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# 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;
• baseline data for Indicators 1 through 17;
• targets for Indicators 1 through 16 for each year reflected in the SPP;
• data from FFY 2020;
• other responsive information for Indicators 1 through 16, including the impact of the COVID 19 pandemic on the data collected, steps taken relevant to the Indicator re: COVID 19 impact (when relevant), and the steps taken to mitigate the impact;
• an explanation of slippage on indicators where New Jersey did not meet its FFY 2020 target;
• specific content required to complete Phase III of the SSIP required by Indicator 17, as well as any updates to previous Phase I, II, and III submissions, and;
• information to address any actions required by OSEP’s response to the State’s FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

The NJDOE collects data each year through NJSMART, New Jersey’s student level data system. The COVID-19 pandemic did not affect the collection or reporting of data in FFY 2020 except for Indicator 3 which was not available at the time of this report due to a delay in administration of statewide assessments from the Spring of 2021 to the Fall of 2021. Data was collected and analyzed for all of the remaining indicators. The potential impact of the pandemic on the outcome data collected is addressed through slippage explanations for each indicator as it is hypothesized that the some indicators were affected more than others.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

655

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

Please see attached narrative

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

The New Jersey Office of Special Education

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), Office of Special Education (NJOSE) provides professional development, technical assistance, coaching opportunities, resources and instructional materials to families of students with disabilities and the educational professionals who serve them. Special Education Consultants, Specialists, and other staff from the NJDOE are based at three Learning Resource Centers that are strategically located in the Northern, Central, and Southern regions of the state to provide services to local school districts, service providers, and families. The NJOSE also has contracts with The Boggs Center at Rutgers University, Statewide Parent Advocacy Network, Montclair State University, and Rowan University for technical assistance, professional development, and to provide additional resources for educational professionals and families.

An Integrated System of Support

Technical Assistance from the NJOSE is designed to support the NJDOE’s mission of supporting schools, educators, and districts to ensure all of New Jersey’s 1.4 million students have equitable access to high quality education and academic excellence. NJOSE initiatives are aligned with State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) priority areas and indicators. The New Jersey Office of Comprehensive Support (NJOCS) includes field support teams that provide direct, individualized support to persistently struggling schools identified as targeted or comprehensive in close alignment with program offices, county offices, and in accordance with the implementation of New Jersey’s Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan. NJOSE coordinates with NJOCS efforts, using data from school performance reports, walkthroughs, and annual school plans with a goal of reducing the achievement gap between general and special education students.

Throughout this collaboration, NJOSE continues to promote the initiatives likely to improve overall achievement for students with disabilities including, but not limited to: Universal Design for Learning, Positive Behavioral Supports in Schools, New Jersey Tiered System of Supports (SPDG funding), the New Jersey Inclusive Education Technical Assistance project, and community-based instruction. NJOSE and the Office of Comprehensive Support seek to promote technical assistance and coaching strategies for districts and schools to increase capacity and sustainability of evidence-based interventions and best practices. Disproportionality and chronic absenteeism are both prominent concerns addressed through the collaboration of the NJOSE, NJOCS and the county offices of the NJDOE under the NJDOE ESSA plan.

The NJOSE is within the NJDOE's Division of Educational Services. Other offices in the division coordinate the implementation of: health services; interventions for struggling learners; services for English Language Learners, services for migrant and homeless students; career education; school culture and climate; and grants under ESSA. The offices within this division take a collaborative and unified approach to technical assistance by designing technical assistance and professional development initiatives that address the needs of all student subgroups, including students with disabilities.

With a goal of gathering stakeholder input regarding professional development, the Office conducts monthly meetings with the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC) which represents families, school districts and other entities that serve or advocate on behalf of people with disabilities. The SSEAC discusses data from the APR and other sources and offers input regarding technical assistance and professional development initiatives.

Additionally, NJOSE collaborates with other divisions across the Department (ie: the Division of Field Support and Services and the Division of Early Childhood) to facilitate the inclusion of students with disabilities in all NJDOE initiatives. The Department, as noted in our ESSA State plan, has made great efforts to make sure that all stakeholders and all relevant staff from the Department are at the table in the planning phase of initiatives and projects to be assured the interests of students with disabilities are included at all stages of implementation.

A Tiered System of Support

When identifying technical assistance needs, data from the following sources are analyzed: the NJSMART system; the Student Safety Data System (SSDS); the NJOSE End-of-Year Report; School Performance Reports, Annual Performance Report data; and monitoring data.

The NJOSE has continued to provide a tiered technical assistance model designed to strategically assist schools and districts according to their level of need. Data are analyzed with input from other offices within the Department and the SSEAC to determine which districts and schools are targeted for assistance and the intensity of services needed.

Level I – Topical Strategies, Resources, and Information - The NJOSE makes available to educators and families information on new policies, regulations (state and federal) and effective practices through the NJOSE web site, documents disseminated through the weekly NJDOE broadcast and through one or two day training sessions. During the COVID-19 pandemic, NJOSE provided resources through the NJDOE COVID-19 website as well as the NJOSE website. Resources relevant to the remote instruction of students with disabilities, supporting parents of students with disabilities during remote (at-home) instruction, mental health supports for students, families and educators, and links to other state agencies were posted and updated by Learning Resource Center staff members. The LRC South, a partnership with Rowan University, met weekly to update their comprehensive resources and responded to the changing needs of LRC users as the pandemic began to unfold. Weekly meetings with the County Special Education Specialists began in March 2020 to respond to the salient needs of districts across the state. Virtual collaborative county information sessions were conducted to speak directly to district Directors of Special Education to address the most frequently asked questions of the NJDOE County Offices. Target group: All districts and schools.

Level II – Moderate Intensity Interventions – Districts or schools demonstrating a need for targeted support are given opportunities to participate in multi-day professional development with onsite coaching. During the COVID-19 pandemic, LRC consultants, OSE specialists, and contracted TA providers all pivoted to remote delivery of Level II technical assistance. Target group: Priority and Focus Schools and Districts (identified based on data analysis.)

Level III – High Intensity Interventions – Districts or schools with pervasive and persistent difficulties are provided more long term and intensive support which includes training and onsite coaching. Beginning in March of 2020, all Level III TA was provided via videoconference. Target group: Districts with schools identified for comprehensive support and multiple schools for targeted intervention.
In summary, technical assistance, through a system integrated with NJDOE initiatives, facilitates implementation of the practices, strategies, and interventions necessary for students with IEPs to achieve the NJDOE goals established for all students. NJOSE collaborates and coordinates efforts with other offices within the Division of Educational Services, other divisions within the NJDOE, and other agencies to facilitate positive school outcomes and post-school outcomes for all New Jersey students with disabilities.

**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 attached narrative

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

13

**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.**

The Office of Special Education’s stakeholder engagement demonstrates equitable representation across a variety of demographic indicators. Ten out of the thirteen members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC) identify as a parent of a child with a disability. This also reflects even distribution of representation across three regions throughout the state. Stakeholders engage from a multitude of roles and perspectives, including parents of a students with disability (3), higher education administrators (4), advocacy groups (4), public school administrators (2) and special education district employee affiliation (1). The majority of our stakeholders, including parents, indicated that they have over 20 years of experience in special education engagement.

Beginning in January of 2021, each monthly State Special Education Advisory Council (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 towards the targets set within the SPP/APR.

In September of 2021, NJOSE presented a proposal to the SSEAC and stakeholder group for changing the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) in order to focus on early literacy. In addition to an analysis of Indicator 3 language arts achievement data, input from parents, SSEAC members, and non-profit advocacy groups (i.e.: Decoding Dyslexia and the AIM Institute) all indicated frustration at the lack of training that elementary school teachers receive in the science of reading. This issue became especially salient during the COVID-19 pandemic and the variety of disruptions caused by the public health management of the schools. The response from stakeholders to the proposed change of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) and SSIP was overwhelmingly positive and is described in more detail in the SSIP (Indicator 17) section of this APR.

**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.**

Beginning in January of 2021, the NJOSE conducted a survey of the active SSEAC members to update and ensure demographic representation across the following categories to name a few: regions of the state, roles within school districts, parent/family status, racial/ethnic groups, gender, LEA type, disability status, and advocacy group. This matrix is going to inform future applications and appointments to the SSEAC. Also, a similar survey is being conducted in 2022 in order to update the information gathered regarding our SPP/APR stakeholder group. Once gaps in representation can be identified, the NJOSE hopes to utilize its relationships with relevant professional organizations and advocacy groups to increase awareness of opportunities for stakeholder participation and to encourage participation. In the last quarter of 2021, the NJDOE hired a Federal Reporting and Stakeholder Engagement Specialist who will take the lead in organizing SSEAC meetings and stakeholder activities.

The NJDOE OSE also partners with the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN) to provide support and training to LEA parent advisory groups across the state. In FFY 2020, another project called Stakeholder Engagement Volunteer Advocates (SEVA) program was implemented. SEVA helps enhance the capacity of SPAN Resource Parents to serve as volunteer supports for families in preparing for and at IEP meetings focused on inclusion and effective transition to adult life with a focus on increasing the number of under-served families who can be provided with in-person support and building the knowledge and skills of families and youth, particularly those facing the greatest challenges, to advocate on their own behalf to secure effective 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.**

As previously mentioned, beginning in January 2021, SSEAC/Stakeholder meetings were utilized to present to the public and stakeholder groups of SPP/APR indicators to make the information more digestible, focused and to promote deeper discussion. In the past, one or two stakeholder meetings were held per year to review and set targets for the SPP/APR and feedback from stakeholders suggested that these six-hour meetings did not allow for time to digest information and provide thoughtful feedback. They were overwhelming for most participants. During meetings, video conference chats, anonymous feedback sessions using Jam Board, and video conference polling features were utilized to solicit input and summarize the resulting suggestions. With Jam Board, the links were left open indefinitely for participants in case they wanted to contribute additional information even after the meeting ended. In total, ten monthly meetings were held in FFY 2020.

**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.**

After each monthly meeting of SSEAC and SPP APR stakeholders, a portion of the next meeting was set aside to provide any follow-up information from the previous month’s discussion (“old business”) including any requested data analysis (when applicable). As mentioned in the previous paragraph, Jam board links were left open 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 were (and continue to be) posted on the NJDOE website as well.

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

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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 revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

NJDOE posted the 2018-2019 local district profiles on June 26, 2020. (see https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/info/spp/sppi1920/ )

Consistent with the requirements established in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004), NJDOE made New Jersey’s FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2019 SPP/APR were 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/info/spp/. The FFY 2020 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 2019 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/info/spp/. The USOSEP’s response to the NJDOE’s SPP/APR FFY 2020 submission will again be posted at: http://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/info/spp/ .

Distribution to the Media:
Annually, upon submission to USOSEP, the NJDOEP 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.

Distribution to Public Agencies:
Members of the State Special Education Advisory Council as well as SPP/APR stakeholders participated in a meeting on September 23, 2021 (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 2019 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.

Regarding the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, NJDOEP 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 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

None

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2019 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA. Specifically, weblinks to LEAs in the following counties were broken: Passaic, Salem, Somerset, Sussex, Union, Warren.

OSEP issued a monitoring report to the State on May 6, 2019, and is currently reviewing the State’s response submitted on February 11, 2022 and will respond under separate cover.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2019 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA. With its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2019. In addition, the State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

## Intro – Attachments

 

# 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 EDFacts 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 91.42% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 78.00% | 78.00% | 81.00% | 81.00% | 81.50% |
| Data | 77.99% | 78.80% | 78.84% | 80.14% | 83.83% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 91.50% | 91.50% | 91.75% | 91.75% | 92.00% | 92.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 8,639 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 19 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 792 |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8,639 | 9,450 | 83.83% | 91.50% | 91.42% | Did not meet target | 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 received 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. This change in calculation will be reflected in the February 1, 2023 submission so baseline and targets will change again next year. They changed this year to reflect the data reported in Section 618 of the IDEA. 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 baseline was changed to reflect the data reported Section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in the file specification FS009. This change in data collection was made in FFY19 and the baseline was changed accordingly.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using IDEA Section 618 data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

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.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). 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.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 8.38% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 13.00% | 13.00% | 12.00% | 12.00% | 6.00% |
| Data | 5.80% | 6.04% | 5.80% | 6.65% | 10.28% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 8.30% | 8.25% | 8.25% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 7.75% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 8,639 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 19 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 792 |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 792 | 9,450 | 10.28% | 8.30% | 8.38% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**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)**

The baseline was changed to reflect the data reported Section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in the file specification FS009. This change in data collection was made in FFY19 and the baseline was changed accordingly.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using IDEA Section 618 data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 EDFacts 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 CFR §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** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00%  | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 19,577 | 19,438 | 17,557 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 6,090 | 4,432 | 3,367 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 11,486 | 12,018 | 10,866 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 1,056 | 922 | 892 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 18,319 | 17,085 | 28,768 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 5,121 | 3,634 | 5,873 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 11,219 | 10,631 | 18,077 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 1,039 | 918 | 889 |

\*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.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 18,632 | 19,577 |  | 95.00% | 95.17% | Met target | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 17,372 | 19,438 |  | 95.00% | 89.37% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 15,125 | 17,557 |  | 95.00% | 86.15% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 17,379 | 18,319 |  | 95.00% | 94.87% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 15,183 | 17,085 |  | 95.00% | 88.87% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 24,839 | 28,768 |  | 95.00% | 86.34% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**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.**

https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/2021/index.shtml

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, New Jersey school districts operated on a virtual-remote-hybrid schedule for the 2020-2021 school year. To ensure as many students as possible were able to participate in the statewide assessments, New Jersey took advantage of the flexibility allowed by the United States Department of Education to administer the 2020-2021 statewide assessments in the Fall of 2021. As a result of the delayed administration, New Jersey was not able to meet the December 15 deadline for submitting the assessment files to EdFacts. Rather, the files will be submitted by February 15, 2022. The assessment data has been populated in Indicator 3 for the April 2022 clarification period and NJ has submitted all required components for this indicator at that time.

New Jersey moved from the PARCC assessment to the New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) in FFY18. The baseline has been revised to reflect this change.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3A - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (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 EDFacts 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** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 23.50% | 23.50% | 24.00% | 24.00% | 24.50% | 24.50% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 20.50% | 20.50% | 21.00% | 21.00% | 21.50% | 21.50% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 17.50% | 17.50% | 18.00% | 18.00% | 18.50% | 18.50% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 25.00% | 25.00% | 25.50% | 25.50% | 26.00% | 26.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 13.50% | 13.50% | 14.00% | 14.00% | 14.50% | 14.50% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 9.50% | 9.50% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.50% | 10.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**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 regular assessment | 16,612 | 15,588 | 13,671 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,303 | 1,273 | 883 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,901 | 2,708 | 2,449 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**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 regular assessment | 15,821 | 13,995 | 23,377 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 960 | 273 | 531 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 662 | 439 | 1,139 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 4,204 | 16,612 |  | 23.50% | 25.31% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 3,981 | 15,588 |  | 20.50% | 25.54% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 3,332 | 13,671 |  | 17.50% | 24.37% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,622 | 15,821 |  | 25.00% | 10.25% | Did not meet target | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 712 | 13,995 |  | 13.50% | 5.09% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 1,670 | 23,377 |  | 9.50% | 7.14% | N/A | N/A |

**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.**

https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/2021/index.shtml

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, New Jersey school districts operated on a virtual-remote-hybrid schedule for the 2020-2021 school year. To ensure as many students as possible were able to participate in the statewide assessments, New Jersey took advantage of the flexibility allowed by the United States Department of Education to administer the 2020-2021 statewide assessments in the Fall of 2021. As a result of the delayed administration, New Jersey was not able to meet the December 15 deadline for submitting the assessment files to EdFacts. Rather, the files will be submitted by February 15, 2022. The assessment data has been populated in Indicator 3 for the April 2022 clarification period and NJ has submitted all required components for this indicator at that time.

New Jersey moved from the PARCC assessment to the New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) in FFY18. The baseline has been revised to reflect this change.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (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 EDFacts 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** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 30.25% | 30.25% | 30.75% | 30.75% | 31.25% | 31.25% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 37.50% | 37.50% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.50% | 38.50% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 30.75% | 30.75% | 31.25% | 31.25% | 31.75% | 31.75% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 36.25% | 36.25% | 36.75% | 36.75% | 37.25% | 37.25% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 17.25% | 17.25% | 17.75% | 17.75% | 18.25% | 18.25% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.50% | 10.50% | 11.00% | 11.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**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 | 1,070 | 958 | 936 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 307 | 246 | 259 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**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 | 1,065 | 961 | 933 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 486 | 125 | 292 |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 307 | 1,070 |  | 30.25% | 28.69% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 246 | 958 |  | 37.50% | 25.68% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 259 | 936 |  | 30.75% | 27.67% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 486 | 1,065 |  | 36.25% | 45.63% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 125 | 961 |  | 17.25% | 13.01% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 292 | 933 |  | 10.00% | 31.30% | N/A | N/A |

**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.**

https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/2021/index.shtml

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, New Jersey school districts operated on a virtual-remote-hybrid schedule for the 2020-2021 school year. To ensure as many students as possible were able to participate in the statewide assessments, New Jersey took advantage of the flexibility allowed by the United States Department of Education to administer the 2020-2021 statewide assessments in the Fall of 2021. As a result of the delayed administration, New Jersey was not able to meet the December 15 deadline for submitting the assessment files to EdFacts. Rather, the files will be submitted by February 15, 2022. The assessment data has been populated in Indicator 3 for the April 2022 clarification period and NJ has submitted all required components for this indicator at that time.

New Jersey moved from the PARCC assessment to the New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) in FFY18. The baseline has been revised to reflect this change.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide an explanation for the revision. Specifically, the State reported that “New Jersey moved from the PARCC assessment to the New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) in FFY 2018. The baseline has been revised to reflect this change.” However, OSEP notes that the State does not use the PARCC assessment for students taking the alternate assessment, the State uses Dynamic Learning Maps.

OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State’s end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State’s baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above. The State must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.

## 3C - Required Actions

The State did not provide baseline data or targets for this indicator, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide baseline data and the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (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 EDFacts 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 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 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 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 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** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 31.00 | 31.00  | 30.75 | 30.75 | 30.50 | 30.50 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 38.75 | 38.75 | 38.50 | 38.50 | 38.25 | 38.25 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 38.00 | 38.00 | 37.75 | 37.75 | 37.50 | 37.50 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 24.75 | 24.75 | 24.50 | 24.50 | 24.25 | 24.25 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 32.75 | 32.75 | 32.50 | 32.50 | 32.25 | 32.25 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 24.75 | 24.75 | 24.50 | 24.50 | 24.25 | 24.25 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 90,392 | 95,411 | 92,242 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 16,612 | 15,588 | 13,671 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 40,687 | 47,237 | 46,436 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,729 | 3,901 | 3,766 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,303 | 1,273 | 883 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,901 | 2,708 | 2,449 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 90,529 | 93,678 | 137,366 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 15,821 | 13,995 | 23,377 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 21,066 | 22,179 | 34,749 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,022 | 877 | 2,161 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 960 | 273 | 531 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 662 | 439 | 1,139 |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 25.31% | 48.03% |  | 31.00 | 22.72 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 25.54% | 53.60% |  | 38.75 | 28.06 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 24.37% | 54.42% |  | 38.00 | 30.05 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 10.25% | 24.40% |  | 24.75 | 14.15 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 5.09% | 24.61% |  | 32.75 | 19.52 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 7.14% | 26.87% |  | 24.75 | 19.73 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, New Jersey school districts operated on a virtual-remote-hybrid schedule for the 2020-2021 school year. To ensure as many students as possible were able to participate in the statewide assessments, New Jersey took advantage of the flexibility allowed by the United States Department of Education to administer the 2020-2021 statewide assessments in the Fall of 2021. As a result of the delayed administration, New Jersey was not able to meet the December 15 deadline for submitting the assessment files to EdFacts. Rather, the files will be submitted by February 15, 2022. The assessment data has been populated in Indicator 3 for the April 2022 clarification period and NJ has submitted all required components for this indicator at that time.

The data used to calculate the proficiency rate gap, consistent with the Measurement Table) was from FFY18 (18-19 school year). New Jersey moved from the PARCC assessment to the New Jersey Student Learning Assessment (NJSLA) in FFY18. The baseline has been revised to reflect this change.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 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 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), 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:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 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 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts 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 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 4.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 1.20% | 1.10% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 0.90% |
| Data | 1.51% | 1.83% | 0.91% | 0.76% | 0.76% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.79% | 0.79% | 0.78% | 0.78% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs in the State** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 657 | 0.76% | 0.80% | 0.30% | 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

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

"Significant Discrepancy" is defined as a suspension rate of greater than 5 times the baseline statewide average (i.e., a rate of more than 3%)

Methodology: The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) determined whether significant discrepancies were occurring in each LEA by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. NJDOE used a set number of times above the state average to determine significant discrepancy. Data from the Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days of the Annual Report of Children Served were used in the process.

Specifically, first, NJDOE calculated the baseline state average (i.e., a rate of .6%) for the baseline year of 2004-2005 for all districts in the state. Second, NJDOE used a multiple of the baseline statewide average (i.e., more than 5 times the state average) to determine local districts demonstrating a significant discrepancy. In calculating the percent of districts with a significant discrepancy for this FFY 2019 APR, all LEAs were included in the calculation. No LEAs in the state were excluded from this calculation based on a minimum cell size requirement. An LEA was determined to demonstrate a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year if the LEA rate exceeded 3.0% (0.6% x 5 = 3.0%).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.**

Districts 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 review includes a self-assessment, and/or desk audit and/or an onsite targeted 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 district discipline and suspension data. District data, reported through the Student Safety Data System (SSDS), are reviewed and analyzed to identify the specific schools within the identified districts where most suspensions over 10 days occurred. School-based discipline practices and tracking data are analyzed to identify noncompliance and patterns of suspension. Districts 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. Districts 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 district staff. Districts are provided with additional training as described below (see discussion of improvement activities).

All of the districts identified with significant discrepancies in their suspension rates participated in the targeted review process described above to determine compliance with the federal requirements related to this indicator.

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 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Verification of correction is conducted by the NJDOE in accordance with USOSEP 09-02 memo. Districts are required to correct noncompliance identified during monitoring activities within one year of identification. If noncompliance is not corrected, state-directed corrective action plans are required that include specific activities, timelines and documentation to demonstrate correction. Corrective action activities include the development or revision of policies and procedures, training, activities related to implementation of procedures and/or oversight of implementation of procedures. In addition to requiring corrective actions that address any root causes of noncompliance, the NJDOE verifies correction consistent with USOSEP Memorandum 09-02 by reviewing files with individual noncompliance to be corrected and reviewing subsequent data collected following the implementation of the corrective actions that demonstrate 100 percent compliance with regulatory requirements. Technical assistance is provided as needed to assist districts in timely correction, training of staff and/or development of oversight activities to ensure implementation of IDEA. Technical assistance documents (e.g., state notice and IEP sample forms, discipline requirements power point presentation) are disseminated to assist districts with establishing or revising procedures that comply with federal and state special education requirements.

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

To verify correction of noncompliance, when possible, 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. 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 09-02 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 positive behavioral supports in districts with high rates of suspension.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, 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 with Indicator 4A identified in FFY 2019 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Verification of correction is conducted by the NJDOE in accordance with USOSEP 09-02 memo. Districts are required to correct noncompliance identified during monitoring activities within one year of identification. If noncompliance is not corrected, state-directed corrective action plans are required that include specific activities, timelines and documentation to demonstrate correction. Corrective action activities include the development or revision of policies and procedures, training, activities related to implementation of procedures and/or oversight of implementation of procedures. In addition to requiring corrective actions that address any root causes of noncompliance, the NJDOE verifies correction consistent with USOSEP Memorandum 09-02 by reviewing files with individual noncompliance to be corrected and reviewing subsequent data collected following the implementation of the corrective actions that demonstrate 100 percent compliance with regulatory requirements. Technical assistance is provided as needed to assist districts in timely correction, training of staff and/or development of oversight activities to ensure implementation of IDEA. Technical assistance documents (e.g., state notice and IEP sample forms, discipline requirements power point presentation) are disseminated to assist districts with establishing or revising procedures that comply with federal and state special education requirements.

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

To verify correction of noncompliance, when possible, 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. 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 09-02 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 positive behavioral supports in districts with high rates of suspension.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, 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 with Indicator 4A identified in FFY 2018 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 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 in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018: (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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), 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:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 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 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 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 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 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 0.15% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.30% | 0.15% | 0.15% | 0.15% | 0.91% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 in the State** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 0 | 657 | 0.91% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) determined whether there was a significant discrepancy in the suspension rate for each racial/ethnic group in each LEA by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. Specifically, for each LEA, the suspension rate was calculated for each racial/ethnic group by dividing the number of children with IEPs suspended for greater than 10 days in a school year by the number of children with IEPs reported in the specified racial/ethnic group.

In order to compare the district rate for each racial/ethnic group to other LEAs in the state, the state rate for all children with IEPs suspended was calculated by dividing the number of children of all racial/ethnic groups suspended for greater than 10 days by the number of children with IEPs in the state. The state rate for FFY 2020 was .75% . The district rate for each racial/ethnic group was then compared to the state rate and if the district rate for a specific racial/ethnic group was greater than three times the state rate (or greater than 2.25%), the district was determined to demonstrate a “significant discrepancy” for the specific racial/ethnic group.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.**

For FFY 2020, the two (2) districts identified for significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year participated in a self-assessment or desk monitoring of policies, procedures and practices to determine if the district demonstrated noncompliance with requirements related to the discipline of students with disabilities. The self-assessment and desk monitoring tool were aligned with the IDEA requirements identified by the USOSEP as related to Indicator 4B and included a review of compliance indicators related to the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.170(a) and 300.646(a)(3) as well as a review of policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy 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.

Result of the Review: Zero (0) districts had findings of noncompliance in one or more of the requirements reviewed indicating that policies, procedures or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy.

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 2019**

| **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 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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 that parents and case managers are informed of suspensions. The findings made related to this indicator ranged from individual child files missing necessary documentation of a behavioral intervention plan or manifestation determination to districts or schools not having procedures in place.

To verify correction of noncompliance, when possible, 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. 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 09-02 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 positive behavioral supports in districts with high rates of suspension. All districts identified for a significant discrepancy in their suspension and expulsion rates are invited to specific training and ongoing technical assistance opportunities to assist with correction of noncompliance, identification of root causes, and implementation of best practices in implementing positive behavioral support systems, differentiated instruction and placement in the least restrictive environment.

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

To verify correction of noncompliance, when possible, 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. 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 09-02 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 positive behavioral supports in districts with high rates of suspension. All districts identified for a significant discrepancy in their suspension and expulsion rates are invited to specific training and ongoing technical assistance opportunities to assist with correction of noncompliance, identification of root causes, and implementation of best practices in implementing positive behavioral support systems, differentiated instruction and placement in the least restrictive environment.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, 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 with Indicator 4B identified in FFY 2019 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 have corrected the noncompliance, 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 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 EDFacts 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 49.00% | 49.50% | 50.00% | 50.50% | 50.50% |
| A | 44.64% | Data | 45.99% | 45.08% | 44.62% | 45.12% | 44.64% |
| B | 2019 | Target <= | 15.50% | 15.50% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 14.00% |
| B | 14.98% | Data | 14.72% | 14.36% | 14.74% | 14.44% | 14.98% |
| C | 2019 | Target <= | 7.40% | 7.20% | 7.10% | 6.90% | 6.90% |
| C | 6.78% | Data | 7.51% | 7.25% | 7.14% | 7.02% | 6.78% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 45.00% | 45.00% | 45.50% | 45.50% | 46.00% | 46.00% |
| Target B <= | 14.75% | 14.75% | 14.50% | 14.50% | 14.25% | 14.25% |
| Target C <= | 6.75% | 6.75% | 6.50% | 6.50% | 6.25% | 6.25% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 223,903 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 101,276 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 34,920 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 13,987 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 333 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 496 |

**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 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 101,276 | 223,903 | 44.64% | 45.00% | 45.23% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 34,920 | 223,903 | 14.98% | 14.75% | 15.60% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 14,816 | 223,903 | 6.78% | 6.75% | 6.62% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 EDFacts 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 – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 43.50% | 44.00% | 44.50% | 45.00% | 46.00% |
| **A** | Data | 43.67% | 44.83% | 45.73% | 47.44% | 44.82% |
| **B** | Target <= | 35.00% | 34.50% | 34.50% | 34.00% | 34.00% |
| **B** | Data | 36.71% | 39.33% | 39.67% | 38.75% | 41.14% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline 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** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 47.00% | 47.00% | 47.50% | 47.50% | 48.00% | 48.00% |
| Target B <= | 38.75% | 38.75% | 38.25% | 38.25% | 37.75% | 37.75% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 0.19% | 0.19% | 0.18% | 0.18% | 0.17% | 0.17% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 4,842 | 7,659 | 940 | 13,441 |
| 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 | 1,916 | 3,650 | 501 | 6,067 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 2,078 | 2,715 | 258 | 5,051 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 154 | 233 | 57 | 444 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 15 | 10 | 0 | 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

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 | 6,067 | 13,441 | 44.82% | 47.00% | 45.14% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 5,499 | 13,441 | 41.14% | 38.75% | 40.91% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Home | 25 | 13,441 |  | 0.19% | 0.19% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State has established baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 2 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2013 | Target >= | 72.00% | 72.50% | 72.50% | 73.00% | 73.00% |
| A1 | 72.60% | Data | 85.98% | 73.24% |  |  | 25.00% |
| A2 | 2013 | Target >= | 77.00% | 78.00% | 78.00% | 78.50% | 78.50% |
| A2 | 76.25% | Data | 77.47% | 76.22% |  |  | 40.00% |
| B1 | 2013 | Target >= | 67.00% | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% |
| B1 | 66.67% | Data | 78.30% | 66.02% |  |  | 50.00% |
| B2 | 2013 | Target >= | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% | 54.00% |
| B2 | 48.25% | Data | 51.85% | 56.64% |  |  | 20.00% |
| C1 | 2013 | Target >= | 70.00% | 70.50% | 71.00% | 71.00% | 71.00% |
| C1 | 70.29% | Data | 76.17% | 52.38% |  |  | 50.00% |
| C2 | 2013 | Target >= | 59.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 61.00% | 61.00% |
| C2 | 56.00% | Data | 58.02% | 62.94% |  |  | 40.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 72.75% | 72.75% | 73.00% | 73.00% | 73.25% | 73.25% |
| Target A2 >= | 76.50% | 76.50% | 76.75% | 76.75% | 77.00% | 77.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 67.00% | 67.00% | 67.50% | 67.50% | 68.00% | 68.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 48.50% | 48.50% | 48.75% | 48.75% | 49.00% | 49.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 55.00% | 55.00% | 55.50% | 55.50% | 56.00% | 56.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 56.00% | 56.00% | 56.50% | 56.50% | 57.00% | 57.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

26

**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 | 3 | 11.54% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 12 | 46.15% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 10 | 38.46% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 3.85% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 22 | 25 | 25.00% | 72.75% | 88.00% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 11 | 26 | 40.00% | 76.50% | 42.31% | Did not meet target | No 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 | 4 | 15.38% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 7.69% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 11 | 42.31% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 6 | 23.08% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 11.54% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 17 | 23 | 50.00% | 67.00% | 73.91% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 9 | 26 | 20.00% | 48.50% | 34.62% | Did not meet target | No 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 | 4 | 15.38% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 3.85% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 9 | 34.62% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 10 | 38.46% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 7.69% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 19 | 24 | 50.00% | 55.00% | 79.17% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 12 | 26 | 40.00% | 56.00% | 46.15% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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?  | NO |

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

YES

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

Through discussions with the task force and consultation with our National Technical Assistance DaSy representative, Sharon Walsh, it was decided that NJ would utilize the Child Outcomes Summary (COS).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Rather than implementing the COS across the state at one time, NJ preferred to begin our implementation with a Pilot of ten districts in FFY 2019, as to assist in working out any difficulties prior to expanding to more districts. The Acting 619 Coordinator trained all applicable personnel in the ten districts including administration, child study team members, coaches, and teachers. In addition to the trainings, all available resources created by the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center were discussed with the participating districts, so they had multiple methods for accessing information and answering questions. The Acting 619 Coordinator also provided individual technical assistance as needed to the districts.

The data presented for FFY 2020 represents the data collected from 9 pilot districts. As a result, there were 240 students who counted as “entries” and only 26 students who were classified as “exits” during the second year of the pilot data collection. While this is not the scope that NJDOE OSE had planned on in FFY 2020, it still represents growth from the 109 students entered in FFY 2019 and only 5 students for which exit data was received.

New Jersey continues to work towards rectifying the current situation with Indicator 7, and with the support of a new Administration, it was decided to slightly shift gears towards a plan that will build our capacity to collect and report data that is representative of the entire state. We have recognized the pitfalls with the rotating cohort-based model utilized in previous years and would like to work towards full state implementation of the Child Outcomes Summary tool to collect Preschool Outcomes data.

Finally, to memorialize this data collection process, the Acting 619 Coordinator worked with the Web Development team in the Office of Information Technology to build a data system to store the Indicator 7 data. This data system now allows districts to enter their COS information in real time and additionally mitigate the errors of incomplete or duplicate records. Each year, the Part B Data Manager will pull a report from the data system which will be utilized to convert the data to complete the Indicator 7 reporting, including the summary statements .

In 2021, approximately 175 LEAs were selected to begin implementation of the COS and received training from the 619 coordinator to begin using the process and the new data collection tool. until we reach all LEAs in the state who provide preschool programming. Due to the ability to reach LEAs across the state on virtual platforms, we are confident that through live training sessions, recorded webinars, and additional COS materials provided by ECTA, we will be able to support the large number of LEAs beginning this process. By June of 2024, we anticipate all LEAs in the state to be reporting on both entry and exit data for their preschoolers. After June of 2024, all districts will be required to collect Preschool Outcomes data every year, diminishing the issues of LEAs not knowing what Cohort they are in, or forgetting the data collection process by the time it is their turn again. The plan to phase in the COS over a three-year period is a direct result of NJDOE's limited capacity to train all LEAs throughout the state at once. Also, the data collection portal needs to be tested before inundating it with data from all LEAs and this approach allows the application to be adjusted and technical issues to be addressed with a more manageable number of schools.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for A1, A1, B1, B2, and C2, but OSEP cannot accept the target for C1 because the State's end target for FFY 2025 does not reflect improvement over the State's FFY 2013 baseline data.

The State indicated in its initial SPP/APR submission in February 2022 that it was using sampling for Indicator B-7. However, when OSEP requested a copy of the State’s sampling plan prior to clarification, the State indicated during clarification that it is not sampling under this indicator. The State’s FFY 2020 data reflect outcome data for a very low number of children (26) for Indicator B-7. OSEP has concerns about whether these are representative of the State’s performance under this indicator and how they reflect the measurement for this indicator (which allows either sampling or data reported on all children).

## 7 - Required Actions

The State did not provide targets for sub-indicator C1, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

With its FFY 2021 data for this indicator, the State must provide an explanation of how its data are representative for the State and meet the measurement for this indicator as well as how the State is able to report on the performance on each LEA under this indicator.

# 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 2 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 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 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 should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting 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.

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 NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 80.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.50% | 85.50% | 86.00% | 86.00% |
| Data | 84.45% | 84.49% | 83.65% | 84.74% | 84.92% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.30% | 85.30% | 85.60% | 85.60% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10,389 | 12,344 | 84.92% | 85.00% | 84.16% | 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.**

43,574

**Percentage of respondent parents**

28.33%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 24.39% | 28.33% |

**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 6 spoken languages in addition to English in NJ including: Spanish, Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Portuguese, Korean, and Haitian.
 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. The capacity for districts to address such issues while balancing the daily protocols associated with educating students during the COVID-19 pandemic was hindered and addressed with additional TA (webinar sessions) during the summer of 2021 for selected districts in Cohort 15. The resulting increase in response rate was a positive sign that these efforts were worth revisiting with adjustments for next year.

**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.**

Response rate data is attached in the accessible Excel spreadsheet and explained below:
Line A (in gray) refers to the final Cohort 15 sample. The sample consists of parent contact information lines for which there is an address and up to two email addresses. 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.
Lines B through C (in green) look at the quality of the parent contact information and denominator reduction based on those who we know we were unable to contact. Line B1a shows the percent of the contact information lines in the Cohort that contained a Postal mailing address. The line labeled B1b assesses the final quality of the Postal mailing addresses based on the number of cases where the letters were returned as undeliverable. Among all cases, both preschool and schoolage combined, 99.93% provided an apparent Postal mailing address. Of those that provided a Postal mailing address, 3.26% were found to be invalid.
Line B2a shows the percent of the contact information lines in the Cohort that contained one or more email addresses. Overall, 86.90% of the address lines had email address information. This is an increase from last year’s 77.14%. Line B2b shows the number and percent of those sample lines where the email address information resulted in a “bounce-back”. An email bounce-back is an error message sent by a server indicating that an email could not be sent or delivered. Overall, 4.52% of the cases that provided an email address had invalid information. This is lower than last year’s 5.16%.
Line B combines the results of the Postal and email address quality check to account for 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, 0.88% of the Cohort 15 sample could not be contacted. Line C represents the remaining contact information lines in Cohort 15 that should have received a survey invitation and thus had “reasonable opportunity” to participate.
Lines D through F (in blue) account for the survey data collected. Lines D1 through D3 show the breakdown of the type of survey returned: a paper survey from the first mailing, second mailing, or a survey completed on the web. For Cohort 15, almost three-quarters of all the completed surveys were done online through the web survey (72.50%). This is similar to last year when 72.46% of the surveys were web responses and also the fourth time that the majority of surveys were done electronically as opposed to on paper.
For the past five cohorts, we collected meta-data from the devices used to complete the survey. The final breakdown of web responses was around a 67:33 split, with 67.03% of all web responses coming from a mobile device such as a tablet or smart phone while 32.86% used a desktop or laptop. This is the third year more parents completed the web survey on a mobile device and the breakdown shows an increasing trend towards the use of mobile devices. Last year, the ratio was about a 65:35 split, but with fewer mobile responses (63.83%) and more desktop/laptop responses (36.15%) than this year. Two years ago, the ratio was about a 55:45 split, with 55.31% using mobile while 43.77% used a desktop or laptop. The year before, the ratio was about a 50:50 split, and it is likely that this trend will continue. This year’s parents of preschool students showed an even greater use of mobile devices with 74.16% of their electronic responses being from a tablet or cell phone. This is compared to 66.35% of web responses from schoolage parents coming from a mobile device.
Line E shows the number of returned surveys that were declared “ineligible” based on less than 50% of the NCSEAM question set being answered (line E1) or incorrect student age for the type (schoolage or preschool) of survey used (line E2). Line F shows the number of completed surveys once the ineligible surveys are removed from the number returned. This is the eventual numerator in the response rates.
Line G shows the base response rate. It is calculated using the number of completed surveys (line F) divided by the number of cases in the final Cohort 15 sample (line A). Line G is shaded the same (in gray) as line A to show which number is being used in the denominator of the calculation. The final base response rate was 28.08%.
Line H (in green) shows an adjusted response rate that takes into account “reasonable opportunity” to participate. The denominator in the calculation comes from line C (in green) and removes the cases where all contact information was invalid. The numerator in the calculation remains the same (line F). 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 28.33%.
The response rate for the Cohort 15 survey is also affected by other external factors. Firstly, postal service remained slow due to multiple reasons including COVID-19. This affected the speed at which paper questionnaires could both be distributed and then returned in the shortened timeframe of the Cohort 15 survey. Secondly, some parents experienced confusion about whether or not they qualified for the survey due to the reference back to the already concluded 2020-2021 school year. Several parents contacted the BCSR to say that their child had graduated or they moved out of state, but after discussion about the sample year understood that the survey did apply to them.
It is also important to note that the actual survey results and final facilitation scores may be affected because of the Coronavirus-related events of 2020 and 2021. Many students experienced intermittent in-person and remote learning because of the school closures during the 2020-2021 school year, significantly impacting parents’ involvement with schools and their ability to obtain special education services for their children.
Despite these challenges, the Cohort 15 survey saw the second-fastest progression to a 20% response rate compared to any previous year. This may be attributed to parents’ preference to complete the survey online, increased engagement with electronic correspondence due to remote learning, the timing of the survey in the calendar year, or the result of a desire to express stronger feelings about special education due to the adjustments made to the 2020-2021 school year.

**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 should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

When compared to other cohorts in the 13-year history, Cohort 15 improved to be the best year for gender representation and minority representation, while primary disability was less representative than in Cohort 14. For the first time, all three areas are within the threshold (+/- 3.0%) for representativeness. Cohort 15 is the first year that minority respondents were not under-represented and were within the +/- 3.0% range (-0.16%).The primary disability numbers – learning disability (LD), emotional disability (ED), intellectual disability (ID), and all other disabilities (AO) – differ by absolute values between 0.02% and 2.50% in Cohort 15. The value with the maximum difference, -2.50%, ranks Cohort 15 as having the sixth-smallest difference from the target representation among the cohorts in the 13-year history. Using +/- 3.0% as a guideline, each disability category met the threshold for representativeness in the sample. In prior years, the greatest differences were in the LD and AO categories – reaching a high in 2011 where learning disabilities (LD) were under-represented by 6.36% and all other (AO) disabilities were over-represented by 8.76%.
In Cohort 15, the representativeness for gender ranked 1st out of the 13-year history – under-representing females by only 0.08%. This number is within the +/- 3.0% threshold for representativeness. In other years, female representation differed by absolute values ranging from 0.19% to 4.42%.
Until Cohort 15, minorities have always been under-represented, and by a notable percentage. Cohort 15 saw improved numbers with minorities only being under-represented by 0.16%. This is the best in the cohort history. The minority under-representation has ranged from 3.09% to 10.71% in other years.
While it is appropriate to compare the responding population to the target population for the cohort, it is important to remember that the target population for the Cohort is itself a sample of the State population and thus differs to some degree. We provide the additional state demographic comparison because, technically, the sample is supposed to represent the “state”, not just the cohort.? Each cohort is supposed to represent a “mini-New Jersey” as it is described to districts in the webinars, and each cohort may be a little bit off from the state numbers due to the sampling process. Additionally, the parents who respond may be demographically off from the cohort target. So, if the cohort target can be slightly off from the state, and the responding population can be off from the cohort target, it is good to look at just how far the responding population differs from the state population.
Below is an accessible table illustrating the demographic representativeness of the respondents to the parent survey:
Cohort 15 (2020-21)
Target Population Representation
Primary Disability Category
LD 32.00%
ED 3.00%
ID 3.00%
AO 62.00%
Gender Female 33.00%
Race/Ethnicity Minority 55.00%

Respondent Representation
Primary Disability
LD 29.50%
ED 3.54%
ID 3.02%
AO 63.94%
Gender Female 33.08%
Race/Ethnicity Minority 54.84%

Difference
LD -2.50%
ED 0.54%
ID 0.02%
AO 1.94%
Gender Female -0.08%
Race/Ethnicity Minority -0.16%

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

YES

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

**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 the target group.

| **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 ± 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 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)**

An error was found in the total number of respondents reported that verified the response rate as 28.33% not 28.28%

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 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 demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The representativeness of the response group is reported in the FFY 2020 data.

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted a sampling plan for this indicator, however, the attachment provided is the sampling plan for Indicator 14, Post-School Outcomes.

## 8 - Required Actions

The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator, but did not submit the sampling plan with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR. With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must submit the sampling plan used to collect the FFY 2021 data.

## 8 – Attachments



# 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, etc. 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

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

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 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, etc.) 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | NVR |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 0 | 631 | NVR | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**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.**

In FFY 2020, two (2) districts were identified for disproportionate representation. Districts identified for disproportionate representation participated in a self-assessment of policies, procedures and practices to determine if the district demonstrated noncompliance with requirements related to the identification of students with disabilities. The self-assessment was aligned with the IDEA requirements identified by the USOSEP as related to Indicators 9 and 10 and included a review of compliance indicators related to the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. As a result of the self-assessment, zero (0) LEAs had findings of noncompliance in one or more of the requirements reviewed.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Since all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories, NJ has revised its baseline using FFY 2020 data.??

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2020 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 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 618 data for FFY 2020, 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, etc. 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**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.

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 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, etc.) 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | NVR |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 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.**

74

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 44 | 0 | 581 | NVR | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**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.**

In FFY 2020, forty-four (44) districts were found to have disproportionate representation. Districts identified for disproportionate representation participated in a self-assessment of policies, procedures and practices to determine if the district demonstrated noncompliance with requirements related to the identification of students with disabilities. The self-assessment was aligned with the IDEA requirements identified by the USOSEP as related to Indicators 9 and 10 and included a review of compliance indicators related to the requirements of 34 CFR 300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.

As a result of the self-assessment, zero (0) LEAs identified noncompliance indicating that the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Since all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories, NJ has revised its baseline using FFY 2020 data.??

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2020 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 10 - Required Actions

# 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 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, etc.) 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 83.90% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 91.32% | 91.96% | 91.29% | 93.41% | 79.86% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20,017 | 18,029 | 79.86% | 100% | 90.07% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

1,988

**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 Reason 01: Incomplete Residency
Between 1-5 Days: 8
Between 6-15 Days: 14
Between 16-30 Days: 8
Between 31-60 Days: 8
Between 61-90 Days: 2
Between 91-120 Days: 1
More than 120 Days: 3
TOTAL: 44

Delay Reason 02: Additional Evaluations Needed
Between 1-5 Days: 36
Between 6-15 Days: 51
Between 16-30 Days: 36
Between 31-60 Days: 46
Between 61-90 Days: 20
Between 91-120 Days: 10
More than 120 Days: 12
TOTAL: 211

Delay Reason 03: Specialized Evaluations Needed
Between 1-5 Days: 23
Between 6-15 Days: 28
Between 16-30 Days: 30
Between 31-60 Days: 25
Between 61-90 Days: 13
Between 91-120 Days: 8
More than 120 Days: 1
TOTAL: 128

Delay Reason 06: Vacancies of Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel
Between 1-5 Days: 6
Between 6-15 Days: 10
Between 16-30 Days: 11
Between 31-60 Days: 4
Between 61-90 Days: 2
Between 91-120 Days: 1
More than 120 Days: 0
TOTAL: 34

Delay Reason 07: Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel were Unavailable
Between 1-5 Days: 69
Between 6-15 Days: 72
Between 16-30 Days: 44
Between 31-60 Days: 46
Between 61-90 Days: 9
Between 91-120 Days: 13
More than 120 Days: 4
TOTAL: 257

Delay Reason 14: Closure Due to COVID
Between 1-5 Days: 205
Between 6-15 Days: 227
Between 16-30 Days: 219
Between 31-60 Days: 258
Between 61-90 Days: 114
Between 91-120 Days: 73
More than 120 Days: 57
TOTAL: 1153

No Reason or Invalid Reason Provided:
Between 1-5 Days: 53
Between 6-15 Days: 63
Between 16-30 Days: 22
Between 31-60 Days: 16
Between 61-90 Days: 3
Between 91-120 Days: 3
More than 120 Days: 1
TOTAL: 161

TOTAL FOR ALL DELAY REASONS: 1988

**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, 2020 to June 30, 2021 as reported by districts on October 15, 2021.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,549 | 3,549 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 Memorandum 09-02, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the district level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are grouped by finding to make findings at the district level. Districts 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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**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 2020. 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. Districts 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 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 Memorandum 09-02, 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 with Indicator 11 identified in FFY 2019 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: 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 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, etc.) 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 73.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 92.05% | 91.86% | 92.04% | 81.22% | 67.48% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 2,666 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 0 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 1,775 |
| 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.  | 134 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 3 |
| 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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. | 1,775 | 2,529 | 67.48% | 100% | 70.19% | 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**

754

**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.**

Delay Reason 01: Incomplete Residency
Between 1-5 Days: 4
Between 6-15 Days: 3
Between 16-30 Days: 2
Between 31-60 Days: 5
Between 61-90 Days: 2
Between 91-120 Days:1
More than 120 Days: 1
TOTAL: 18

Delay Reason 02: Additional Evaluations Needed
Between 1-5 Days: 1
Between 6-15 Days: 0
Between 16-30 Days: 1
Between 31-60 Days: 1
Between 61-90 Days: 4
Between 91-120 Days: 0
More than 120 Days: 0
TOTAL: 7

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: 1
More than 120 Days: 0
TOTAL: 4

Delay Reason 06: Vacancies of Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel
Between 1-5 Days: 1
Between 6-15 Days:
Between 16-30 Days: 2
Between 31-60 Days:
Between 61-90 Days:
Between 91-120 Days:
More than 120 Days: 1
TOTAL: 4

Delay Reason 07: Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel were Unavailable
Between 1-5 Days: 4
Between 6-15 Days: 4
Between 16-30 Days: 5
Between 31-60 Days: 13
Between 61-90 Days: 4
Between 91-120 Days: 5
More than 120 Days: 5
TOTAL: 40

Delay Reason 14: Closure Due to COVID
Between 1-5 Days: 11
Between 6-15 Days: 16
Between 16-30 Days: 19
Between 31-60 Days: 26
Between 61-90 Days: 21
Between 91-120 Days: 11
More than 120 Days: 15
TOTAL: 119

No Delay Code or Invalid Delay Code
Between 1-5 Days: 106
Between 6-15 Days: 110
Between 16-30 Days: 117
Between 31-60 Days: 119
Between 61-90 Days: 73
Between 91-120 Days: 25
More than 120 Days: 12
TOTAL: 562

TOTAL FOR ALL DELAY REASONS: 754

**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 New Jersey Standards Measurement and Resource for Teaching (NJSMART) 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 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 905 | 905 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 Memorandum 09-02, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the district level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are grouped by finding to make findings at the district level. Districts 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. Was correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b), (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. Had developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**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 2020.

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 Memorandum 09-02, 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 with Indicator 12 identified in FFY 2019 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# 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 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, etc.) 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 90.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 75.29% | 80.14% | 98.72% | 92.81% | 90.10% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 234 | 252 | 90.10% | 100% | 92.86% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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 a targeted review process. Each year, a sample of districts and charter schools, where students ages 16 and above are enrolled, is selected to participate in the transition targeted review. During FFY 2020, thirty-four (34) districts/charter schools with students aged 16 and above were selected to participate in the targeted review. A sample of student files was collected from each district/charter school 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 districts/charter schools in the cohort.

A report of results, including findings of noncompliance, as needed, was issued to each of the districts/charter schools participating in the targeted review. Noncompliance was found in four (4) districts/charter schools. Districts/charter schools are required to develop corrective action plans to address the noncompliance and to correct it as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of the report.

To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors will conduct desk audits and onsite visits in each district/charter school with a finding of noncompliance to ensure each district:

- is correctly implementing the specific relevant regulatory requirements by reviewing updated subsequent data for a period of time, based on
 the level of noncompliance, that demonstrate 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements; and

- has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction, by reviewing a sample of the files found to have noncompliance.

| **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 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 31 | 31 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 Memorandum 09-02, NJDOE aggregates all available data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the district level to determine which districts/charter schools demonstrate noncompliance and ensure that the all instances of noncompliance are addressed. Individual instances of noncompliance are grouped by requirement to make findings at the district/charter school level. Districts/charter schools 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 audits and onsite visits that each district/charter schools with a finding of noncompliance:

1. Is correctly implementing the specific relevant regulatory requirements by reviewing updated subsequent data for a period of time, based on the level of noncompliance, that demonstrate compliance; and
2. Has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction by reviewing a sample of the files found to have noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

Districts/charter schools where noncompliance was identified related to Indicator 13 were required to correct the noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case not later than one year from identification in accordance with the USOSEP memo 09-02. Each district/charter school with a finding of noncompliance for this indicator was required to either review and revise its procedures, including procedures for transition assessment, review and revise its IEP form, conduct staff training regarding transition procedures, and review and revise IEPs of students whose IEPs were determined to be noncompliant. NJDOE reviewed procedures, all or a sample of the revised files in each district/charter, and files of students whose IEPs were developed subsequent to the monitoring, to verify the correction of each individual case of noncompliance.

Districts/charters were also required to submit updated subsequent data such as IEPs and/or other documentation generated for students subsequent to the date of their targeted review report to demonstrate current implementation of the requirements at 100% compliance. Districts/charters where oversight was a root cause of noncompliance were also required to implement a system of oversight to ensure compliant implementation of the specific regulatory requirements.

To verify correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, 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 with Indicator 13 identified in FFY 2019 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# 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 = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] 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 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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, etc.).

**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 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 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 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 should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 46.50% | 47.00% | 47.00% | 47.50% | 48.00% |
| A | 45.00% | Data | 53.26% | 52.50% | 52.20% | 47.67% | 51.93% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 75.50% | 75.50% | 76.00% | 76.00% | 77.00% |
| B | 74.00% | Data | 82.32% | 80.53% | 83.67% | 78.57% | 80.12% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 86.00% | 86.50% | 86.50% | 86.50% | 87.00% |
| C | 84.00% | Data | 89.57% | 88.80% | 89.55% | 86.92% | 87.15% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 48.00% | 48.00% | 48.50% | 48.50% | 49.00% | 49.00% |
| Target B >= | 74.00% | 74.00% | 74.50% | 74.50% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| Target C >= | 87.00% | 87.00% | 87.50% | 87.50% | 88.00% | 88.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 2,504 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 1,737 |
| Response Rate | 69.37% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 861 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 499 |
| 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) | 49 |
| 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). | 67 |

| **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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 861 | 1,737 | 51.93% | 48.00% | 49.57% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 1,360 | 1,737 | 80.12% | 74.00% | 78.30% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 1,476 | 1,737 | 87.15% | 87.00% | 84.97% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **C** | The decrease in the percentage for Indicator 14C may be due to the challenges facing employment settings that have had some closures, reduced or hybrid schedules, and other adjustments due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on these employment settings.  |

**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** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 76.08% | 69.37% |

**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. Timelines and deadlines had to be adjusted due to complications from the COVID-19 pandemic. Although many schools were providing some form of in-person instruction, it was still an atypical year and the demands on NJ districts were high. Daily protocols, monitoring of student and staff exposure to the virus and modified scheduling all had a negative affect on districts' capacity to follow-up with requests for data. For FFY 2021, timelines for data collection were more typical with follow-up TA sessions provided to districts who needed additional assistance. The Bloustein Center at Rutgers University 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.

**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.**

From the analysis provided by the Bloustein Center, nonresponse bias was not identified as an issue with this year's data.

**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.**

Representativeness: Using the NPSO Response Calculator (see attached) NJOSE calculated the representativeness of respondents to all student exiters from Cohort IV districts (from the 2018-2019 school year). Representativeness is calculated for each demographic category by subtracting the percentage of respondents from the percentage of all student exiters in Cohort IV for each category. A difference of ±3% is considered a statistical difference.

Comparison of Representativeness: Student exiters who responded to the survey were representative of all student exiters from 2018-2019 for all categories of disability, gender and students in separate, out of district placements.

For accessibility purposes, the NPSO Response Calculator re: Representativeness (see Definition above) has been recreated below rather than attached:
1) Target Lever Totals
Overall 2504
LD 1103
ED 150
CI 68
AO 1183
Female 847
Minority 1142
Out of District 101
Dropout 64
Abbott 260

2) Response Totals
Overall 1737
LD 762
ED 100
CI 43
AO 832
Female 586
Minority 749
OOD 63
Dropout 17
Abbott 165

3) Target Lever Representation
LD 44.05%
ED 5.99%
CI 2.72%
AO 47.24%
Female 33.83%
Minority 45.61%
OOD 4.03%
Dropout 2.56%
Abbott 10.38%

4) Respondent Representation
LD 43.87%
ED 5.76%
CI 2.48%
AO 47.90%
Female 33.74%
Minority 43.12%
OOD 3.63%
Dropout 0.98%
Abbott 9.50%

5) Difference
LD -0.18%
ED - 0.23%
CI - 0.24%
AO 0.65%
Female -0.09%
Minority -2.49%
OOD -0.41%
Dropout -1.58%
Abbott -0.88%

Note: positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation. Discrepancies in the proportion of responders was within the +/-3% acceptable range for all categories.

We encourage users to also read the Westat/NPSO paper Post-School Outcomes: Response Rates and Non-response Bias, found at https://transitionta.org/wp-content/uploads/docs/ResponseRatesandNonresponseBias.pdf

**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)**

YES

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

**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. None of the proportions analyzed exceeded this threshold.

| **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 yars 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?  | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR**

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP will follow up with the State under separate cover regarding the submission.

## 14 - Required Actions

# 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**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**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 baseline 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 114 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 17 |

**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 NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 77.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 57.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 75.00% |
| Data | 100.00% | 71.43% | 77.78% | 93.75% | 30.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 77.00% | 77.00% | 77.25% | 77.25% | 77.50% | 77.50% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17 | 114 | 30.00% | 77.00% | 14.91% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The State’s failure to meet its target for this Indicator is likely due to the COVID-19 global pandemic. As part of the State’s response efforts, the Governor signed several executive orders to prevent and mitigate the spread of the virus. Specifically, Executive Order No. 104 (Murphy, 2020) signed on March 16, 2020 ordered the closure of all public and private school buildings and the suspension of in-person instruction and services. Subsequent Executive Orders, as well as the continued spread of the virus throughout the State, resulted in the delivery of remote and virtual instruction for the 2020-2021 school year. As a result, districts and parents of students with disabilities were precluded from holding in-person resolution sessions. Even though districts were encouraged to offer and hold virtual resolution sessions with parents/guardians of students with disabilities, the number of agreements resulting from resolution sessions is below the target.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**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 baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 450 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 46 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 64 |

**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 NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 38.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 38.50% | 38.50% | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.50% |
| Data | 33.16% | 35.63% | 38.86% | 37.91% | 30.09% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.25% | 38.25% | 38.50% | 38.50% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 46 | 64 | 450 | 30.09% | 38.00% | 24.44% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The State’s failure to meet its target for this Indicator is likely due to the COVID-19 global pandemic. As part of the State’s response efforts, the Governor signed several executive orders to prevent and mitigate the spread of the virus. Specifically, Executive Order No. 104 (Murphy, 2020) signed on March 16, 2020 ordered the closure of all public and private school buildings and the suspension of in-person instruction and services. Subsequent Executive Orders, as well as the continued spread of the virus throughout the State, resulted in the delivery of remote and virtual instruction for the FFY2020. As a result, districts and parents of students with disabilities were precluded from holding in-person special education mediation conferences. Despite conducting virtual special education mediation conferences, the number of agreements resulting from mediation conferences, is below the target.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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) 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 2, 2022, 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) for 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, is 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, is 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 SPP/APR, 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., Feb 2021). 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 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

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 (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., 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 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) 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)?**

SIMR from FFY 2013-FFY 2020:
From FFY 2013-FFY 2019, the SiMR has been, without revision, the following: New Jersey will improve the five-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) for students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) from a baseline of 80% to 85%. The original goal was to reach 85% in FFY 2018 and this SIMR was extended to become the target for FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 with the decision made to revise the SSIP and SIMR in August of 2021.

Proposed SIMR FFY 2021:
By utilizing targeted and comprehensive school data and the Implementation Science framework to identify schools, New Jersey will establish literacy "Transformation Zones" that receive intensive coaching and support in early reading. By 2027, New Jersey will increase the percentage of students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone schools who score at or above benchmark on a district-selected literacy assessment tool by a minimum of 10% (compared to baseline) by the end of their third grade year. At this time, since districts have not been selected nor baseline data has been established, this SiMR will need to be refined as NJ completes Phase I and enters Phase II of the SSIP. The timeline for this work is outlined in the sections that follow.

**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)**

NO

**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 proposed Theory of Action for FFY 2021 is described below:
1. By using SISEP’s implementation science framework to structure the work, and the NJTSS resources and menus of evidence-based assessment and interventions, SEA capacity will be increased to provide K-3 literacy supports to schools within the Literacy Transformation Zone.

2. By providing support and coaching to districts in the Literacy Transformation Zone, the SEA will impact each LEA by assisting in the development of:
a. evidence-based benchmark assessment practices;
b. the use of evidence-based screening and identification processes;
c. building capacity for an NJTSS-ER structure of interventions; and
d. the use of appropriate evidence-based reading intervention developed as part of the NJTSS-ER framework to address the reading needs of students.

3. These changes at the LEA and school level will lead to classroom improvement in:
a. Standards-based literacy instruction
b. Implementation of evidence-based interventions matched to student need(s)
c. Goal setting and progress monitoring

4. These classroom-level changes will lead to:
a. An increase in individualized instruction and student growth in the area of literacy
b. An increase in the number of students with disabilities with access to quality, evidence-based instruction in reading
c. An increase in the number of students with disabilities who perform at or above benchmark at the end of the third grade within the Literacy Transformation Zone (SiMR)

5. Scaling up of these practices will eventually lead to statewide gains in third grade reading achievement proficiency for students with disabilities.

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

The FFY 2013-2020 Theory of Action is not attached because Indicator 17 did not have a drop down selection to allow for the uploading of documents. The FFY 2021 Theory of Action is summarized above and represents a complete shift in focus from graduation rate to early literacy.

**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.**

As previously described, NJDOE is currently transitioning towards focusing on a different SiMR, a different set of coordinated activities, and a new SSIP with a different theory of action. Rationale for this change has been presented in preceding sections along with justification including stakeholder input, data analysis, and cross-divisional activities facilitated by the SISEP Center.

**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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 80.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Federal 5-Year Graduates** | **Adjusted 5 Year Cohort Count** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| \*[[2]](#footnote-3)1 | 18,433 | 83.20% | 85.00% | 82.50%2 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Student data are collected annually, for all students who exit high school, through the New Jersey Standards Measurement Resource for Teaching (NJSMART) data collection system.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

The five-year rate is the number of students in a cohort who graduated within five years (i.e., those students receiving a regular diploma) by the total number of first-time ninth graders who entered the cohort five years earlier. The five-year rate was selected after analyzing data and determining that the vast majority of students with IEPs graduate within 5 years of entering high school. Focusing on this rate accounts for variation in learning rates that result in an extra year of study to meet state and local graduation requirements and receive a regular diploma. The calculation is included below:
5 Year Cohort Graduates in Year X divided by
 [First Time 9th graders in year X-5] + [Transfers in] – [Verified Transfers out]-[Excluded from cohort]\*
\*(Exclusions are aligned with federal requirements.)

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Since the coherent strategies and activities identified through the Theory of Action look to address student discipline and student engagement in post-secondary transition (ie: PBIS and CBI), the other additional data point that the OSE considers in measuring progress towards the SSIP is dropout. The dropout rate for students with IEPs decreased from 10.28% in FFY 2019 to 8.38% in FFY 2020. The baseline dropout rate from FFY 2011 was 15.36%.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that 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.**

As NJ has entered Phase I of the development of a new SSIP and SiMR, the evaluation plan presented below is intended to provide information on the “outgoing” SSIP and SiMR:

New Jersey Tiered System of Supports (NJTSS)
Evaluation questions for NJTSS, aligned with the theory of action and the NJTSS-ER grant, include the following:
• To what extent have schools implemented a multi-tiered system of early reading support?
• What is the early reading performance of students in schools receiving support in the implementation of NJTSS-ER?
The measures used to answer these questions include:
• Use of the Screening Mapping Tool
• The Screening Tools Quality Evaluation Rubric
• Mid-Year Reflection Evaluation
• Core Instruction Analysis Tool
• Classroom Observation Checklist
• District Year-End Action Plan

Community Based Instruction: (CBI)
Evaluation questions for Community Based Instruction include the following:
• To what extent were more students educated in the Least Restrictive Environment (CBI for targeted students) while preparing to transition to post-secondary life?
The measures used to answer this question were:
• Quality Benchmark and Fidelity Measurement of Community-based Instruction (CBI) Program Rating Form
• Participation rates for students enrolled in CBI programs
• Comparison of CBI program capacity from last year to this year

Universal Design for Learning: (UDL)
Evaluation questions for Universal Design for Learning include the following:
• To what extent did the NJDOE enhance educators’ knowledge of UDL principles and strategies for embedding them in instruction?
• To what extent did the NJDOE increase resources for New Jersey educators regarding UDL?
• To what extent did professional development in UDL result in increased levels of engagement in the classroom?
The measures used to answer these questions include:
• Collection of number of UDL overview sessions and number of participants;
• Evaluation of overview sessions by participants; and
• UDL Classroom Walkthrough Tool.

Positive Behavior Supports in Schools (PBSIS):
Evaluation questions for PBSIS include the following:
• To what extent was staff capacity for implementing whole school, whole class, and individualized behavioral interventions increased?
• To what extent did implementation of the three-tiered approach to behavior result in a reduction of negative classroom behaviors (as measured by office conduct referrals, or OCRs) for all students and for students with disabilities?
• Did implementation result in a reduction of suspensions for all students and for students with disabilities?
• Did implementation of PBSIS result in an increased level of engagement in the students’ educational experience and instruction?
The measures used to answer these questions include:
• Collection of the number of days suspended, all students and students with disabilities;
• Collection of the number of office conduct referrals, all students and students with disabilities; and
• Benchmarks of Quality Fidelity Tool.
Data is collected from multiple cohorts of schools participating in PBSIS initiative.

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Implementation of federal and state laws which require that states provide a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities is overseen by two offices within the Division of Educational Services at the NJDOE. The Office of Special Education is primarily responsible for professional development and technical assistance to school districts and parents as well as governance, mediation, due process, and complaint investigation. The Office of Policy and Dispute Resolution was merged with the Office of Special Education to improve collaboration and communication between the oversight of districts and the programmatic support provided to LEAs and families. The Office of Fiscal and Data Services (OFDS) provides grant management, fiscal oversight, and data analyses. The Offices work closely together, and in collaboration with offices throughout the Department, to ensure the needs of students with disabilities are considered in all NJDOE activities and projects. The responsibility for overseeing the SPP/APR and SSIP is currently with the Director and Assistant Director of the Office of Special Education with data and direct support provided by the OFDS as well. Newly hired staff including a Learning Strategies Specialist and Stakeholder Engagement/Federal Reporting Specialist are currently learning the SPP/APR and SSIP process towards increased responsibility for coordinating and aligning all activities within the Office of Special Education

The Office of Special Education is housed within the reorganized Division of Educational Services under the direction of Assistant Commissioner, Kathy Ehling. The Office of Special Education, under the leadership of Kim Murray, continues to be involved in coordinated efforts with other divisions around early childhood education, deaf education, post-secondary transition, autism, school climate improvement, addressing the issue of equity in our schools, and school-based mental health.

The Office of Supplemental Education Programs (Titles I, IV, III, III Immigrant, IV, Migrant Education and McKinney-Vento) remains within the Division of Educational Services and is involved in all Division meetings and planning activities. In overseeing the implementation, tracking, and reporting of NDOE’s ESSA plan activities, this office has been an important part of coordinating projects and aligning efforts across offices and divisions.

The Office of Comprehensive Support (OCS) in the Division of Field Services continues to provide support to schools identified as in need of comprehensive or targeted support under the ESSA. Support for students with IEPs in these schools continues to be a collaborative effort between the OSE and the OCS.

Also, in response to COVID-19, over 4 billion dollars in Federal ESSER funds flowed through the NJDOE and into LEAs throughout New Jersey. The Division of Educational Services provided technical assistance sessions throughout 2021 to support schools in identifying and selecting effective interventions and uses for the funds they received. Specific allocations were set aside for addressing disrupted learning and the mental health needs of students as a result of the pandemic. A Learning Acceleration Guide was developed by the Office of Standards to assist schools in assessing student performance to prioritize needs and address the effects of disrupted learning as a result of COVID-19.

As previously mentioned, the SISEP Center has been working with a group of representatives from a cross-section of offices across the NJDOE to build internal capacity to use the Implementation Science framework in order to address student needs in a manner that is coordinated and systemic in nature.

**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.**

Outside of the previously described alignment document created through working with the SISEP Center, the NJDOE has not conducted a formal evaluation of these organizational infrastructure changes. In the future, the following forms of evaluation may be considered:
• Utilizing the current work SISEP NJDOE team to develop internal methods of infrastructure evaluation and evaluation of collaborative projects
• Use data received from LEAs regarding use of ESSER (I, II, and III) funds to determine the impact of cross-office technical assistance and training
• Internal evaluation surveys re: inter-departmental collaborative projects
• The use of other informal, qualitative data gathering through NJDOE Division of Educational Services at division-wide articulation meetings

**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*.***

The restructuring of the office as well as the hiring of four new specialists to provide and coordinate technical assistance to schools included the following:
• An Autism Specialist to provide technical assistance to LEAs re: the inclusion of students with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) in general education settings as well as appropriate use of evidence-based interventions to address the needs of students with ASD;
• A Learning Strategies Specialist who is co-leading the SISEP NJDOE collaborative work, providing TA re: inclusive teaching strategies and early literacy;
• A Stakeholder Engagement Specialist to coordinate and collect data re: stakeholder involvement in OSE initiatives as well as oversee the SPP/APR reporting; and
• A Mental Health Specialist to provide additional TA and support to districts using the NJ Comprehensive School Mental Health Resource Guide as the foundation for the development of additional resources and training.

Over twelve TA sessions were held in the Fall of 2021 to provide information and support to districts around the appropriate use of ESSER funds to address the needs of students as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

In collaboration with the SISEP Center, the SISEP NJDOE Team completed the following activities related to infrastructure improvement:
• Analyzed the needs of New Jersey’s targeted support and comprehensive support schools to prioritize areas of improvement aligned to SPP/APR indicators. Selected the improvement of grade K-3 literacy resulting in improved proficiency scores at the end of grade 3 for students with disabilities.
• Examined data to identify districts of need which will lead to the selection of schools to participate in the Literacy Transformation Zone.
• Developed the State Management Team (SMT) and the State Implementation Team (SIT) to coordinate the activities of the SISEP NJDOE Team.
• Created an alignment map of NJDOE initiatives related to increasing literacy proficiency for K-3 students.
• Developed the Terms of Reference (TOR) which is an internal memorandum of understanding to document the agreed upon ways of work for the SMT and SIT. The TOR includes the Communication Protocol, a written document that the outlines the processes for?communicating to internal and external groups/teams whose work would be impacted by the selection and use of the effort and its practices/programs.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Currently, the SISEP NJDOE team are engaging in the following steps towards infrastructure improvement related to the FFY 2021 SiMR and SSIP:
• Training for the State Implementation Team (SIT) on the science of reading and early literacy in order to increase NJDOE capacity to understand literacy interventions and strategies.
• Identification of stakeholders and literacy experts to support the initiative and provide feedback.
• Outlining the structure and nature of the stakeholder engagement activities towards meaningful and relevant feedback and coordination of activities.
• Continuing the selection process to identify a first cohort of schools for the Literacy Transformation Zone
• Moving the implementation science process from the “Exploration Phase” towards the “Installation Phase” and the SSIP from Phase I (ongoing) towards Phase II.
Additional supports for districts to assist them in disrupting the disruptions to instruction throughout the two years of the COVID-19 pandemic are also planned. User-friendly tools to accompany the Learning Acceleration Guide are in development at the time of this report.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

• New Jersey Tiered Systems of Support (NJTSS)
• Community-Based Instruction (CBI)
• New Jersey Positive Behavior Support in Schools (NJPBSIS)
• Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

New Jersey Tiered Systems of Support (NJTSS) is a framework that supports the systematic development of an effective 3 tiered instructional model that utilizes universal screenings, data analysis, and progress monitoring to provide a continuum of supports and interventions to all students. While early reading is the focus of the SPDG that funds the project, the resources and evidence-based practices identified and utilized through the grant are available to all schools and can impact high schools seeking to improve upon the array of supports provided to all students.

Community-Based Instruction (CBI) is an evidence-based instructional practice that involves sustained and repeated instruction that is conducted outside of school property, in the student’s community. It teaches relevant knowledge tied to the NJ Student Learning Standards (NJSLS) and skills needed for competitive, integrated employment. CBI focuses on the following content areas: community living, recreation, career awareness, and career exploration.

New Jersey Positive Behavior Support in Schools (NJPBSIS) provides training and technical assistance in universal (schoolwide) interventions, secondary interventions for students with repeated challenging behaviors, and tertiary interventions for students with more intense behavioral needs. Evidence-based practices are incorporated into each intervention tier. The training and technical assistance is provided to cohort schools over a multi-year period.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) trainings and technical assistance continue to focus on student engagement to support teachers in the planning and implementation of the NJSLS. Due to changing staff responsibilities, UDL trainings became part of the MOU with Montclair State University to promote inclusive education practices in NJ.

**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.**

During this reporting period, NJTSS support focused on: (a) administering and analyzing early reading universal screening and diagnostic assessments; (b) making adaptations to assessment protocols to accommodate hybrid/distal conditions during the pandemic; (c) analyzing student data relative to core reading program components and providing supplements when needed; and (d) making adjustments to small-group differentiation and interventions.
In addition, the state-level coaches worked on developing tools and resources to (a) guide and document districts’ implementation of MTSS in remote/hybrid learning environments and (b) promote sustainability of NJTSS-ER implementation. These tools and resources were instrumental for structuring implementation and building the capacity of site personnel across the state. In addition, biweekly leadership team meetings continued to be conducted by project leaders to assess progress, refine project planning, and brainstorm solutions to challenges. Through these meetings, the NJDOE and project leadership continued to gather input to build capacity for implementation in alignment with supports provided across NJDOE divisions to districts statewide.
Workshop and webinar-based professional development continued for district teams to provide training in MTSS components as well as to build capacity, especially with respect to utilizing student benchmark data and diagnostic skill assessments, refining tier 1 instruction and interventions, and adjusting assessments and instruction/ intervention to accommodate hybrid or remote learning conditions during the pandemic.
In addition, state-level coaches met bi-weekly with school leadership teams and internal district coaches to provide support with using diagnostic skills-specific assessment data to guide instruction/intervention grouping, analyzing core reading program components and providing supplements when needed, and integrating key components for effective intervention implementation. The state-level coaches worked with local district coaches and their site leaders to increase their capacity to support others in their district in implementing NJTSS-ER components and to help them make adjustment as needed to accommodate learning conditions during the pandemic.
The Dumont School District Advisory Committee also continued to provide input about the development, refinement, social validity, and application of tools and protocols for job-embedded support for school personnel.
Despite challenges in implementing NJTSS-ER in a variety of learning environments during the pandemic, students’ exhibited performance increases during this reporting period.
The NJTSS-ER Project has continued to bring together multiple stakeholders at the school, district, and state levels through leadership teams to analyze data and align resources and instruction and interventions planning.
Ongoing professional development conducted by Rutgers and NJDOE project personnel has also continued to result in increased knowledge and capacity of state-level staff.
School leadership team members have continued to increase skills, especially in the areas of utilizing of diagnostic skill inventories for instructional grouping, selecting appropriate interventions, and scheduling and resource allocation.
In response to the pandemic, the NJTSS-ER team produced resources for the NJDOE website and accompanying webinars to support districts/schools statewide in making adjustments to data-driven early reading supports to address learning loss and accommodate distance/remote learning conditions.
Implementation and process data gathered through this SPDG project has also been used during this reporting period to inform proposed adjustments to New Jersey’s Administrative Code Chapter 16 to incorporate new Intervention and Referral Services (I&RS) guidelines.
Overall, it is clear that the activities of the NJTSS-ER project are more closely tied to the proposed SiMR than the SiMR from FFY 2013-20.
Community-based instruction programming was aligned to the SiMR because the implementation of high-quality CBI programming is associated with positive post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. While no direct measure of impact between the CBI programming and the 5-year ACGR was established, both introductory and advanced topic training and technical assistance was provided to over 93 schools interested in improving or developing CBI programming. TA was provided through asynchronous and synchronous learning modules as well as a newly-developed and evolving community of practice model that was created as a response to the changing needs of CBI-implementing schools resulting from disruptions and challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite the pandemic, 62.5% of participating schools reported some progress towards achieving programmatic SMART goals, 25% of schools reported significant progress, and only 12.5% of schools reported little progress. No schools reported “no progress.”
NJPBIS continued its work to address the disproportionate number of students with disabilities who are suspended or removed from the classroom for disciplinary reasons throughout the state of NJ. The original connection to the SiMR was based upon the logic that if more students were engaged in classroom instruction, universal prevention practices in place for behavioral and instructional practices, and data-based decision making was in place to determine students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports, then students with disabilities would be less likely to dropout from school. Although several high schools participate in the network of implementing schools throughout NJ, data was not collected around the correlation between the activities of NJPBSIS and the ACGR. That being said, the program continued with another cohort of training schools (Cohort 14) to build capacity toward implementation of a 3-tiered system of intervention to reduce school suspensions and discipline referrals. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and hybrid scheduling, NJPBSIS continued to support schools through synchronous and asynchronous online modules and both in-person and remote meeting with school implementation teams to assist with the application of concepts presented in the online modules.
Cohort 14 (25 schools) began training in universal intervention and prevention practices, Cohort 13 (18 schools) continued training by beginning capacity building for Tier 2 intervention and Cohort 12 (22 schools) were trained in the development of Tier 3 supports. In addition to the ongoing training and support of 3 cohorts of schools, contacts to maintenance schools for universal tier implementation totaled 1,053 and included emails (924), telephone calls (21) and remote meetings (108), for a total of 219 hours. Contacts to maintenance schools for advanced tier implementation totaled 161 and included emails (135), telephone calls (1), and remote meetings (25) for a total of 41 hours.
As reported above, a direct connection between the following activities and the 5-year ACGR is not present in the current SIMR. Activities continued with NJDOE OSE MOU partners at Montclair State University as a portion of the work completed by the NJ Inclusive Education Technical Assistance (NJIETA) Project. A five-part “UDL for pre-K” and 5-part “UDL for K-12” set of learning modules were updated respectively and provided to schools in the technical assistance program. Data was collected on 45 educators who participated in the UDL for pre-K TA package and feedback was analyzed to determine the 82.7% of participants surveyed reported they would use the UDL strategies covered in the TA package. For the K-12 UDL TA package, 47 participants were surveyed and 89% reported that they would use the strategies learned. In addition to these TA packages (a statewide Tier 2 support) a UDL webinar was created and posted for universal statewide access on the NJIETA website.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Although projects related to the SiMR are tangentially related to the ACGR, one result of the SSIP work completed over the past several years is the requirement of fidelity measures in each new or existing project supported by the NJDOE through a MOU or grant funding.

NJTSS collects fidelity data on the implementation of RTI Essential Components as part of one of the performance measures of the SPDG. For FFY 2020, 79% of schools in Cohort 1 and 86% of schools in Cohort 2 were rating implementation high enough on the RTI Essential Components Worksheet to be considered implementing RTI with fidelity.

NJPBSIS fidelity data is collected by the Benchmarks of Quality pre-implementation and after each subsequent year or training and implementation. 59 schools reported Benchmarks of Quality data with 81% of the responding schools implementing at or above the required score of 70% to be considered “in-place” across all benchmarks. In other words, 81% of responding schools could be considered implementing the core components of PBIS with fidelity.

CBI developed a quality indicator tool to measure the fidelity of implementation based on the core practices associated with high quality CBI. Data was collected from 19 schools implementing CBI to provide a baseline for this measure in its first year of use. Fidelity of CBI practices fell into three categories: Low (0-29% fidelity), Medium (30-69%), or High (70-100%). Overall, 58% of the 19 schools reported implementation within the medium range while 42% were found to be in the low range. Challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic were cited for the lack of high implementors.

NJIETA (UDL TA providers) developed inclusion quality indicators that have, as a subset of domains, high quality instruction using the principles of UDL. Baseline data is being collected with participating schools during the 2021-22 school year.

**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.**

Below is a list of the outcome measures that were identified for each improvement practice:
NJTSS:
End of school year data for 2020-21 Cohort 3 schools including the following results:
• Increased use of Screening Tools
• Increased quality of screening tools as measured by a quality evaluation rubric

For CBI:
• % of participants that increased the number of students participating and/or number of sites was not able to be calculated because community-based sites were closed from March-June due to COVID-19

For NJPBSIS\*:
• The three-year average number of office conduct referrals per day per 100 students for all students decreased from 0.73 to 0.12 (n= 22, measured across cohorts)
• The three-year average number of Out-of-School Suspensions per day per 100 students for all students decreased from 0.09 to 0.06 (n=22, measured across cohorts)
• The three-year average number of office conduct referrals per day per 100 students for students with IEPs decreased from 24.43 to 13.99 (n= 22, measured across cohorts)
• The three-year average number of Out-of-School Suspensions per day per 100 students for all students decreased from 3.72 to 2.29 (n=22, measured across cohorts)
\*Data limitations: Only 22 schools provided data all three years of implementation.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

All four activities will continue to address student and district needs as the NJDOE transitions to the new SSIP Phase I activities. The only difference is that the only activity that will be connected or coordinated with the SSIP will be the NJTSS-ER program.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The NJ Office of Special Education (NJOSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC). The meeting allows for the following:
• the Director of the Office of Special Education to provide updates to members regarding office activities, resources, and progress towards goals,
• the group to discuss and provide input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives,
• the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
• the group to discuss SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.
In previous years, stakeholder meetings took place twice per year during a regularly scheduled SSEAC meeting. Beginning with the January 21, 2021 SSEAC meeting, clusters of SPP/APR indicator data were presented to stakeholders each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets was also collected. For each monthly discussion, stakeholders, along with staff from NJDOE, accomplished the following:
• reviewed current data;
• discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
• collected input regarding improvement activities;
• received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
• engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder meeting:
• Family Voices
• SPAN – The Statewide Parent Advocacy Network
• Dumont Public Schools
• The State Special Education Advisory Council
• New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
• Montclair State University
• Special Olympics New Jersey
• The ARC of New Jersey
• NJ Association of School Psychologists
• NJ Juvenile Justice Commission
• Edgewater Park Public Schools
• Westbridge Academy
• The BOGGS Center – Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
• Advancing Opportunities
• AIM Institute of Research and Learning
• Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens with Disabilities
• Ramapo College of New Jersey
• New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
• Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
• New Jersey City University
• The Search Day Program
• New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association
• ASAH an association representing private schools for students with disabilities
• NJ Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
The COVID-19 pandemic presented a unique opportunity to engage stakeholders remotely through videoconferencing and focused on specific issues related to the changes in New Jersey’s educational practices. Stakeholder and SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2020-21 school year because feedback from members suggested that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state.

Please see previous section re: stakeholder input into changes in the SSIP/SiMR.

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

All four projects have included, as part of the activity plan for each project, a method for engaging stakeholders as a component of their work. NJTSS consults with Dumont Schools as well as collaborating with SPAN in order to engage parents in 15 schools who are participating in the project. NJPBSIS has developed a small advisory group to inform programmatic decisions and provide input into resources and materials developed by the project. CBI created communities of practice to bring together implementers and assist with meeting district and student needs. NJIETA created the Inclusive Leadership Development Group (ILDG) and is currently working to develop a charter with an effective plan to use stakeholder engagement to promote inclusive practices throughout NJ.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

In brief, the concerns expressed by stakeholders re: the lack of connection between the four identified evidence-based practices and the 5-year ACGR was addressed by completely revising the SSIP and selecting a new focus for the SiMR.

**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.**

Plans for the coordination of efforts across offices are still being mapped out through the SISEP NJDOE team with facilitation and guidance from the SISEP Center. Immediate plans are outlined in the section above.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

While the activities of the NJTSS project are going to be included in, and related to the revised SiMR and SSIP, the activities of the other three programs will continue to be monitored using established outcome data related to the anticipated effects of each project (i.e. discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions for NJPBSIS). For anticipated next steps in the Phase I of the revised SSIP, please see the narrative responses in the preceding sections.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

At this time, the challenge with the revision of the SSIP and establishment of a new SiMR is to ensure connection and collaboration across the offices participating in the SISEP consultation work. Anticipated barriers are the contextual barriers that will be encountered once schools have been identified and the work begins in the Literacy Transformation Zone.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

NOTE: A copy of the Theory of Action for Indicator 17 was not able to be uploaded (see Link to Theory of Action) because there was not an option in the dropdown menu in the uploads/reports section of the portal to upload documents to indicator 17.

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 17 - Required Actions

# 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:**

Kim Murray

**Title:**

 Director, Office of Special Education

**Email:**

kimberly.murray@doe.nj.gov

**Phone:**

6093763766

**Submitted on:**

04/28/22 3:42:27 PM

# ED Attachments



1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)