exploration, installation, initial implementation, and scale-up. With explicit attention to training, coaching, and data systems, the state ensured that all Transformation Zone (TZ) districts participated in professional learning on this framework, enabling district implementation teams to share a common approach to guiding early literacy work. NJTSS-ER resources, developed through a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) in partnership with Rutgers, served as the backbone for early reading implementation by providing action plans, practice profiles, and Tier 1–3 tools that participating districts (including TZ districts) can adapt to local contexts, thereby clarifying expectations for evidence-based early literacy practice.

Evidence-based practices identified in the New Jersey Literacy Framework (including explicit foundational skills instruction, phonological and phonemic awareness, oral language development, progress monitoring, and data-based decision-making) were embedded across literacy modules, LEARning about Literacy sessions, and district-level coaching. This alignment ensures that professional learning, coaching supports, and grant expectations consistently reinforce the same practices and fidelity criteria. Transformation Zone, districts have established early literacy implementation teams that participate in monthly coaching sessions guided by implementation science principles and NJTSS-ER tools. Approximately half of TZ districts have begun receiving focused coaching on evidence-based practices, with the remaining districts positioned to engage as implementation progresses.

Strategy 3: All TZ districts received coordinated coaching and technical assistance on evidence-based early literacy practices, with state literacy specialists and consultants engaging literacy leadership teams and K–3 educators in recurring coaching cycles that combined joint planning, classroom observations, targeted feedback, and follow-up reflection. This increased the number of coaching visits and hours of support provided to TZ districts and led educators to report greater confidence in using data to implement and refine literacy interventions, particularly for students with disabilities and multilingual learners.

TZ districts have functioning early literacy implementation teams with defined roles, regular coaching schedules, and emerging action plans focused on strengthening Tier 1 explicit, systematic instruction and aligning Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with screening and progress monitoring data. Coaching now emphasizes early literacy best practices, including explicit training on the “big five” components of early literacy (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension), and intentionally includes special education teachers, interventionists, and school leaders so that those who design, deliver, and support instruction share a common understanding of effective practices and data use. These outcomes advance the SiMR by improving classroom implementation of evidence-based literacy instruction for students with disabilities, supporting sustainability by building local implementation-team capacity to lead ongoing professional learning, and enabling scale-up by establishing a coaching and team model that can be replicated in additional districts.

Strategy 4: Short-term outcomes included statewide implementation of universal literacy screening in grades K–3 and increased district capacity to analyze and use screening data. NJDOE required all local educational agencies (LEAs) serving students in kindergarten through grade three to administer evidence-based universal literacy screeners and submit results through a secure NJDOE portal using standardized templates and protocols. This work was supported by disseminating guidance on screener selection, administration fidelity, data analysis, and instructional response.

To build sustainable data-use routines, standardized data submission enabled the Office of Learning Equity and Academic Recovery (LEAR) to begin identifying statewide and regional trends to inform targeted professional learning and coaching. In addition, Transformation Zone (TZ) districts established literacy leadership teams to institutionalize data-driven decision-making practices. Progress was monitored using screener submission rates, data quality checks, district participation in asynchronous and synchronous professional learning focused on data literacy and goal setting, and early evidence of more precise instructional targeting for diverse learners, including multilingual learners and students with disabilities.

Strategy 5: In the short term, NJDOE aligned the Literacy Framework’s emphasis on high-quality instructional materials (HQIM), universal screening, and tiered interventions with guidance and professional learning focused on inclusive classroom practices, family engagement, and alignment with the New Jersey Student Learning Standards–ELA and state dyslexia legislation. This alignment increased educator participation in professional learning and strengthened educators’ knowledge and confidence in implementing inclusive literacy strategies.

At the intermediate level, initiatives such as the New Jersey Inclusion Project, the New Jersey Preschool Inclusive Education Project (NJPIEP), the Educational Environment Dashboard, Action Learning Groups, and the OSE Learning Resource Centers support districts in identifying and addressing placement and access barriers so that students with disabilities can fully participate in core literacy instruction. Through communities of practice and targeted workshops on high-leverage practices, Universal Design for Learning, and differentiated instruction, these initiatives foster increased collaboration between general and special educators and greater use of evidence-based inclusive literacy practices in classrooms.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

During this reporting period, the State implemented newly identified infrastructure improvement strategies, including the establishment of LEAR as a permanent statewide literacy office, the launch of a statewide LMS/LEARning Hub for coordinated literacy professional learning, and the formalization of a statewide K–3 universal screening and data infrastructure; each of these new strategies is described in the preceding narrative on infrastructure improvements.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

- The State will streamline literacy data systems by better aligning K–3 screening and progress monitoring data with statewide longitudinal data, reducing duplication and reporting burden for districts.
- NJDOE will formalize a governance and funding model for the LMS so aligned professional learning on the Literacy Framework, HQIM, and inclusive practices can be sustained and expanded to more districts.
- For screening and data use, the State will provide more support to district literacy leadership teams to implement regular data review cycles, improving identification of students needing intervention and making instruction more responsive to screening and progress monitoring results.

• NJDOE will expand efforts to build district capacity to design accessible, inclusive classrooms that use High Leverage practices, UDL, and differentiated instruction, so that these environments directly support and strengthen early literacy for students with disabilities.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period include UFLI Foundations, IMSE Orton-Gillingham, Estrellita, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, and NJTSS ER-aligned tiered intervention practices embedded in early literacy curricula and coaching. Because New Jersey is a locally controlled state, districts retain autonomy to select evidence-based curricula; the programs listed here are those that participating districts reported using during this period.

Districts are expected to select materials and approaches that reflect state guidance on structured literacy, including explicit, systematic instruction in phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics and decoding, oral language and vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, combined with regular universal screening, ongoing progress monitoring, and data-based decision making within a multi-tiered system of supports for early reading.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

UFLI Foundations is a foundational skills program that gives young students clear, step-by-step lessons in phonics, decoding, high-frequency words, and reading connected text. IMSE Orton-Gillingham is a structured literacy approach that uses multisensory, carefully sequenced lessons in sounds, spelling patterns, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, especially for students who struggle with reading or have disabilities. Estrellita is a Spanish-language program that builds phonological awareness, phonics, and early reading in Spanish, so that emerging bilingual students develop strong first-language skills that support later biliteracy. Heggerty Phonemic Awareness is a short, daily routine that provides students with intensive practice in hearing and working with sounds in words, strengthening early decoding and spelling. NJTSS ER-aligned tiered intervention practices refer to schools using progress-monitored small groups, clearly defined Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, and regular data meetings within a multi-tiered system of supports that follows the New Jersey Literacy Framework and screening guidance.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

At the program and district levels, these practices are intended to move schools toward a common approach to implementing early literacy best practices: choosing structured literacy programs, screening all K–3 students on a regular schedule, and establishing clear, tiered support procedures that align with state literacy and NJTSS ER guidance. NJTSS ER tools help districts establish routines, such as when data meetings occur, how students are placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3, and how decisions are documented, so that support for students with disabilities and multilingual learners is built into the regular literacy system. For teachers and providers, coaching, RAPID, and LEARning about Literacy sessions, and ongoing coaching cycles are designed to change daily practice by increasing the explicit teaching of the “big five” components of reading, more frequent use of screening and progress-monitoring data, and joint planning between general and special educators. For parents and caregivers, state literacy guidance emphasizes clear communication about screening results, why a student is receiving an intervention, and how families can support reading at home, intended to build stronger partnerships around early literacy for students with disabilities. For children in Transformation Zone schools, especially students with IEPs, the combined use of these programs and tiered supports is expected to lead to earlier identification of reading needs, more targeted instruction, and higher rates of students with IEPs meeting the early literacy benchmarks in the SiMR.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

For district and school leaders, state-developed tools are used to monitor how well screening and data-use systems are being implemented. The Universal Screening Needs Analysis and Action Plan, the Universal Screening Data Analysis Workbook, and the Universal Literacy Screening Quality Evaluation Worksheet guide leadership teams to document which screeners are used, whether they meet quality criteria, how completely and consistently screening is administered, and how results are used to make instructional and intervention decisions. These tools generate concrete evidence about leadership behaviors, such as scheduling data meetings, establishing entry/exit criteria for tiers, and monitoring follow-through on action steps, which are reviewed in coaching sessions to refine systems and practices over time.

As the work transitions more fully into teacher capacity building, fidelity of classroom implementation of specific early literacy practices (e.g., phonological and phonemic awareness routines, decoding instruction) will be monitored using practice profile fidelity tools, such as the Phonological/Phonemic Awareness Fidelity Checklist. Coaches and administrators will use these tools during observations to identify clearly defined instructional behaviors, provide targeted feedback, and track growth across multiple visits, so that fidelity data become a driver for individual coaching, collaborative planning, and adjustments to professional learning.

Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

In addition to screening data, districts collect ongoing progress-monitoring data from curriculum-embedded and intervention assessments (e.g., phonemic-awareness checks, decoding and word-reading accuracy, oral-reading fluency) for students receiving UFLI, IMSE, Orton-Gillingham, Estrellita, Heggerty, and NJTSS-ER-aligned interventions. Leadership teams use the NJTSS-ER Universal Screening Data Analysis Workbook and related (BRIDGE) tools to compare beginning, middle, and end-of-year results, examine growth for students with IEPs and multilingual learners, and determine whether students are moving from below the benchmark to on or above the benchmark under these practices. These analyses, combined with fidelity information and action plan reviews, provide evidence that the EBPs are associated with improved early literacy outcomes in participating schools, supporting decisions to continue and, where appropriate, expand their use.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practice and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Next steps focus on deepening implementation of the selected EBPs and tightening the link between instruction, screening, and progress monitoring data. District literacy leadership teams will use BRIDGE needs analysis and action plan tools to refine how UFLI, IMSE Orton-Gillingham, Estrellita, Heggerty, and NJTSS ER interventions are scheduled, staffed, and monitored, with an emphasis on ensuring that students with IEPs and multilingual learners receive timely, data-aligned support.

In Transformation Zone districts, the key next step is to provide targeted training for teachers on early literacy best practices in the five core areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension so that classroom instruction consistently reflects these structured literacy components. At the classroom level, coaching will increasingly use practice profile fidelity tools (e.g., the Phonological/Phonemic Awareness Fidelity Checklist) to guide observations, provide specific feedback on early literacy routines, and track growth in teacher practice over time.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

One anticipated change is an adjustment to the SiMR timeline. This will be discussed with our OSEP program officer before any official changes are made, but timelines have shifted since the SSIP was initially conceived. While substantial progress has been made in building infrastructure and aligning literacy support across NJDOE offices and divisions, implementation at the LEA level is still in its infancy, and more time may be needed to achieve a measurable impact across the TZ schools, as well as to expand efforts to include more LEAs.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) solicits broad stakeholder input on the State's SPP/APR targets, any subsequent target revisions, and the development and implementation of the SSIP primarily through its monthly meetings of the New Jersey State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). These meetings serve as a consistent, statewide forum for reciprocal communication between OSE and a diverse group of stakeholders representing parents, individuals with disabilities, educators, advocacy organizations, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and partner state agencies.

At each monthly meeting, the Director of the Office of Special Education provides updates related to office activities, resources, and progress toward statewide goals, and facilitates discussion of NJDOE priorities and initiatives. OSE shares dispute resolution findings, presents programmatic and district exemplars, and ensures transparency through public posting of meeting materials, recorded minutes, and a formal public comment process. Meetings also include regular discussion of SPP/APR indicators, targets, determinations, and aligned improvement initiatives, creating an embedded structure for stakeholder input related to both compliance and results-driven accountability.

Throughout FY24, NJ-SSEAC meetings included monthly presentations of SPP/APR indicator data and SSIP-related information. Stakeholders reviewed current data, examined aligned initiatives, and provided feedback on improvement activities and implementation challenges. These discussions informed the identification of priority areas that were addressed through standing and ad-hoc subcommittees, supported requests for additional data analysis, and facilitated ongoing dialogue regarding the implementation and evaluation of the State's SSIP. Input gathered through this process informed OSE's consideration of future targets, revisions, and statewide improvement strategies.

OSE has also intentionally expanded the breadth of stakeholder participation over time. From FFY20 through FFY24, OSE increased the number of stakeholder organizations engaged in advisory and outreach activities by leveraging enhanced communication strategies, statewide engagement opportunities, and NJ-SSEAC subcommittee work. This growth reflects intentional outreach to organizations representing disability advocacy, related services, early childhood, mental health, assistive technology, family support, professional education associations, higher education, and cross-agency partners. These stakeholders are provided ongoing opportunities to engage with NJ-SSEAC activities, remain informed of statewide discussions, and contribute input regarding unmet needs of students with disabilities. See the appendix of stakeholder narrative, part 2, for the complete list of representing organizations.

To maximize accessibility and participation, NJ-SSEAC and stakeholder meetings have been primarily conducted virtually, based on member feedback, with additional in-person and hybrid participation opportunities offered through the Learning Resource Centers. This flexible engagement approach supports participation from stakeholders across geographic regions while maintaining transparency and continuity in stakeholder input processes.

Collectively, these mechanisms ensure that stakeholder input on SPP/APR targets, revisions, and SSIP development and implementation is continuous, representative, and embedded within the State's advisory and improvement structures.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

During the reporting period, NJDOE engaged a statewide Working Group on Student Literacy that included parents, educators, district and school leaders, higher education partners, community organizations, and advocacy groups to provide input on early literacy priorities, universal screening, and dyslexia related guidance. The Working Group met multiple times to review data, react to draft guidance and tools (such as the Literacy Framework and screening expectations), and develop consensus recommendations that informed State decisions about HQIM, universal screeners, and professional learning priorities. Here is a link to those recommendations: <https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:VA6C2:00df50c9-8f2b-4143-97b6-27f9e64b33f0>

NJDOE also used targeted outreach strategies, including surveys, focus groups, and listening sessions with educators and families, to gather feedback on barriers to high-quality literacy instruction and supports for all students. These stakeholder recommendations were summarized and shared internally and externally, and they directly shaped revisions to guidance documents, communication plans, and implementation supports (e.g., LMS modules and technical assistance offerings) described elsewhere in the SSIP.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

All anticipated activities were already described in the narrative above. Any unplanned activities or adjustments to the current plan to support the participating LEAs will be considered based on implementation fidelity and progress-monitoring data received from the TZ districts. A new governor just

took office on January 20, 2026, so the NJDOE OSE will continue to align the work of the SSIP to focus on students with disabilities and the administration's anticipated continuation of the focus on early literacy given the changes to state infrastructure were the result of legislation.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

No specific additional activities are anticipated at this time.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

No newly identified barriers have been identified at this time.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

No additional information at this time.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Indicator 18: General Supervision

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2024 submission, use FFY 2023, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024)
- # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100

Instructions

Targets must be 100%.

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Report in Column A, the number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024), as reported in the compliance indicator, and report in Column C1, the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance. Report in Column B, the number of additional findings of noncompliance related to the compliance indicator made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023–June 30, 2024) and report in Column C2, the number of those additional findings related to the compliance indicator which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	100.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Indicator 9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

NA

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Indicator 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
5	0	5	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are grouped by finding to make findings at the LEA level. LEAs with findings are

required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance. To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a desk audit consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the LEAs indicating the dates of completion of evaluations, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the LEAs regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2024. Interviews conducted with special education directors indicated that root causes of delays continue to be vacancies and the unavailability of child study team or related services personnel. LEAs reported that, consistent with prior year findings, delays were at times due to difficulty scheduling specialists for additional evaluations. NJDOE has provided technical assistance regarding communication with referring early intervention programs, registration strategies, maintaining and using data for Part B 63 oversight and reallocation of staff to meet district needs. NJDOE analyzes subsequent data submitted through NJSMART to determine whether each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The data must demonstrate 100% compliance. The amount of data reviewed varies based on the level of the noncompliance and the size of the LEA.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 2301.

All findings of noncompliance with Indicator 10 identified in FFY 2023 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

Indicator 11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
5,929	0	5,929	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are reported in the SPP/APR, but are aggregated at the district level to identify LEA noncompliance. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance. To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. Achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and
2. Had conducted evaluations, although late, for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the districts indicating the dates of completion of IEP implementation, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the districts regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2024. NJDOE analyzes subsequent data submitted through NJSMART to determine whether each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The data must demonstrate 100% compliance. The amount of data reviewed varies based on the level of the noncompliance and the size of the LEA.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and

2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA

All findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

Indicator 12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
826	0	826	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are reported in the SPP/APR, but are aggregated at the district level to identify LEA noncompliance. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance. To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. Achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and
2. Had conducted evaluations, although late, for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the districts indicating the dates of completion of IEP implementation, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the districts regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2024. NJDOE analyzes subsequent data submitted through NJSMART to determine whether each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The data must demonstrate 100% compliance. The amount of data reviewed varies based on the level of the noncompliance and the size of the LEA.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA

All findings of noncompliance with Indicator 12 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

Indicator 13. 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 meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services and 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 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
6	0	6	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

To ensure correction of noncompliance, districts were required to revise their policies, procedures and practices, and/or revise IEPs based on findings of noncompliance. This involved: (a) development or revision of district or school policies and procedures; (b) training of staff on those new or revised policies; (c) revision of individual student IEPs to reflect requirements; and (d) implementation of oversight mechanisms to ensure all age 16 transition requirements are addressed in every IEP.

To verify correction of noncompliance, when possible, NJDOE reviewed individual IEPs to ensure correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the school district. In some cases, actions occurred, although late and in some cases, individual files were corrected. In the case of policies or procedures, NJDOE verified the presence of revised policies and procedures.

NJDOE also reviewed subsequent data in each school district demonstrating compliance with the specific requirements. These data were reviewed through additional desk audits, data and record submissions, and in some cases, onsite reviews.

The NJDOE continues to ensure correction of noncompliance in accordance with the OSEP 23-01 memo, in collaboration with districts. Monitors provide technical assistance to districts to assist with the development of compliant policies and practices and identification of the root cause of noncompliance. NJDOE staff members from the Learning Resource Centers, in collaboration with the monitors, also provide technical assistance on the development of policies, procedures and practices related age 16 transition requirements.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

To verify correction of noncompliance NJDOE reviewed individual child files or school records to ensure correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the school district.

NJDOE also reviewed subsequent data in each school district demonstrating compliance with the specific requirements. These data were reviewed through additional desk audits, data and record submissions, and in some cases, onsite reviews.

The NJDOE continues to ensure correction of noncompliance in accordance with the OSEP 23-01 memo, in collaboration with districts. Monitors provide technical assistance to districts to assist with the development of compliant policies and practices and identification of the root cause of noncompliance. NJDOE staff members from the Learning Resource Centers, in collaboration with the monitors, also provide technical assistance on the development of policies, procedures and practices related to age 16 transition requirements.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

- 1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
- 2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction by reviewing a sample of the files where noncompliance was identified.

All findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 23-01 within one year of identification.

Optional for FFY 2024 and 2025:

Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
6,766	0	6,766	0	0

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2023	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
6,766	6,766	Not Valid and Reliable	100%	100.00%	Met target	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	0.00%
---	-------

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2023 (the period from July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024)	6,766
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	6,766
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	0

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	0
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	0
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	0

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement

provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

18 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2024 in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR.

The State must establish baseline for this indicator in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

18 - OSEP Response

The State has established baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2023, but OSEP cannot accept that baseline data because the State's FFY 2023 data were not valid and reliable.

18 - Required Actions

The State must establish baseline for this indicator in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR.

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Kimberly A. Murray

Title:

Director, Office of Special Education

Email:

kimberly.murray@doe.nj.gov

Phone:

609-376-3766

Submitted on:

04/22/26 12:26:31 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

New Jersey 2026 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
90.68%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	19	95.00%
Compliance	22	19	86.36%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2026: Part B."

2026 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	36%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	88%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	39%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	93%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	44%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	89%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	29%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	91%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	5	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma*	93	2

*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2026 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.64%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	83.55%	YES	1
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	77.89%	YES	1
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	93.03%	YES	2
Indicator 18: General Supervision	100	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	93.39%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/FFY2024-Part-B-SPP-APR-Reformatted-Measurement-Table.pdf>

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, 13 and 18.

Data Rubric

New Jersey

FFY 2024 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	0	0
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
18	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2024 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 7/30/25	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/7/26	1	0	1	2
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/19/25	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 11/19/25	1	0	1	2

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	19
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	24.43

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.28571429 points are subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	24.43
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	50.43
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	54.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9339
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	93.39

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.28571429.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2026 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described in the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	FS002 & FS089	7/30/2025
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	2/18/2026
Part B Exiting	FS009	2/18/2026
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	2/18/2026
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/7/2026
Part B Dispute Resolution	FS227, FS228, FS229, FS230	11/19/2025
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	FS231, FS232, FS233, FS234, FS235, FS236, FS237, FS238	11/19/2025

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data and metadata responses submitted to *EDFacts* align. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

New Jersey

School Year: 2024-25

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	269
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	72
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	41
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	55
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	17
(1.2) Complaints pending.	15
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	15
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	182

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	959
(2.1) Mediations held.	826
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	415
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	63
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	411
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	141
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	133

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	1,014
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	81
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	25
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	59
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	35
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	24
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	198
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	757

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	16
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	1
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	3
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	13

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
New Jersey

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/19/2025

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2026 will be posted in June 2026. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 18, 2026

Honorable Lily Laux
Commissioner
New Jersey Department of Education
100 Riverview Plaza
Trenton, NJ 08625

Dear Commissioner Laux:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2026 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that New Jersey meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of New Jersey's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2024 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

New Jersey's 2026 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2026 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2026: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2026, as it did for Part B determinations in 2015-2025. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for New Jersey).

In making Part B determinations in 2026, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment);
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2023-2024) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2026 determinations, OSEP is using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2026 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2025 determination. OSEP used the publicly available NAEP data for the BIE that was comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; specifically OSEP did not use NAEP participation data in making the BIE's 2026 determination because the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the BIE that is publicly available is 2020, whereas the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico that is publicly available is 2024);
- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of New Jersey's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) SPP/APR reporting tool using your New Jersey-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access New Jersey's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 18, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that New Jersey is required to take. The actions that New Jersey is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for your State to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) New Jersey's RDA Matrix;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2026 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated New Jersey's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2024-2025," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the New Jersey's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, New Jersey's 2026 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's or Entity's 2026 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless OSEP has imposed programmatic Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2023, 2024, and 2025), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2026 determination.

The Department is committed to transparency, accountability, strong partnerships with States and stakeholders, high expectations, and improved outcomes for children with disabilities. To support these priorities, the Secretary is considering modifications to the factors the Department uses when making determinations, effective June 2027. Potential additional factors include graduation rates and assessment data, such as graduation rates for students with disabilities compared to all students, and Statewide assessment results of students with disabilities compared to all students. Other potential factors include longstanding noncompliance (such as OSEP-identified noncompliance that remains unresolved) as a factor in determinations.

For the FFY 2025 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2027, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2025 SPP/APR and the 2027 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and data submitted during correction opportunities will not be used for these purposes. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 15, and 16 (as they have in the past). States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in EDPass prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the business rule; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the uploaded data triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, New Jersey must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in New Jersey on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after New Jersey's submission of its FFY 2024 SPP/APR. In addition, New Jersey must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the New Jersey's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, New Jersey must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes New Jersey's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates New Jersey's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with New Jersey over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,



Erin McHugh
Deputy Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: New Jersey Director of Special Education