

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

New Jersey



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

- Introduction;
- baseline data for Indicators 1 through 17;
- targets for Indicators 1 through 16 for each year reflected in the SPP;
- data from FFY 2021;
- 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 2021 target;
- specific content describing the completion of Phase I activities of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as required by Indicator 17, as well as any updates to previous Phase I submissions and remaining planned activities for Phase II, and;
- information to address any actions required by OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

658

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.

Please see attached narrative.

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 New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities

- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

8

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. Eight out of the fifteen members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC) identify as a parent of a child with a disability. The advisory panel consists of members who are representative of the State's population and who are involved in, or concerned with, the education of children with disabilities, including: (i) parents of children with disabilities; (ii) individuals with disabilities; (iii) teachers; (iv) representatives of institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel; (v) State and local education officials; (vi) administrators of programs for children with disabilities; (vii) representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities;

(viii) representatives of private schools and public charter schools; (ix) at least one representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; and (x) representatives from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, these members are representative across the three primary regions of New Jersey.

Beginning in January of 2022, 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.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

In April 2022, the OSE conducted a survey of the active SSEAC members to update and ensure demographic representation across: regions of the state, roles within school districts, parent/family status, racial/ethnic groups, gender, LEA type, disability status, and advocacy group. This matrix is going to inform future applications and appointments to the SSEAC. 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 are identified, the OSE intends to engage professional organizations and advocacy groups to increase awareness of opportunities for stakeholder participation and to encourage participation. The OSE's Federal Reporting and Stakeholder Engagement Specialist took the lead in organizing and enhancing SSEAC meetings and stakeholder activities.

At the conclusion of the council year, resources from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) and State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) in June of 2022 were used, to administer the Agency Capacity Assessment/State Capacity Assessment (ACA/SCA). This evidence-based tool was used to "assess the impact and presence of efforts to build strong foundations needed to adopt, sustain and scaled effective practices to which an agency invests in and aligns system components to support use of best practices, which includes support and development of implementation teams within and across all levels of the system." NJ-SSEAC members completed a survey designed to gather feedback on leadership, infrastructure, resources, communication, and engagement. The OSE utilized these resources prior to the relaunch of the NJ-SSEAC council in September of 2022, to ensure that activities to support areas of continued strength and weakness were addressed prior to the orientation of new members.

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

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Beginning in January 2021, SSEAC/Stakeholder meetings were utilized to present SPP/APR indicator data to the public and stakeholder groups. This data was intentionally presented over the course of several months to allow an in-depth review of data and ensure adequate time was available for deep discussion. These meetings featured video conference chats, anonymous feedback sessions using Jam Board, and polling to solicit input and summarize discussions and suggestions. Jam Board links were left open indefinitely for participants to contribute additional information even after the meeting ended. In total, ten monthly meetings were held in FFY 2021.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

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

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

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

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

NJDOE posted the FFY2020 local district profiles on June 1, 2022. (see <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/spp/index.shtml>)

Consistent with the requirements established in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004), NJDOE made New Jersey's FFY 2020 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 2020 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 2020 SPP/APR was posted on the New Jersey Department of Education's website following the submission to USDE with the requested clarifications. The SPP/APR was posted at: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/spp/index.shtml>. The FFY 2021 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 2020 submission that included USOSEP's determination regarding the State's compliance with the requirements of Part B of the IDEA at <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/spp/index.shtml>. The USOSEP's response to the NJDOE's SPP/APR FFY 2021 submission will again be posted at: <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/spp/index.shtml>.

Distribution to the Media:

Annually, upon submission to USOSEP, the NJDOE makes the SPP/APR available to the media through the NJDOE website and refers the press to the SPP/APR website when press inquiries are relevant to the SPP indicators. Additionally, the OSE is actively curating landing pages, specific to each of

the indicators. In August of 2022, the OSE released the following indicator landing pages consistent with the website migration (see stakeholder attachment):

- Indicator 7: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/preschooloutcomes.shtml>
- Indicator 8: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/parentsurvey.shtml>
- Indicator 14: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/postschooloutcomes.shtml>; Transition Toolkit to Address Successful Post-School Outcomes: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/programs/njtransition/>

Distribution to Public Agencies:

Members of the State Special Education Advisory Council as well as SPP/APR stakeholders participated in a meeting in October 2022 (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 2020 SPP/APR submission and the posting of the determination letter from the USOSEP as well. The USOSEP Response table was discussed in detail with the stakeholders. Information regarding the submission of the SPP/APR and the state's determination is also annually discussed with county special education specialists who communicate the information to local special education directors at their monthly meetings.

Additionally, the Director for the OSE presented at events across the state to communicate the results of the public reports. In addition to an internal agency presentation with other divisions and offices, the OSE presented publicly to county specialists that govern over 680 local education agencies, at the New Jersey Principal and Supervisors Association (NJPSA), and at the New Jersey Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC) meeting. The assistant director and federal reporting and engagement specialist supplemented her presentation by conducting a professional development opportunity at a statewide conference titled "Using Local Performance Reports (Indicators) to Drive Priorities for Improvements for Students with Disabilities".

Regarding the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, NJDOE will distribute a memo to school districts, agencies, organizations, and individuals concerned with special education, in accordance with the NJDOE's broadcast procedures. The memorandum will provide information regarding 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

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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The Web link for FFY 2019 is: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/spp/index.shtml>

With its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, NJDOE reported on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA as well. It is also located at the following URL: <https://nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/spp/index.shtml>

Intro - OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 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, the State provided a Web link on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State, however that Web link is broken.

OSEP issued a monitoring report to the State on May 6, 2019. OSEP is reviewing documents the State has already submitted and will review any additional documents the State wishes to submit that address the outstanding findings.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	91.42%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	78.00%	81.00%	81.00%	81.50%	91.50%
Data	78.80%	78.84%	80.14%	83.83%	91.42%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	91.50%	91.75%	91.75%	92.00%	92.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE

as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	11,545
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	2,818
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	23
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	818

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
11,545	15,204	91.42%	91.50%	75.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In 2019 the United States Department of Education (USED) conducted a Performance Review of New Jersey’s federal title programs under the ESEA. The report issued by USED noted that students with disabilities whose IEPs exempt them from passing a statewide graduation assessment but have satisfied the graduation assessment requirements by meeting alternate requirements in their IEPs have not met New Jersey’s graduation requirements. New Jersey’s current graduation assessment requirements require all graduates to either demonstrate proficiency on the statewide assessment, meet the designated cut score on an alternate assessment, or demonstrate proficiency through Portfolio Appeals. State regulations also allow the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team of a student with a disability to exempt a student from demonstrating proficiency on a Statewide or LEAwide assessment. These students may satisfy the graduation assessment requirements by meeting alternate requirements specified in their IEPs. Beginning with the 2021-2022 school year, a student with disabilities who has not met the statewide assessment requirement, including students with significant intellectual disabilities administered the Dynamic Learning Maps, and whose IEP exempts them from meeting this requirement will receive a state endorsed diploma but will not be included in federal reporting as having received a diploma. As a result of this change in the calculation, the rate for Indicator 1 declined. It is anticipated that New Jersey will establish new baselines and targets as a result of the change in methodology in FFY22.

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 in FFY19.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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.

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	8.38%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	13.00%	12.00%	12.00%	6.00%	8.30%
Data	6.04%	5.80%	6.65%	10.28%	8.38%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	8.25%	8.25%	8.00%	8.00%	7.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
 - New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
 - NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
 - The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE’s approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	11,545

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	2,818
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	23
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	818

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
818	15,204	8.38%	8.25%	5.38%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline was changed in FFY 2019 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

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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
 - New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
 - NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
 - The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University

- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	18,194	18,291	18,822
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,090	2,204	2,561
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,002	13,829	13,379
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,674	1,575	1,578

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	18,192	18,289	19,084
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,700	1,685	2,045
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,369	14,268	13,611
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,668	1,576	1,579

*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 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17,766	18,194	95.17%	95.00%	97.65%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17,608	18,291	89.37%	95.00%	96.27%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	17,518	18,822	86.15%	95.00%	93.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17,737	18,192	94.87%	95.00%	97.50%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17,529	18,289	88.87%	95.00%	95.84%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	17,235	19,084	86.34%	95.00%	90.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and

- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
 - New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
 - NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
 - The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	16,092	16,033	15,940
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,786	579	428
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,555	1,829	1,437

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	16,069	15,953	15,656
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,567	380	249
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,403	890	807

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,341	16,092	25.31%	23.50%	20.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,408	16,033	25.54%	20.50%	15.02%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,865	15,940	24.37%	17.50%	11.70%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Nationally, and in New Jersey, there continues to be challenges determining the scope of learning loss that resulted from the disruptions in public education related to the COVID-19 pandemic such as closures, reduced or hybrid schedules, and staffing shortages. Overall, achievement scores dropped for all general education students in New Jersey. As reported to State Board of Education in November 2022, results indicated the most significant learning loss in the area of reading, consistent with results reported in 3B and 3C. However, it should be noted that while these lower achievement trends are consistent with results for all students, Indicator 3D identifies the significance of impacts across student groups. Indicator 3D suggests that the gap between student achievement for students with IEPs and general education students decreased. One interpretation of this finding might be that the learning loss for students with disabilities, as it relates to grade level standards, was relatively less significant when compared to the general education population. This may be due to increased time in school (students with IEPs were typically provided in-person instruction a greater percentage of the time than their general education counterparts during the pandemic), more opportunities for intervention strategies, and a continual emphasis on the identification of the academic needs of classified students on an individualized basis across the state. When examining the slippage across 3B and 3C, it should be considered as a national and state priority to address learning loss due to COVID-19 but does not necessarily reflect disproportionate results for students with disabilities throughout New Jersey.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Nationally, and in New Jersey, there continues to be challenges determining the scope of learning loss that resulted from the disruptions in public education related to the COVID-19 pandemic such as closures, reduced or hybrid schedules, and staffing shortages. Overall, achievement scores dropped for all general education students in New Jersey. As reported to State Board of Education in November 2022, results indicated the most significant learning loss in the area of reading, consistent with results reported in 3B and 3C. However, it should be noted that while these lower achievement trends are consistent with results for all students, Indicator 3D identifies the significance of impacts across student groups. Indicator 3D suggests that the gap between student achievement for students with IEPs and general education students decreased. One interpretation of this finding might be that the learning loss for students with disabilities, as it relates to grade level standards, was relatively less significant when compared to the general education population. This may be due to increased time in school (students with IEPs were typically provided in-person instruction a greater percentage of the time than their general education counterparts during the pandemic), more opportunities for intervention strategies, and a continual emphasis on the identification of the academic needs of classified students on an individualized basis across the state. When examining the slippage across 3B and 3C, it should be considered as a national and state priority to address learning loss due to COVID-19 but does not necessarily reflect disproportionate results for students with disabilities throughout New Jersey.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Nationally, and in New Jersey, there continues to be challenges determining the scope of learning loss that resulted from the disruptions in public education related to the COVID-19 pandemic such as closures, reduced or hybrid schedules, and staffing shortages. Overall, achievement scores dropped for all general education students in New Jersey. As reported to State Board of Education in November 2022, results indicated the most significant learning loss in the area of reading, consistent with results reported in 3B and 3C. However, it should be noted that while these lower achievement trends are consistent with results for all students, Indicator 3D identifies the significance of impacts across student groups. Indicator 3D suggests that the gap between student achievement for students with IEPs and general education students decreased. One interpretation of this finding might be that the learning loss for students with disabilities, as it relates to grade level standards, was relatively less significant when compared to the general education population. This may be due to increased time in school (students with IEPs were typically provided in-person instruction a greater percentage of the time than their general education counterparts during the pandemic), more opportunities for intervention strategies, and a continual emphasis on the identification of the academic needs of classified students on an individualized basis across the state. When examining the slippage across 3B and 3C, it should be considered as a national and state priority to address learning loss due to COVID-19 but does not necessarily reflect disproportionate results for students with disabilities throughout New Jersey.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,970	16,069	10.25%	25.00%	18.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,270	15,953	5.09%	13.50%	7.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,056	15,656	7.14%	9.50%	6.75%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Nationally, and in New Jersey, there continues to be challenges determining the scope of learning loss that resulted from the disruptions in public education related to the COVID-19 pandemic such as closures, reduced or hybrid schedules, and staffing shortages. Overall, achievement scores dropped for all general education students in New Jersey. As reported to State Board of Education in November 2022, results indicated the most significant learning loss in the area of reading, consistent with results reported in 3B and 3C. However, it should be noted that while these lower achievement trends are consistent with results for all students, Indicator 3D identifies the significance of impacts across student groups. Indicator 3D suggests that the gap between student achievement for students with IEPs and general education students decreased. One interpretation of this finding might be that the learning loss for students with disabilities, as it relates to grade level standards, was relatively less significant when compared to the general education population. This may be due to increased time in school (students with IEPs were typically provided in-person instruction a greater percentage of the time than their general education counterparts during the pandemic), more opportunities for intervention strategies, and a continual emphasis on the identification of the academic needs of classified students on an individualized basis across the state. When examining the slippage across 3B and 3C, it should be considered as a national and state priority to address learning loss due to COVID-19 but does not necessarily reflect disproportionate results for students with disabilities throughout New Jersey.

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/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response**3B - Required Actions**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University

- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	1,674	1,575	1,578
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	438	452	525

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	1,668	1,576	1,579
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	729	247	513

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	438	1,674	28.69%	30.25%	26.16%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	452	1,575	25.68%	37.50%	28.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	525	1,578	27.67%	30.75%	33.27%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Students that participated in the AA-AAAS for grade 4 for FFY 2021, were greatly impacted due to COVID-19 closures. These students, consistent with results for indicator 3B, demonstrated learning loss due to lack of early literacy instruction and exposure. Additionally, for many of these fourth grade students participation in the AA-AAAS was a novel experience. The spring 2021 administration of the AA-AAAS was an in-person assessment with no remote administration option and many of the students did not participate as they were on remote instruction due to health concerns.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	729	1,668	45.63%	36.25%	43.71%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	247	1,576	13.01%	17.25%	15.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	513	1,579	31.30%	10.00%	32.49%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**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/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

It was necessary to establish a baseline for Indicator 3C for FFY20 because it was the first time reporting on the proficiency rate of students with disabilities assessed using alternate academic achievement standards. The baseline for indicator 3C submitted in FFY20 was established using data from FFY18 (2018-2019) as statewide assessments were waived in FFY19 due to the pandemic. The targets for FFY20 through FFY25 represent improvement over baseline.

3C - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Baseline and targets were established for Indicator 3C and were entered into eMaps during the clarification period for the FY2020 submission.

3C - OSEP Response

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

The State provided FFY 2020 through FFY 2021 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;

- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
 - New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
 - NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
 - The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	93,632	100,780	102,877
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,092	16,033	15,940
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	43,811	48,443	47,155
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,432	3,292	2,783
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,786	579	428
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,555	1,829	1,437

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	94,953	101,983	104,658
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,069	15,953	15,656
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	35,331	31,967	27,653
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,114	1,808	1,586
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,567	380	249
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,403	890	807

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20.76%	49.39%	22.72	31.00	28.63	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	15.02%	51.33%	28.06	38.75	36.32	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	11.70%	48.54%	30.05	38.00	36.84	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.48%	39.44%	14.15	24.75	20.95	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.96%	33.12%	19.52	32.75	25.16	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	6.75%	27.94%	19.73	24.75	21.19	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	1.10%	1.00%	1.00%	0.90%	0.80%
Data	1.83%	0.91%	0.76%	0.76%	0.30%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.80%	0.79%	0.79%	0.78%	0.78%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)

- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

658

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.30%	0.80%		N/A	N/A

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

New Jersey has established a minimum "n" size of 30. For indicator 4A, "n" size refers to the total enrollment of students with disabilities in the LEA.

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

In sum, an LEA must serve at least 30 children with disabilities and must remove at least 10 children with disabilities from school via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in a school year to be included in calculations of significant discrepancy.

"Significant Discrepancy" is defined as a suspension rate of 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 LEAs in the state. Second, NJDOE used a multiple of the baseline statewide average (i.e., more than 5 times the state average) to determine LEAs demonstrating a significant discrepancy. 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)

In calculating the percent of LEAs with a significant discrepancy for this APR, 69 LEAs were removed because they did not meet the minimum 'n' size of 30. Of the remaining 589 LEAs, zero (0) met the minimum cell size of 10.

Discipline data from the 2020-2021 school year demonstrates that zero (0) LEAs were identified for significant discrepancy. Disciplinary practices appear to have been profoundly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the pandemic, most of New Jersey's LEAs operated fully or partially remote, and there was a dramatic decrease in incidents leading to removals. Just twenty-three (23) LEAs reported removing between one (1) and three (3) children with disabilities for more than 10 cumulative days. Preliminary data from the 2021-2022 school year, which saw the return to in-person instruction in all LEAs in the state, indicate that incidents leading to removals are approaching pre-pandemic levels.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

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

LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year participate in a targeted review process. The 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).

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that 632 districts met the minimum n size requirement, and 23 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "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." Because of this discrepancy, OSEP cannot determine if any districts were excluded from the calculation and cannot determine whether the State met its target.

As noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State's methodology for examining data for this indicator must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The State reported it has established a minimum n and/or cell size. However, OSEP notes that the State did not provide a value of the State used n and/or cell size and a description of what these values represent, which is information that would enable OSEP to determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to identify significant discrepancies in its LEAs.

Additionally, the Part B SPP/APR General Instructions also noted that factors OSEP may consider when determining reasonableness of a State's methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and whether statistically sound alternative methodologies exist or are being used by similarly-situated States. OSEP notes that the State's chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States that use a rate ratio.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.15%	0.15%	0.15%	0.91%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

658

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	0.00%	0%		N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

New Jersey has established a minimum "n" size of 30. For indicator 4B, "n" size refers to the total enrollment of students with disabilities in the LEA.

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

In sum, an LEA must serve at least 30 children with disabilities and, for each racial/ethnic group, must remove at least 10 children with disabilities from school via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in a school year to be included in calculations of significant discrepancy for that racial/ethnic group.

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 LEA 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 LEA rate for each racial/ethnic group was then compared to the state rate and if the LEA rate for a specific racial/ethnic group was greater than three times the state rate (or greater than 2.25%), the LEA was determined to demonstrate a "significant discrepancy" for the specific racial/ethnic group.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

69 LEAs were removed from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum 'n' size of 30. The remaining 589 LEAs were removed from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum cell size of 10.

Discipline data from the 2020-2021 school year demonstrates that zero (0) LEAs were identified for significant discrepancy. Disciplinary practices appear to have been profoundly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the pandemic, most of New Jersey's LEAs operated fully or partially remote, and there was a dramatic decrease in incidents leading to removals. Just twenty-three (23) LEAs reported removing between one (1) and three (3) children with disabilities for more than 10 cumulative days. Preliminary data from the 2021-2022 school year, which saw the return to in-person instruction in all LEAs in the state, indicate that incidents leading to removals are approaching pre-pandemic levels.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

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

LEAs identified for significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year participate in a self-assessment or desk monitoring of policies, procedures and practices to determine if the LEA demonstrated noncompliance with requirements related to the discipline of students with disabilities. The self-assessment and desk monitoring tool are 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.

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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not 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 the State uses in its analysis of LEAs that it identifies as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity. Specifically, the State reports, "Discipline data from the 2020-2021 school year demonstrates that zero (0) districts were identified for significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days. Most of New Jersey LEAs were on full remote or a hybrid school for the entirety of the 2020-2021 school year, which resulted in a dramatic decrease in disciplinary actions in all categories. Discipline data indicates that there were just thirty-four (34) instances of removals greater than 10 days during the 2020-2021 school year. Preliminary data from the 2021-2022 school year indicate that disciplinary removals are approaching pre-pandemic levels." The State must provide a description of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as required by the measurement table, even if the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, is zero.

As noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State's methodology for examining data for this indicator must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The State reported it has established a minimum n and/or cell size. However, OSEP notes that the State did not provide a value of the n and/or cell size or a description of what these values represent, which is information that would enable OSEP to determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to identify significant discrepancies in its LEAs.

Additionally, the Part B SPP/APR General Instructions also noted that factors OSEP may consider when determining reasonableness of a State's methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and whether statistically sound alternative methodologies exist or are being used by similarly-situated States. OSEP notes that the State's chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States that use a rate ratio.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2019	Target >=	49.50%	50.00%	50.50%	50.50%	45.00%
A	44.64%	Data	45.08%	44.62%	45.12%	44.64%	45.23%
B	2019	Target <=	15.50%	15.00%	15.00%	14.00%	14.75%
B	14.98%	Data	14.36%	14.74%	14.44%	14.98%	15.60%
C	2019	Target <=	7.20%	7.10%	6.90%	6.90%	6.75%
C	6.78%	Data	7.25%	7.14%	7.02%	6.78%	6.62%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE,

accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
 - New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
 - NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
 - The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	225,333
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	99,586
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	34,890
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	12,960
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	292
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	520

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	99,586	225,333	45.23%	45.00%	44.20%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	34,890	225,333	15.60%	14.75%	15.48%	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]	13,772	225,333	6.62%	6.75%	6.11%	Met target	No Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
A	Between FFY 2020 and FFY 2021, the percentage of students with IEPs in the general education classroom for 80% of the day or more dropped from 45.23% to 44.20%. Anecdotal evidence gathered from the County Offices of Education and LEAs suggests that parents of students with IEPs were seeking as many supports as possible for their children in order to limit learning loss, developmental gaps, and social emotional challenges resulting from disruptions in learning. Consistent in-person instruction for students with IEPs was a priority for most LEAs during these disruptions and, therefore, it is hypothesized that parents advocated for more restrictive programs to address student needs as opposed to less restrictive settings. Teacher burnout, staffing attrition, and the increased academic supports needed in general education settings all posed challenges to LEAs in making progress towards creating greater capacity in NJ schools to meet the needs of students with IEPs in the most inclusive educational environments.						

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	44.00%	44.50%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%
A	Data	44.83%	45.73%	47.44%	44.82%	45.14%
B	Target <=	34.50%	34.50%	34.00%	34.00%	38.75%
B	Data	39.33%	39.67%	38.75%	41.14%	40.91%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	47.00%	47.50%	47.50%	48.00%	48.00%
Target B <=	38.75%	38.25%	38.25%	37.75%	37.75%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.19%	0.18%	0.18%	0.17%	0.17%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	5,416	7,025	597	13,038
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	2,186	3,397	297	5,880
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,282	2,525	194	5,001
b2. Number of children attending separate school	188	265	42	495
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	0	1	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	13	17	2	32

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	5,880	13,038	45.14%	47.00%	45.10%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,498	13,038	40.91%	38.75%	42.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	32	13,038	0.19%	0.19%	0.25%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

Between FFY 2020 and FFY 2021, the percentage of children with IEPs aged 3-5 that were served in a separate special education preschool class, separate school or residential facility increased from 40.91% to 42.17%. Enrollment in preschool programs dropped in New Jersey during the COVID-19 pandemic creating an environment where newly enrolled preschool students have been presenting with more significant needs and additional gaps in developmental “readiness” for school. Consistent in-person instruction for students with IEPs was a priority for most LEAs during these disruptions and, therefore, it is hypothesized that parents advocated for more restrictive programs to address preschool student needs as opposed to less restrictive settings.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2013	Target >=	72.50%	72.50%	73.00%	73.00%	72.75%
A1	72.60%	Data	73.24%			25.00%	88.00%
A2	2013	Target >=	78.00%	78.00%	78.50%	78.50%	76.50%

A2	76.25%	Data	76.22%			40.00%	42.31%
B1	2013	Target >=	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	70.00%	67.00%
B1	66.67%	Data	66.02%			50.00%	73.91%
B2	2013	Target >=	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	54.00%	48.50%
B2	48.25%	Data	56.64%			20.00%	34.62%
C1	2013	Target >=	70.50%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	55.00%
C1	70.29%	Data	52.38%			50.00%	79.17%
C2	2013	Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	61.00%	61.00%	56.00%
C2	56.00%	Data	62.94%			40.00%	46.15%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing

- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

112

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	4	3.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6	5.36%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	63	56.25%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	29	25.89%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	8.93%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	92	102	88.00%	72.75%	90.20%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	39	112	42.31%	76.50%	34.82%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4	3.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	9	8.04%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	59	52.68%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	35	31.25%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	4.46%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	94	107	73.91%	67.00%	87.85%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	40	112	34.62%	48.50%	35.71%	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	3.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	8	7.14%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	49	43.75%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	40	35.71%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	11	9.82%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	89	101	79.17%	55.00%	88.12%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	51	112	46.15%	56.00%	45.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Please refer to the narrative under the heading "Provide additional information about this indicator," which summarizes the progress made towards statewide implementation of the Child Outcome Summary (COS). Because the data presented in last year's APR were not representative nor reflective of the state's performance in this indicator, conclusions should not be drawn regarding preschool outcomes. While this year's data increased in quantity (from 26 students to 112) it is still not a representative sample and therefore conclusions cannot be drawn from the results. As the sample size increases from year to year, we have explored methods to analyze the collected data for FFY 2022 to see to what extent the data would be representative but the infrastructure for such calculations is not in place at this time. Ultimately, the entire state will be required to submit these data.

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.

New Jersey is transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory to the Child Outcome Summary (COS). Please see the narrative under the heading "Provide additional information about this indicator" for more detailed information.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FY2019, New Jersey began to transition from the Battelle Developmental Inventory to the Child Outcome Summary (COS) Tool to collect data for Indicator 7. To date, the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education has trained 322 out of the 526 LEAs providing preschool special education services. School closures and prolonged periods of remote and hybrid instruction due to the global pandemic presented implementation challenges in FY2020, but the statewide rollout has continued without issue and New Jersey is on track to complete the three-year rollout on time.

New Jersey continues to work towards increasing the number of LEAs implementing the COS and reporting data to be included in Indicator 7. During FY2021, year one of the three-year rollout of the COS, 152 LEAs received training and began implementing the COS Tool. At that time, a total of 6 training sessions were held. Three sessions were held with Child Study Team members from each of the LEAs, and three sessions were held with teachers and related service providers from the same LEAs. Training took place virtually, allowing for larger audiences and minimizing travel. Sessions provided an overview of Indicator 7, the COS Tool and, recording and reporting data.

An Indicator 7 webpage was created on the NJDOE Office of Special Education website and includes a variety of resources from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center to support teams in implementation of the COS. In addition, links to information from the PACER center helps provide support on talking to families about Indicator 7.

The NJDOE Office of Special Education and the Office of Information Technology collaborated to create a data system to store the Indicator 7 data. The data system allows for the districts to enter the COS information for both entry and exit ratings. A manual on how to enter information into the data system was created to aid in supporting LEAs and reduce the number of errors with data entry. The COS Data is pulled from the system for Indicator 7 reporting, including the summary statements.

To support the efforts of LEAs in the implementation of the COS, a specific email account was developed for LEAs to reach out with questions and concerns. Each concern is addressed on an individual basis and provided with support. In addition to individualized support that is provided based on need, a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document has been created and is posted on the Office of Special Education website.

In Fall 2022, the trainings from the previous year were adjusted based on stakeholder and LEA feedback. Three virtual sessions attended by 161 additional LEAs were provided in FFY2022, year two of the three-year rollout.

Fall of 2021 through Fall of 2022 allowed for a substantial growth in the number of entry and exit ratings. There are 2,244 entry ratings and 112 exit ratings that are currently in the system. A large increase in the number of exit ratings is anticipated in June 2023, as students who were entered in Fall of 2021 will be transitioning to kindergarten. As the number of data points continues to increase, the NJDOE plans to analyze the exit data to determine the representativeness of the sample. Ultimately, however, all districts will be reporting COS data and this analysis would not be necessary.

Based on feedback from OSEP, the NJDOE Office of Special Education has begun to explore a process by which a sampling plan can be developed that would provide a representative sample taken from the current districts that are trained and implementing the COS. This sampling plan would provide valid data while the final cohorts of LEAs are trained and until statewide implementation is achieved.

7 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

New Jersey continues to work towards increasing the number of LEAs implementing the COS and reporting data to be included in Indicator 7 with full implementation by the conclusion of the 23-24 school year. By training an additional cohort of districts between the Fall of 2021 through the Fall of 2022 NJ saw substantial growth in the number of entry and exit ratings. There are 2,244 entry ratings and 112 exit ratings that are currently in the system. A large increase in the number of exit ratings is anticipated in June 2023, as students who were entered in Fall of 2021 will be transitioning to kindergarten. As the number of data points continues to increase, the NJDOE plans to analyze the exit data to determine the representativeness of the sample. This calculation will not be necessary once statewide implementation is achieved. While this year's data increased in quantity (from 26 students to 112) it is still not a representative sample and therefore conclusions cannot be drawn from the results. Given this relatively small sample size, a solid conclusion for slippage in A2 cannot be drawn.

7 - OSEP Response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR the State was required in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR to 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. The State reported, "While this year's data increased in quantity (from 26 students to 112) it is still not a representative sample and therefore conclusions cannot be drawn from the results." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. Additionally, the State reset its targets for sub-indicator C-1 for FFYs 2020 through 2025 but OSEP cannot accept these targets because these data are not valid and reliable.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has

formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	80.60%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	85.50%	85.50%	86.00%	86.00%	85.00%

Data	84.49%	83.65%	84.74%	84.92%	84.16%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.00%	85.30%	85.30%	85.60%	85.60%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
9,123	10,948	84.16%	85.00%	83.33%	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.

44,358

Percentage of respondent parents

24.68%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	28.33%	24.68%

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 2022 for selected districts in Cohort 16. The resulting increase in response rate was a positive sign that these efforts were worth revisiting with adjustments for next year.
4. One of the largest districts in the Cohort 16 sample impacted response rates for this reporting period. During the preparation phase there was a memo, training, individual opportunity for support and for each of the participating districts. This individual district submitted their student files, contact information and email addresses, but upon further review, it was determined that the parent email addresses for this district were not aligned to the correct student profile. There were numerous attempts to contact the district and inform them of the need to revise and resubmit the file. The efforts occurred from April through September of 2022. Despite efforts by the Office of Special Education, County Special Education Specialist and Technical Assistance provider, the submission remained incomplete. This resulted in distribution of only paper mailings and an overall response rate of 4.3%. This will inform of us approach in the future.

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.

Line A (in gray) refers to the final Cohort 16 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, 99.24% provided an apparent Postal mailing address. Of those that provided a Postal mailing address, 3.27% 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, 85.68% of the address lines had email address information. This is similar to last year's 85.90%. 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, 10.31% of the cases that provided an email address had invalid information. This is a significant increase over last year's 4.52%.

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, 1.46% of the Cohort 16 sample could not be contacted, which is an increase over the 0.88% unable to contact from Cohort 15. Line C represents the remaining contact information lines in Cohort 16 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 16, almost three-quarters of all the completed surveys were done online through the web survey (72.73%). This is similar to last year when 72.50% of the surveys were web responses and is also the fifth time that the majority of surveys were done electronically as opposed to on paper.

For the past six cohorts, we collected meta-data from the devices used to complete the survey. The final breakdown for Cohort 16 web responses was 66.49% of all web responses coming from a mobile device such as a tablet or smart phone, 33.49% from a desktop or laptop. This is the fourth year more parents completed the web survey on a mobile device and the breakdown supports the trend towards the use of mobile devices. This year’s ratio is not as strongly in favor of mobile devices as Cohorts 14 & 15, but it is still holding the trend compared to earlier years that had a split closer to 50:50. This year’s parents of preschool students showed a greater use of mobile devices with 69.45% of their electronic responses being from a tablet or cell phone, but the difference between this figure and parents of schoolage students was not as large as previous cohorts.

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 16 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 25.02%.

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 25.39%.

The administration process for Cohort 16 reverted to a more typical timeline in comparison to Cohorts 14 & 15, but still differed from the standard schedule. The survey timelines for both Cohorts 14 & 15 were significantly delayed due to Coronavirus-related school closures beginning in March of 2020. Working with these cyclical delays while trying to return to the standard schedule meant that Cohort 16 data collection still started slightly later than usual. Data collection did not start until June 23, which is about one month later than the start dates seen in the years before 2020.

Cohort 16 also had a shortened timeframe for data collection compared to previous years. Prior to Cohort 14 in 2020, data collection would start at the end of the selected school year and close before the start of the next. This helped ensure that surveys were not submitted with responses related to the incorrect school year. Using Cohort 16 to return to the standard project timeline meant that we still wanted to close data collection before the start of the next school year, but with data collection beginning in late June the survey was open for about one month less than normal. Additionally, the full data collection period occurred during the summer and did not have any overlap with the school year, when parents may be more responsive to school-related correspondence.

Despite these challenges, the Cohort 16 survey saw the third-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, or the result of a desire to express stronger feelings about special education due to the Coronavirus-related adjustments made to the recent school years.

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

When compared to other cohorts in the 14-year history, Cohort 16 improved to be the best year for gender representation and second-best for minority representation, while primary disability was less representative than in Cohort 15. Two of the three demographic areas, gender and ethnicity, were within the threshold (+/- 3.0%) for representativeness. Cohort 16 is the just the second year that minority respondents were not under-represented outside of the +/- 3.0% range (-2.15%).

The primary disability numbers – learning disability (LD), emotional disability (ED), intellectual disability (ID), and all other disabilities (AO) – differ by absolute values between 0.43% and 4.10% in Cohort 16. The value with the maximum difference, +4.10%, ranks Cohort 16 as having the tenth-smallest difference from the target representation among the cohorts in the 14-year history. Using +/- 3.0% as a guideline, emotional disability (ED) and intellectual disability (ID) met the threshold for representativeness in the sample.

In prior years, the greatest differences were, and continue to be, 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%. Two contributing reasons should be noted for the LD and AO differences from the sample targets. The first is that due to rounding for the four disability categories in the original sample draw for Cohort 16, they all rounded down and thus sum to a total of 99% instead of 100%. This contributes to the total difference. Secondly, over time there has been a shift in disability reporting from the learning disability category (LD) into more specific and smaller n-size categories grouped together as all other disabilities (AO). For the next cycle of cohort selection and data collection, the contributing classifications for AO should be revisited to determine if any of them are of a great enough proportion to use in the sampling framework.

In Cohort 16, the representativeness for gender ranked 1st out of the 14-year history – under-representing females by only 0.04%. This number is within the +/- 3.0% threshold for representativeness. In other years, female representation differed by absolute values ranging from 0.08% to 4.42%.

Until Cohort 15, minorities had always been under-represented by a percentage outside of the designated +/- 3.0% threshold for representativeness. Cohort 16 is just the second time that the proportion was within that representativeness threshold, only being under-represented by 2.15%. This is the second-best in the cohort history. The minority under-representation has ranged from 0.16% 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. The following three tables explore this.

The first table shows how the Cohort 16 respondents compare to the Cohort 16 target population.

Cohort 16 (2021-22)
 Target Population Respondent Representation
 Primary Disability Category
 LD 32.00%
 ED 4.00%
 ID 2.00%
 AO 61.00%
 Gender Female 33.00%
 Race/Ethnicity Minority 53.00%

The second table is in the same format as the first, however, the comparison numbers come from the NJ State population numbers used to select Cohorts 11 through 16.

Respondent Representation
 Primary Disability
 LD 28.55%
 ED 3.57%
 ID 2.79%
 AO 65.10%
 Gender Female 32.96%
 Race/Ethnicity Minority 50.85%

The final table will look at how the responding sample compares to updated state population numbers. The change in these differences when compared to the 2016 state population numbers reflect the changing population in the state and the constant effort to use sampling methods to match.

Difference
 LD -2.59%
 ED 0.18%
 ID 0.46%
 AO 1.95%
 Gender Female 0.10%
 Race/Ethnicity Minority -1.27%

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. The updated 2019 state population numbers improved on the difference in primary disability (max of -2.59%), while showing slight decrease for race and ethnicity (-1.27% difference) and gender (0.10% difference).

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

Survey Question	Yes / No
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The sampling plan has been included with the FFY 2021 APR. Feedback regarding the State Sampling Plan was provided in December of 2022. Adjustments will be made to the greatest extent possible and should be reflected in the FFY2022 APR.

8 - OSEP Response

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias or identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children receiving special education services in the State, as required by the Measurement Table.

In its description of its FFY 2021 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. Specifically, the State reported, "We provide the additional state demographic comparison because, technically, the sample is supposed to represent the "state", not just the cohort." The State must include the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, as required by the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Measurement Table.

OSEP notes the State did not include the specific race and ethnicity groups included in their analysis and instead reported "race/ethnicity/minority" as one overall group. Therefore, it is unclear to OSEP whether the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, as required by the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Measurement Table.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. OSEP notes that FFY2021 NJ-8 sampling plan submission includes references to leavers and post-school outcomes identical to the FFY2021 NJ-14 sampling plan. While some overlap is expected given the sampling procedures are the same for both indicators, references to Indicator 14 elements should not be included in Indicator 8's sampling plan. Further, OSEP notes that the rest of the sampling plan is identical to the sampling plan submitted in FFY 2020. OSEP identified concerns in its evaluation of that sampling plan that indicated it may not yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State has not yet responded to OSEP's concerns. The State must submit by June 1, 2023 its revised sampling plan that the State plans to use for its FFY 2023 data collection and indicate how the revised plan addresses the concerns identified in OSEP's evaluation.

8 - Required Actions

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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	634	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

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

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 is 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	NVR	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 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.

84

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
40	9	574	0.00%	0%	1.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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. Nine (9) LEAs identified noncompliance through the self-assessment in one area: provision of evaluation reports to parents/guardians at least 10 days prior to the eligibility meeting. Review of the self-assessments indicate that the noncompliance was the result of a breakdown in LEA procedures. All LEAs have revised their procedures to ensure evaluation reports at provided within required timelines.

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.

LEAs identified for disproportionate representation participated in a self-assessment of policies, procedures and practices to determine if the LEA 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. Nine (9) LEAs identified noncompliance through the self-assessment in one area: provision of evaluation reports to parents/guardians at least 10 days prior to the eligibility meeting. Review of the self-assessments indicate that the noncompliance was the result of a breakdown in LEA procedures. All LEAs have revised their procedures to ensure evaluation reports at provided within required timelines.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.96%	91.29%	93.41%	79.86%	90.07%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
27,487	25,554	90.07%	100%	92.97%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

1,933

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.

01: Incomplete Residency

Between 1-5 Days: 11
 Between 6-15 Days: 14
 Between 16-30 Days: 14
 Between 31-60 Days: 19
 Between 61-90 Days: 2
 Between 91-120 Days: 1
 More than 120 Days: 8
 Total: 59

02: Additional Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 51
 Between 6-15 Days: 79
 Between 16-30 Days: 67
 Between 31-60 Days: 84
 Between 61-90 Days: 29
 Between 91-120 Days: 22
 More than 120 Days: 6
 Total: 338

03: Specialized Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 62
 Between 6-15 Days: 55
 Between 16-30 Days: 57
 Between 31-60 Days: 47
 Between 61-90 Days: 20
 Between 91-120 Days: 3
 More than 120 Days: 9
 Total: 253

06: Vacancies of Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel

Between 1-5 Days: 13
 Between 6-15 Days: 21
 Between 16-30 Days: 21
 Between 31-60 Days: 13
 Between 61-90 Days: 13
 Between 91-120 Days: 5
 More than 120 Days: 6
 Total: 92

07: Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel were Unavailable

Between 1-5 Days: 171
 Between 6-15 Days: 184
 Between 16-30 Days: 134
 Between 31-60 Days: 121
 Between 61-90 Days: 43
 Between 91-120 Days: 19
 More than 120 Days: 20
 Total: 692

09: Late Referral: If the Written Referral for the Initial Evaluation was Made Fewer than 120 Days Prior to Age 3

Between 1-5 Days: 0
 Between 6-15 Days: 0
 Between 16-30 Days: 0
 Between 31-60 Days: 0
 Between 61-90 Days: 0
 Between 91-120 Days: 0
 More than 120 Days: 0
 Total: 0

No Reason or Invalid Reason
 Between 1-5 Days: 141
 Between 6-15 Days: 154
 Between 16-30 Days: 88
 Between 31-60 Days: 76
 Between 61-90 Days: 20
 Between 91-120 Days: 6
 More than 120 Days: 14
 Total: 499

TOTAL OF ALL DELAY REASONS: 1933

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, 2021 to June 30, 2022 as reported by districts on October 15, 2022.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1,988	1,988		0

FFY 2020 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 LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are grouped by finding to make findings at the LEA level. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance.

To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. Achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and
2. Had conducted evaluations, although late, for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP 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 LEAs indicating the dates of completion of evaluations, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the LEAs regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2021. Interviews conducted with special education directors indicated that root causes of delays continue to be vacancies and the unavailability of child study team or related services personnel.

LEAs reported that, consistent with prior year findings, delays were at times due to difficulty scheduling specialists for additional evaluations. NJDOE has provided technical assistance regarding communication with referring early intervention programs, registration strategies, maintaining and using data for 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 2020 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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

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 2021. 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 2020 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

11 - OSEP Response

The State reported, the State "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" in its FFY 2020 findings of noncompliance verified as corrected. OSEP notes that Indicator 11 measures the percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for individual evaluation, or if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe, as stated in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Measurement Table.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.86%	92.04%	81.22%	67.48%	70.19%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,129
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.	2,063
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.	201
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	8
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,063	2,920	70.19%	100%	70.65%	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
857

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: 7
 Between 6-15 Days: 6
 Between 16-30 Days: 4
 Between 31-60 Days: 11
 Between 61-90 Days: 3
 Between 91-120 Days: 3
 More than 120 Days: 1
 TOTAL: 35

Delay Reason 02: Additional Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 2
 Between 6-15 Days: 1
 Between 16-30 Days: 3
 Between 31-60 Days: 1
 Between 61-90 Days: 4
 Between 91-120 Days: 0
 More than 120 Days: 1
 TOTAL: 12

Delay Reason 03: Specialized Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 3
 Between 6-15 Days: 2
 Between 16-30 Days: 4
 Between 31-60 Days: 1
 Between 61-90 Days: 2
 Between 91-120 Days: 2
 More than 120 Days: 1
 TOTAL: 15

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

Between 1-5 Days: 0
 Between 6-15 Days: 2
 Between 16-30 Days: 1
 Between 31-60 Days: 0
 Between 61-90 Days: 0
 Between 91-120 Days: 0
 More than 120 Days: 0
 TOTAL: 3

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

Between 1-5 Days: 2
 Between 6-15 Days: 2
 Between 16-30 Days: 11
 Between 31-60 Days: 11
 Between 61-90 Days: 9
 Between 91-120 Days: 6
 More than 120 Days: 2
 TOTAL: 43

No Delay Code or Invalid Delay Code
 Between 1-5 Days: 168
 Between 6-15 Days: 151
 Between 16-30 Days: 154
 Between 31-60 Days: 153
 Between 61-90 Days: 86
 Between 91-120 Days: 26
 More than 120 Days: 11
 TOTAL: 749

TOTAL FOR ALL DELAY REASONS: 857

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 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
754	754		0

FFY 2020 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 2021.

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 2020 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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

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.

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 2019.

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 2020 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP memorandum 09-02 within one year of identification.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	80.14%	98.72%	92.81%	90.10%	92.86%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
340	340	92.86%	100%	100.00%	Met 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 LEAs, where students ages 16 and above are enrolled, is selected to participate in the transition targeted review. Thirty-four (34) LEAs with students aged 16 and above were selected to participate in the targeted review. A sample of student files was collected from each LEA representing a variety of disability categories, racial/ethnic groups, grade levels and placements. The revised checklist, developed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), was used by state monitors to review each student file. Files were determined noncompliant if one or more of the 8 questions on the checklist received a response of "no." Targeted technical assistance was offered to all LEAs in the cohort.

A report of results, including findings of noncompliance, as needed, was issued to each of the LEAs participating in the targeted review. Noncompliance was found in zero (0) LEAs.

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 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	18	0	0

FFY 2020 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 LEA level to determine which LEAs 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 LEA level. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance.

To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined through desk audits and onsite visits that each LEA 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

LEAs 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 LEA 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 LEA, and files of students whose IEPs were developed subsequent to the monitoring, to verify the correction of each individual case of noncompliance.

LEAs 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. LEAs 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 2020 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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

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.

13 - OSEP Response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported 100% compliance in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR data table, however, the State also reported in the narrative, "Noncompliance was found in four (4) districts/charter schools." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

13 - Required Actions

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

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 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2009	Target >=	47.00%	47.00%	47.50%	48.00%	48.00%
A	45.00%	Data	52.50%	52.20%	47.67%	51.93%	49.57%
B	2009	Target >=	75.50%	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%	74.00%
B	74.00%	Data	80.53%	83.67%	78.57%	80.12%	78.30%
C	2009	Target >=	86.50%	86.50%	86.50%	87.00%	87.00%
C	84.00%	Data	88.80%	89.55%	86.92%	87.15%	84.97%

FFY 2020 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and

- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
 - New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
 - NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
 - The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,094
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,471
Response Rate	70.25%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	623
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	551
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)	66
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).	42

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	623	1,471	49.57%	48.00%	42.35%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,174	1,471	78.30%	74.00%	79.81%	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)	1,282	1,471	84.97%	87.00%	87.15%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>The number of youths who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school who are enrolled in higher education dropped from 49.57% in FFY 2020 to 42.35% in FFY 2021. This significant drop in enrollment could be due to several factors. First, disruptions in learning may have impacted student readiness for higher education. Second, some students may have delayed enrollment as a result of social emotional needs, anxiety, caregiving responsibilities or financial need. Finally, it is important to note that this trend is consistent with the national data reported by the federal government in 2021 that undergraduate enrollments dropped by 560,000, a 3.6% decline, in 2020, compared with the year before. In late August 2021, some 16 percent of adults 18 years old and over who had household members planning to take postsecondary classes in fall 2021 reported that all plans to take classes in the fall had been canceled for at least one household member. The most frequently cited reason they reported for the cancellations was not being able to pay for classes/educational expenses because of changes to income from the pandemic (48 percent). https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cha/</p>

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	2020	2021
Response Rate	69.37%	70.25%

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 (see attached Response Calculator), non-response 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. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Representativeness: Using the NPSO Response Calculator, see below, the NJOSE calculated the representativeness of respondents to all student exiters from Cohort IV districts (from the 2019-2020 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 2019-2020 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:

Target Lever Representation

- LD 45.61%
- ED 5.4%
- CI 2.63%
- AO 46.37%
- Female 36.25%
- Minority 54.06%
- Black 18.39%
- Hispanic 30.95%
- Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 4.73%
- OOD 4.78%
- Dropout 3.34%
- Abbott 22.30%

Respondent Representation

- LD 44.26%
- ED 4.42%
- CI 2.65%
- AO 48.67%
- Female 35.89%
- Minority 51.8%
- Black 17.06%
- Hispanic 29.98%
- Other 4.76%
- OOD 3.67%
- Dropout 1.77%
- Abbott 20.46%

Difference

- LD -1.35%
- ED - 0.98%
- CI 0.02%
- AO 2.3%
- Female -0.35%
- Minority -2.26%

Black -1.32%
 Hispanic - 0.97%
 Other 0.03%
 OOD -1.10%
 Dropout -1.58%
 Abbott -1.84%

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 years reflecting the population of the State at a pre-set confidence level of plus or minus 3%. NJDOE established a +/- 3% sampling error, i.e. the sample that is chosen will be representative of districts serving students with disabilities within the state at a level of error that will be plus or minus 3% -- an error band of 6%. Through the establishment of the +/- 3% sampling error and the use of the NPSO sampling calculator, selection bias should be prevented.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. OSEP notes that the sampling plan submitted is identical to the sampling plan included in the State's FFY 2020 submission. OSEP identified concerns in its evaluation of the FFY 2020 sampling plan that indicated it may not yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State has not yet responded to OSEP's concerns. The State must submit by June 1, 2023 its revised sampling plan that the State plans to use for its FFY 2023 data collection and indicate how the revised plan addresses the concerns identified in OSEP's evaluation.

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 ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	135
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	11

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey

- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	77.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	75.00%	77.00%-85.00%
Data	71.43%	77.78%	93.75%	30.00%	14.91%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	77.00%	77.25%	77.25%	77.50%	77.50%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
11	135	14.91%	77.00%	8.15%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Several mechanisms are available through the NJDOE to assist in resolving IDEA disputes. These processes include IEP facilitation, informal conflict resolution through the special education Ombudsman, mediation, state complaint investigations, due process hearings, resolution sessions, expedited due process hearings, emergent relief due process hearings and enforcements of agreements and decisions. NJDOE makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial level appropriate. Mediators are highly trained and experienced intermediaries that are assigned on a rotational basis. While the NJDOE encourages LEAs to offer and hold resolution sessions with parents/guardians of students with disabilities, many parents elect to waive that process and choose instead to have a mediation conference with a trained, neutral third party. The State's failure to meet its target for this Indicator is likely because the mediation system offered by the NJDOE is robust and accessible and parents can choose to have a mediation conference in lieu of a resolution session, resulting in resolution session agreements failing to meet the target.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	616
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	66
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	98

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
 - American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
 - Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
 - New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
 - NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
 - The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	38.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	38.50%	39.00%	39.00%	39.50%	38.00%
Data	35.63%	38.86%	37.91%	30.09%	24.44%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	38.00%	38.25%	38.25%	38.50%	38.50%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
66	98	616	24.44%	38.00%	26.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response**16 - Required Actions**

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 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 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SIMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

By 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.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

By utilizing targeted and comprehensive school data and being guided by the principles and framework of implementation science, New Jersey examined relevant data sources (cycle data, proficiency, growth, graduation rate, etc.) to identify a pool of districts that would be invited to participate in the initial cohort of Transformation Zones (TZ). The inclusion criteria for the selection of TZ districts were: whether the Local Education Agency (LEA) had targeted schools in status for students with disabilities, whether the LEA had comprehensive schools, whether the district has schools below the 10th percentile in New Jersey's statewide accountability system, whether the LEA had a high percentage of students with disabilities ("high" being a classification rate of at least 20%), whether the district was on remote instruction at the time of the data pull (Spring 2021), and whether the district had a low graduation rate (in the bottom 10% of districts with high schools statewide). All five districts selected for participation met at least two of the inclusion criteria mentioned above.

From a pool of five districts, four districts have committed to participating in the initiative. Participating TZ districts will be trained and supported in the use of implementation science to build district and school capacity in the adoption, integration, and implementation of evidence-based instructional practices in early literacy that are effective and sustainable to enhance student learning outcomes.

The demographic description of participating TZ districts is as follows:

- District 1, Asbury Park, located in Monmouth County, has 4 schools and serves approximately 1728 students. In fall 2021, approximately 50.3% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 17.9% qualified for special education services, 9.4% are English Language Learners, and 3.3% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 3.4% White, 45.5% Hispanic, and 50.5% Black or African American.
- District 2, Willingboro, located in Burlington County, has 9 schools and serves approximately 3407 students. In fall 2021, approximately 65.3% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 19% qualified for special education services, 2.6% are English Language Learners, and 1% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 2.8% White, 16.3% Hispanic, and 76.3% Black or African American.
- District 3, Palisades Park, located in Bergen County, has 3 schools and serves approximately 1667 students. In fall 2021, approximately 27.4% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 11.5% qualified for special education services, 36.2% are English Language Learners, and 0.2% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 9.4% White, 55.8% Hispanic, 1.7% Black or African American, and 31.7% Asian.
- District 4, Bridgeton, located in Cumberland County, has 8 schools and serves approximately 6173 students. In fall 2021, approximately 6.9% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 8.7% qualified for special education services, 28% are English Language Learners, and 2.6% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 19.8% Black or African American, 3% White, and 75.5% Hispanic.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

The Theory of Action is described below:

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

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)

YES

Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2021	4.55%
B	2021	4.79%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%
Target B >=	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Part	Total number of Students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone Scoring Proficient or Better on the A) NJSLA (Spring 2022) and B) NJ Start Strong (Fall 2022)	Total number of Students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone Who Took the A) NJSLA (Spring 2022) and B) NJ Start Strong (Fall 2022)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	14	308		4.00%	4.55%	N/A	N/A
B	9	188		4.00%	4.79%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

- The New Jersey Student Learning Assessments for English Language Arts (NJSLA-ELA) measures student proficiency with grade-level skills, knowledge, and concepts that are critical to college and career readiness. On each assessment, students read and analyze passages from authentic fiction and nonfiction texts. The test can also include multimedia stimuli such as video or audio. The NJSLA-ELA assessments emphasize the importance of close reading, synthesizing ideas within and across texts, determining the meaning of words and phrases in context, and writing effectively when using and/or analyzing sources.
- The Start Strong Assessments for English Language Arts provide educators and parents with a beginning-of-year indication of some conceptual or skill gaps that might exist in a student's understanding of the prior year's New Jersey Student Learning Standards (NJSL) and the level of support students may need to inform instruction.

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

Data are collected through the NJSMART Education Data System a statewide data collection system that is used for many of the SPP/APR indicators. As the activities of the SSIP continue to progress from the analysis (Phase I) to the planning (Phase II) phase, each school will be providing student-level and classroom-level data to inform decisions regarding evidence-based practices, fidelity of implementation, and selection of appropriate benchmark assessments.

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

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, 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 OSE and the SISEP team are completing Phase I (analysis) and entering Phase II (Planning) of the SSIP, an evaluation plan has not been developed yet. An evaluation plan will be included in the FFY2022 SSIP.

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:

The State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center is a national technical assistance center funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs. The center's goal is to support the implementation of instructional and leadership practices that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

The SISEP Center has worked collaboratively with the NJDOE to cultivate the department's knowledge and skills in the use of implementation science practices and tools to improve our implementation infrastructure. NJDOE's SISEP team consists of the State Transformation Specialists (STS), State Management Team (SMT), State Implementation Team (SIT), and Executive Sponsors. The teams are intra-departmental and include members from the Office of Special Education, Office of Comprehensive Support, Office of Recruitment, Preparation and Certification, Office of K-3 Education, Office of Standards, the Office of Supplemental Educational Programs, and Student Support Services. Having a diverse group of participants with knowledge of existing systems across the department and state has allowed NJDOE to complete a comprehensive assessment to identify the focus area (early literacy), identify initiatives within each division related to the focus area, and identify potential programs, practices, and innovations to address the area of focus area.

In an effort to continue alignment with current initiatives and leverage potential future initiative development, NJ reviewed the NJDOE Initiative Inventory. The following highlights initiatives and infrastructure improvement strategies that were recently implemented at the department level:

- The SISEP initiative has allowed the Office of Comprehensive Support (OCS) to intensively collaborate with the Office of Special Education, Office of Student Services, and Office of Supplemental Programs. The role of OCS during this collaboration has been multifold; their main role has been that of liaison between district teams and the State Implementation Team under SISEP. OCS works to advocate for the district teams, bring issues and questions to the forefront to be resolved, help to reflectively craft training that will meet the needs of New Jersey's diverse districts and their learners, and maintain relationships between the district and the SISEP team to ensure fidelity to roll out and implementation. Throughout the 2022-2023 school year the SISEP Team, in collaboration with the Office of Comprehensive Support, has launched the work in school districts, identifying four across the state. District-level training is underway, with each district completing at least two modules, and participating in follow-up district meetings and coaching. Subsequent trainings have been planned and scheduled. Furthermore, Regional Support Team (RST) leads are working directly with the districts to provide 1:1 follow-up and support. OCS is also engaged in the State Management Team (SMT) for SISEP planning and support. Through that work, OCS provides insight, as well as gains clarity and understanding on the ways in which the office can systematically support initiatives roll-out now and in the future
- The work of the Office of Standards has been augmented meaningfully by the collaboration with SISEP. Over the past year, the Office of Standards leveraged SISEP's early literacy expertise to inform the review and revisions of the New Jersey Student Learning Standards (NJSLs). The NJ SISEP team assisted in draft reviews and connected the office with their early literacy consultants to advise and inform the content of the NJSLs -- ELA. Over the next several months, the Office of Standards will continue discussions with the SISEP team to help inform a set of resources to be released at the point of NJSLs adoption.
- The Division of Early Childhood Services is focused on high-quality early education for students in preschool to grade three. The K-3 Office has contributed its expertise in the area of improving early literacy in targeted schools by providing responses to inquiries regarding best practices in early literacy and the history of the Reading First and the Reading Coaches Initiatives. In addition, the office provided feedback during the development of the Practice Profile and Get/Give documents. This collaborative work with the SISEP team members has impacted the office's recent professional development planning and resource materials review process. As the office plans professional development sessions and reference materials for early childhood educators, they are also connecting the research and evidence-based practices referred to in the SISEP training modules.
- The Department proposed a new N.J.A.C. 6A:9B-14.23 to create a new educational services endorsement to support early literacy at the school and school district levels. The proposed early literacy specialist endorsement is part of the Department's focus on literacy development for early learners and is aligned to, and supports the work being done in the literacy TZs. Currently, a number of individuals with varying levels of training and expertise support the State's youngest readers. Existing training equips reading specialists to support students in kindergarten through grade 12, but the training does not necessarily require a deep understanding of the foundational support necessary to serve students in preschool through third grade. The introduction of a new educational services endorsement specific to meeting the literacy development needs of young readers aligns with the Department's goals to create opportunities for all students to be reading at or above grade level by third grade.
- Learning acceleration is an ongoing instructional process by which educators engage in formative practices to improve students' access to and mastery of grade-level standards. The goal of learning acceleration extends beyond recovering the ground lost to COVID-19, and is a long-term, comprehensive framework that anchors districts' academic, social, and behavioral interventions to the common purpose of promoting global competitiveness for all students. Using principles derived from the Council of the Great City Schools resource entitled "Addressing Unfinished Learning After COVID-19 School," NJDOE developed The Learning Acceleration Guide which summarizes the developing base of literature on learning acceleration approaches and shared promising practices from New Jersey schools. It has been crafted for LEA administrators with the goal of improving student outcomes. The guide includes key evidence-based practices that LEAs can implement, examples of learning acceleration in action across the state of New Jersey and prompts that encourage reflection.
- The OSE also continues to engage with institutes of higher education to expand its capacity to provide professional development and supports to LEAs across the state. In FFY 2022, the OSE entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with William Paterson University to provide an additional 42 training sessions, many of which will be in a multi-session/series format, to LEAs across the Northern region of NJ as well as remote engagement of LEAs statewide. This will ultimately expand the options utilized to provide supports to TZ schools and support scaling-up during Phase III of SSIP implementation.

Infrastructure improvement strategies were also implemented in the TZ schools. Please see the heading "Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)" for a description of these strategies.

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.

As the SISEP work has evolved, the immediate impacts seen complement our existing work of implementing structures and systems, reflecting on current practices, and operationalizing theory into action. The NJDOE is committed to utilizing the principles of implementation science to build each the LEA's capacity to provide access to high-quality and equitable educational opportunities for all students, utilize measures to assess the efficacy and fit of evidence-based practices, and using multiple forms of data to inform decision making and measure impact. While short-term impacts have not been measured at the time of this report, the following outcomes have been observed:

- Professional Development opportunities in TZ schools that match the individualized needs of educators based on Exploration Phase activities and needs assessment.
- Increased capacity to capture and analyze data through collaboration within the NJDOE between the OSE and Office of Comprehensive Support.
- The adoption of quality standards for the implementation of current evidence-based practices in TZ schools.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

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

The following are the next steps and anticipated outcomes for the infrastructure improvement strategies:

Next Steps

- Formation of District Implementation Team (DIT) and Building Implementation Teams (BIT) to guide work.
- Support TZ in team selection, ensuring diverse and representative stakeholders are engaged in supporting and leading implementation, which results in increased buy-in, ownership, and sustainability for the work.
- Support districts in developing a Terms of Reference and Communication Protocol.
- Guide districts in the assessment of the fit and feasibility of evidenced-based programs or practices; and the development and adoption of a formal procedure for selecting innovations.
- Completion of the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) (Ward et al., 2015) to align efforts and resources around practices intended to impact student outcomes.

Anticipated Outcomes

- The overarching goal of SISEP is to systematically improve academic outcomes and support; this is in direct alignment with the overarching goals of OCS. By engaging in the SISEP initiative, the department anticipates seeing an improvement in literacy achievement for all students.
- Research shows that for students who experience difficulty acquiring proficient literacy skills, a central factor is often underdeveloped phonemic awareness. Phonemic awareness assessment and instruction as essential evidence-based components of a comprehensive literacy program. Long-term, implementation science, and phonics training will impact student growth and proficiency as teachers become well-versed in instructional strategies, paradigms, and pedagogy of phonemic instruction.
- Over the next several months, the Office of Standards will continue discussions with the SISEP team to help inform a set of resources to be released at the point of NJSLs adoption. This will include resources designed to support diverse learners in meeting the NJSLs expectations, including students with disabilities.
- The development sessions and reference materials for early childhood educators designed by the Division of Early Childhood will reflect the research and evidence-based practices referred to in the SISEP literacy training modules.
- The introduction of a new educational services endorsement specific to meeting the literacy development needs of young readers aligns with the Department's goals to create opportunities for all students to be reading at or above grade level by third grade. Once passed, the proposed endorsement will increase the support available to students to actualize this goal.
- The NJDOE Learning Acceleration guide will support educators in examining their existing instructional practices and policies and assist in designing systems that support learning acceleration for all students leading to improved academic and social-emotional outcomes.
- The OSE has increased its capacity to provide and coordinate professional development with the hiring of new staff in FFY2021. In addition to OSE staff who can provide support and professional development to LEAs re: early literacy, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with William Paterson University (WPU) will provide an additional 42 professional development sessions and a series of supports on early literacy. Coordination between WPU in Northern NJ and TA providers at Rowan University in Southern NJ will greatly expand the opportunities for NJDOE OSE to support teachers in TZ schools as well as providing a foundation of resources to support the scaling up of efforts in the future.

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

The NJ SISEP Team will support and guide districts through the intentional process of determining the suitability of their evidence-based literacy program. Districts will be supported in examining the following criteria needed to ensure that the selected evidence-based practice is usable: clear description or program, clear program components that define the program, operational definition or program components, and practical fidelity assessments.

For some districts, the process of selecting an evidence-based literacy program has not yet been completed. With guidance from the state's team, districts will conduct a needs assessment including administrative data and perspectives of staff, community partners, students, and families to identify the needs of the identified focus population. Additionally, districts will be supported in the selection of an evidence-based literacy program that meets the needs of their organization.

The following evidence-based literacy programs are currently being implemented in TZ districts: iReady, Estrellita, and IMSE Orton-Gillingham.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

- iReady is an evidenced-based online program for reading and/or mathematics that will help teacher(s) determine your student needs, personalize learning, and monitor progress throughout the school year. i-Ready includes diagnostic and personalized instruction and allows teachers to meet students exactly where they are and provides data to increase student learning gains.
- Estrellita delivers a streamlined curriculum, utilizing an evidence-based, systematic, and accelerated approach to ensure quality teaching for successful learning. This approach guarantees a rigorous and effective Beginning Spanish Reading program that serves as a bridge to English by laying a strong foundation in Spanish literacy. Estrellita's supplemental program meets other benchmarks and practices evidenced as critical for students, such as the five effective practices by the National Reading Panel: Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Reading Comprehension, and

Vocabulary Development.

- Orton-Gillingham is a research-based, scientific approach to reading and writing instruction. It is direct, explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction that incorporates multi-sensory elements. IMSE's program is based on the science of reading research.

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.

- iReady provides a foundation for teachers to address the individualized needs of students and to differentiate instruction. It is intended to support the SiMR by providing teachers in TZ schools with tools to address the learning needs of a diverse variety of students. This intended impact may only be evident if programs are implemented with fidelity.
 - As mentioned above, Estrellita serves as a bridge to English by laying a strong foundation in Spanish literacy. Estrellita's supplemental program meets other benchmarks and practices evidenced as critical for students, such as the five effective practices by the National Reading Panel: Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Reading Comprehension, and Vocabulary Development. This is intended to impact the SiMR by providing a more individualized approach to the growing number of ELL students in TZ schools.
 - Orton-Gillingham (O-G) is an approach influences several reading programs that have been studied. The first task for TZ schools is to determine to what extent the O-G is being followed/implemented by teachers and if appropriate Tier 3 intervention programs for students who need intensive support in learning are being matched to individualized student needs. The intention of developing strong Tier 3 interventions for identified students is to reduce the learning gap in literacy for students through intensive, evidence-based instruction which will impact the SiMR by impacting students with the most need of literacy support.
- It is important to note that the three evidence-based practices listed above may change as the work of the SISEP team progresses. It may be found that a different approach is more appropriate, or an approach may be more effective depending on the readiness and capacity of the LEA to implement the approach with fidelity. This is one of the first goals of this work in the TZ schools: to determine if the right program has been selected for the appropriate students and is being implemented with fidelity.

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

At this early stage of Exploration with the identified TZ schools, fidelity data has not been collected.

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.

Data needs to be collected in each TZ school in order to determine if the evidence-based practices identified should continue or if new practices should be identified and implemented. This is one of the next steps in the Exploration stage of Implementation Science and will inform the Installation Stage as the SISEP team continues to work with each school.

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

The following information will be collected for each evidence-based practice in order to inform the work of the SISEP team during the next reporting period:

- The extent to which each evidence-based practice is being implemented with fidelity
- The extent to which each school has the capacity to implement each evidence-based practice with fidelity
- The extent to which each evidence-based practice currently being implemented in each TZ school is matched to the needs of the students and teachers in each school
- The criteria (if any) that each school uses to identify students who may need additional reading instructional supports
- The criteria (if any) that each school uses to identify evidence-based practices that may be considered to replace currently selected practices.

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 Phase II of the SSIP continues, it is inevitable that changes and adjustments will be made since data is still being gathered from the TZ schools. All changes will be documented and articulated in the SSIP for FFY2022.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey Office of Special Education (OSE) meets monthly with stakeholders who are members of the State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-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;
- discussion and input regarding NJDOE priorities and initiatives;
- presentations from programs, districts and stakeholder groups to highlight exemplar programs, initiatives and opportunities;
- dissemination of meeting information the public with a process to allow public comment and the recording of minutes; the public to be privy to meeting information and to be able to comment and have those comments recorded in the minutes, and
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities.

NJ-SSEAC meetings focused on sharing of SPP/APR indicator data 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 OSE, accomplished the following:

- reviewed current data;
- discussed current initiatives and activities aligned to the indicator(s);
- collected input regarding improvement activities;
- determined Council priorities that evolved into three subcommittees (see stakeholder attachment)
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.

For FY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FY21, the OSE focused on efforts to enhance outreach and engagement through various strategies. In doing so, the OSE expanded its outreach to 68 stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the NJ-SSEAC has formed subcommittees to formulate strategic planning strategies to further engage internal and external representatives to inform the work on the OSE as well as outreach through NJ-SSEAC activities.

- Alliance for the Betterment of Citizens w/Disabilities
- Alliance of Private Special Education Schools North Jersey
- American Physical Therapy Association of New Jersey (APTANJ)
- ASAH Private School
- AutismNJ
- Brain Injury Alliance of New Jersey
- Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health
- Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Developmental Disabilities Association of New Jersey (DDANJ)
- Disability Rights New Jersey
- Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Early Intervention Providers Association
- Educational Services Commission of New Jersey
- Learning Disabilities Association of NJ
- Mental Health Technology Transfer Center (MHTTC)
- New Jersey Assistive Technology Center (Advancing Opportunities)
- New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education
- New Jersey Council for Exceptional Children
- New Jersey Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
- New Jersey Literacy Association
- New Jersey Occupational Therapy Association
- New Jersey Regional Family Support Planning Councils
- New Jersey Speech Language Hearing Association
- NJ Association of Learning Consultants
- NJ Association of School Psychologists
- NJ Association of School Social Workers
- NJ Center for Tourette Syndrome
- New Jersey Integrated System of Care for Children
- NJ Chapter: American Academy of Pediatrics
- NJ Commission for the Blind
- NJ Council on Developmental Disabilities
- NJ Department of Children and Families
- NJ Department of Corrections
- NJ Principals and Supervisors Association/Foundation for Educational Administration
- NJ School Boards Association (NJSBA)
- NJ School Counselor Association (NJSCA)
- NJ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/NJ Bilingual Educators
- The New Jersey Affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Richard West Assistive Technology Advocacy Center
- SEL4NJ
- Special Olympics New Jersey
- State Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
- The Adaptive Technology Center
- The Arc of New Jersey
- The College of New Jersey
- The Learning Disabilities Association of New Jersey
- Kean University
- William Paterson University
- Caldwell College
- Monmouth University
- Seton Hall University
- Montclair State University
- Centenary University
- Rutgers University
- Rowan University
- Stockton University

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 NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2021-22 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.

For additional information on a narrow scope of the NJ OSE's approach to stakeholder engagement, please see the attached narrative for part B.

The primary method utilized to engage stakeholders at the state level in SSIP activities was through the NJ-SSEAC and Stakeholder meetings. The change in the SiMR and SSIP were proposed and enthusiastically accepted by the NJ-SSEAC during FFY 2020 and an update to SISEP and SSIP-

related activities was provided as recently as the January 19, 2023 NJ-SSEAC meeting. NJOSE will continue to provide semi-annual updates to the NJ-SSEAC.

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

Stakeholder engagement in regard to the SSIP has two targeted levels: engagement with the SISEP team and engagement within the TZ schools. At this time, the inclusion of specialists from across different offices and initiatives at the NJDOE informs the activities of the SSIP with a variety of input from the New Jersey Tiered System of Support project to the county offices of education across the state. The statewide stakeholder engagement described above occurs through the NJ-SSEAC and will eventually scale up beyond the OSE.

Within the TZ schools, the first step in engaging with the schools has been taken by working with administration to identify needs, teach the concepts and framework of Implementation Science, and plan professional development sessions. As engagement with each TZ school evolves, local stakeholder engagement will be necessary and critical. Informing parents about literacy strategies at home to support school-based learning, engaging teachers in effective professional development and coaching, and identifying opportunities for community supports (after-school programs, etc.) will be key activities in the next two years of the SSIP.

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

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

All activities have been described above.

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

N/A

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

State partners at our institutes of higher education such as the BOGGS Center and the Center for Autism and Early Childhood Mental Health have reported significant challenges in engaging schools in intensive coaching and technical assistance supports due to staffing shortages, a lack of release time for participants, and related difficulties scheduling team meetings because of class coverages and operational needs. As a result, several programs have already moved towards asynchronous training models with on-site coaching components and follow-up activities. NJDOE and OSE intends to utilize these strategies that have demonstrated promise in engaging schools during the COVID-19 pandemic to engage with TZ schools and will adjust the supports provided accordingly.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

TZ Infrastructure Improvement Strategies:

Since the spring of 2022, NJ engaged TZ districts in an "Exploration" process to reach a mutually-informed agreement to participate in a collaborative partnership. The process consists of exchanges of information, meetings with senior leadership and stakeholders, and both parties assessing current readiness and fit. The goal of the Exploration Stage is to collaboratively determine which evidence-based literacy practice or program is the best fit by examining the degree to which a particular practice or program meets the school and district needs from the perspective of students, staff, families, and community partners. This stage involves an examination of whether the programs or practices are actually implemented as intended (NIRN, 2020). Additionally, key functions of Exploration include the formation of a representative implementation team to guide the work, demonstrated need for practice or program, and the selection of a practice or program that matches the demonstrated need and is feasible to implement. Each of these activities help create the infrastructure necessary to achieve organizational readiness for implementation. The information below highlights some of the activities in which NJ and districts have engaged in the exploration process.

- District Engagement & Readiness - An invitation letter from Assistant Commissioner Kathy Ehling was emailed to district Superintendents with a general description of the TZ work, and an offer to engage in exploration by setting up an initial meeting. After a positive response, the department scheduled initial meetings with participating districts to provide an overview of the SISEP project and implications for systems change within literacy, provide a general overview of time and personnel commitments for work in the TZ, and engaged in question-and-answer sessions. Soon after, an initial meeting was scheduled with participating districts to gather information related to district/NJDOE readiness and fit and continue the mutual selection process. During this process, districts were given an overview of the Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria which were used to determine eligibility and fit. Additionally, district leadership teams completed an exploration questionnaire to examine organizational readiness in areas such as principles, core competencies, and contextual conditions.
- Developing Training and Coaching Plans – Training and coaching are the principle ways in which behavior change is brought about and professional development, support, and feedback are keys to quality service delivery and to improving service delivery over time (NIRN, 2015). The NJ SISEP team developed an infrastructure of training and coaching for TZ district administrators, implementation teams, and teachers. As part of the exploration stage, district implementation teams participated in professional learning sessions on Implementation Science, Stages of Implementation, and Teaming Structures. Coaching sessions are scheduled after each professional learning session to ensure that new skills are understood and used in practice, district teams are supported, and fidelity is achieved. In addition, in collaboration with the State Management and State Implementation teams, NJDOE literacy consultants created a training module that will introduce educators to relevant research and theoretical models of skilled reading with a focus on connecting the research to best practices for phonemic awareness instruction. The module will introduce and explain phonemic awareness, one critical component of reading instruction, through online lectures, background reading, instructional demonstrations, and an activity workbook to support notetaking and the application of new learning.
- Developing Communication Plans and Protocols – The SISEP Team developed three documents that support communication protocols and planning. The Give / Get document provides an overview of the commitment of the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) and State Implementation and Scaling Up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) and TZ districts; and what each gets in return. This document was reviewed, agreed upon, and signed by TZ districts during the initial stages of the partnership. The Practice Profile is a tool used to operationalize a conceptually defined strategy through community engagement and research methods so that it is clear what practitioners will do as they carry out the innovation (Metz, 2016). The NJDOE's Practice Profile focuses on phonemic awareness (an advanced subcategory of phonological awareness that involves attending to, thinking about, and consciously manipulating the smallest, individual units of sound in a word called phonemes) and provides a fully operationalized practice model for consistent delivery. In addition, the NJ SISEP Team will work with districts to develop a Terms of Reference (TOR) that will serve as a working agreement to provide clarity about the work of the team, orient new members, and assist the team to stay on mission.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets 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:

Kimberly Murray

Title:

Director, Office of Special Education

Email:

kimberly.murray@doe.nj.gov

Phone:

609-376-3766

Submitted on:

04/26/23 2:49:42 PM