

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

New Jersey



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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 2022;
- methodology descriptions via three sampling plans (Indicator 7, 8 and 14);
- an explanation of slippage on indicators where New Jersey did not meet its FFY 2022 target;
- specific content describing Phase II (plan) activities of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as required by Indicator 17 including targets for the Transformation Zone schools, as well as any updates to remaining planned activities for Phase II and a projected plan to transition to Phase III; and
- information to address any actions required by OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

More information is available in the Stakeholder (part 2) attachment.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

661

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

See attached

Technical Assistance System:

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

See attached

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.

See attached

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

The New Jersey 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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing

opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

Apply stakeholder engagement 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 fourteen 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.

Throughout the 2022-2023 council year, the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC) meetings included a stakeholder portion that focused on a group of SPP/APR indicators. Parent members were an integral part of reviewing this information, discussing alignment and implementation of NJDOE partnerships and projects, and providing input towards the targets set within the SPP/APR. In alignment to the structure of the Local Education Agencies' public Special Education Profile, the council has focused on receiving data presentations and facilitating discussions around the following topic areas: (a) Achievement for Students with Disabilities (Indicators 3 and 7); (b) Least Restrictive Environment (Indicators 5 and 6); (c) Secondary Success (Indicators 1, 2, and 14); (d) Parent Involvement (Indicator 8); (e) Equity (Indicators 4a, 4b, 9 and 10); and (d) Compliance (Indicators 11, 12, and 13).

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 2023, 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 2024 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 May of 2023 were used, to administer the Agency Capacity Assessment/State Capacity Assessment (ACA/SCA). This evidence-based tool was used to "assess the impact and presence of efforts to build strong foundations needed to adopt, sustain and scaled effective practices to which an agency invests in and aligns system components to support use of best practices, which includes support and development of implementation teams within and across all levels of the system." NJ-SSEAC members completed a survey designed to gather feedback on leadership, infrastructure, resources, communication, and engagement. The OSE compares the results from year to year, both qualitative and quantitative, to ensure that activities to support areas of continued strength and weakness are addressed prior to the council's 1st public meeting and through consultation with the executive committee of the council, one being a parent representative.

The OSE also partners with the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN) to provide support and training to LEA parent advisory groups across the state. Several training slots are allocated to engage with schools identified, as 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 self-advocacy regarding inclusion and transition to adult life.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Throughout the 2022-2023 council year, the State Special Education Advisory Council (SSEAC) meeting included a stakeholder portion that focused on a group of SPP/APR indicators. Parent members were an integral part of reviewing this information, discussing alignment and implementation of NJDOE partnerships and projects, and providing input towards the targets set within the SPP/APR. In alignment to the structure of the Local Education Agencies' public Special Education Profile, the council has focused on receiving data presentations and facilitating discussions around the following topic areas: (a) Achievement for Students with Disabilities (Indicators 3 and 7); (b) Least Restrictive Environment (Indicators 5 and 6); (c) Secondary Success (Indicators 1, 2, and 14); (d) Parent Involvement (Indicator 8); (e) Equity (Indicators 4a, 4b, 9 and 10); and (d) Compliance (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). For a formal review of presentations, topics discussed, and a summary of input provided, please review to the 2022-2023 State Special Education Advisory Council Annual Report.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

A portion of each meeting is dedicated to addressing questions and concerns from the previous meeting, including the provision of requests for additional data or data 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 2021 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

NJDOE posted the 2021-2022 local district profiles on June 1, 2023. (see <https://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources/index.shtml>)

Consistent with the requirements established in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004), NJDOE made New Jersey's FFY 2021 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 2021 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 2021 SPP/APR was posted on the New Jersey Department of Education's website following the submission to USDE with the requested clarifications. The SPP/APR was posted at: <http://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources.shtml>. The FFY 2022 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 2021 submission that included USOSEP's determination regarding the State's compliance with the requirements of Part B of the IDEA at <http://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources.shtml>. The USOSEP's response to the NJDOE's SPP/APR FFY 2022 submission will again be posted at: <http://www.nj.gov/education/specialed/monitor/dataandresources.shtml>.

Distribution to the Media:

Annually, upon submission to USOSEP, the NJDOE makes the SPP/APR available to the media through the NJDOE website and refers the press to the SPP/APR website when press inquiries are relevant to the SPP indicators. Additionally, the OSE is actively curating landing pages, specific to each of the indicators. In 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 2023 (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 2021 SPP/APR submission and the posting of the determination letter from the USOSEP as well. The USOSEP Response table was discussed in detail with the stakeholders. Information regarding the submission of the SPP/APR and the state's determination is also annually discussed with county special education specialists who communicate the information to local special education directors at their monthly meetings.

Additionally, the Director of the OSE presented at events across the state to communicate the results of the public reports. In addition to an internal agency presentation with other divisions and offices, the OSE presented publicly to county specialists 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 OSE's federal reporting and engagement specialist supplemented her presentation by conducting a professional development opportunity at three in-person, regional conferences and two statewide, online offerings. One of the offerings was specifically geared to stakeholders. The title of the presentation was "Special Education Data 360 Series: Local Special Education Profiles 101". An additional presentation was provided to the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network, New Jersey's parent training information center, during a roundtable event in June of 2023.

Regarding the FFY 2022 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

None

Intro - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508.

On May 6, 2019, OSEP issued findings in its monitoring report, which are not fully resolved. Longstanding noncompliance (from any unresolved finding identified by OSEP during and prior to FFY 2021) may be a factor in the Department's 2025 determinations. OSEP will work with the State to clarify what actions remain.

Intro - Required Actions

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Stakeholder Engagement attachments included in the State's FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	91.42%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	81.00%	81.00%	81.50%	91.50%	91.50%
Data	78.84%	80.14%	83.83%	91.42%	75.93%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	7,905

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	7,560
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	54
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,245

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
7,905	16,764	75.93%	91.75%	47.15%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The methodology for calculating Indicator 1 no longer includes students with disabilities whose IEPs modify or waive a graduation requirement. Data from FFY2020 reflected a spike in graduation rate for students with IEPs due to the temporary elimination of assessment as a graduation requirement. Students during the 2019-2020 school year were not required to take or pass an assessment to graduate. As a result, the IEPs of students with disabilities did not address statewide assessment as a graduation requirement and were included in the graduation count as students who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma. Based on information from the field, all students, including students with disabilities, continue to face adverse academic, emotional, and behavioral impacts of COVID. It is likely that the drop in graduation rate can be attributed in part to those struggles.

Given the degree of variation in results over the last three reporting cycles, the OSE is dedicated to identifying the root causes leading to the drop in the graduation rate. The Office of Special Education (OSE) will utilize post-waiver data trends to establish new baselines and targets to ensure reliable and valid measures of graduation rates while utilizing calculations that exclude students who waived assessment requirements per their IEP. The OSE is continuing to increase awareness of changes to the methodology for calculating Indicator 1 so that LEAs utilize the general education portfolio appeals process to satisfy the graduation assessment requirement rather than waiving graduation requirements altogether. On December 20, 2023, a broadcast was sent out to all LEA administrators clarifying this process. It can be found here:

<https://www.nj.gov/education/broadcasts/2023/dec/20/PortfolioAppealsProcess-InformationandUpdatesfor2023-2024Submissions.pdf>.

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. 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)

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 ED²Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	8.38%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	12.00%	12.00%	6.00%	8.30%	8.25%
Data	5.80%	6.65%	10.28%	8.38%	5.38%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and

guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	7,905
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	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 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	7,560
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	54
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,245

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,245	16,764	5.38%	8.25%	7.43%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	18,584	18,124	18,068
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,939	2,109	2,770
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	12,497	13,810	12,785
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,721	1,508	1,442

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	18,605	18,120	17,736
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,685	1,628	2,216
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	12,734	14,222	12,818
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,722	1,501	1,445

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

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

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,157	18,584	97.65%	95.00%	97.70%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17,427	18,124	96.27%	95.00%	96.15%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	16,997	18,068	93.07%	95.00%	94.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,141	18,605	97.50%	95.00%	97.51%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17,351	18,120	95.84%	95.00%	95.76%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	16,479	17,736	90.31%	95.00%	92.91%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

NJ Department of Education Assessment Data Reports: <https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/>.

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 EDEfacts 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	24.00%	24.00%	24.50%	24.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	21.00%	21.00%	21.50%	21.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	18.00%	18.00%	18.50%	18.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	25.50%	25.50%	26.00%	26.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	14.00%	14.00%	14.50%	14.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	16,436	15,919	15,555
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,839	617	454
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,745	2,164	1,685

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	16,419	15,850	15,034
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,707	359	233
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,778	1,034	832

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,584	16,436	20.76%	24.00%	21.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,781	15,919	15.02%	21.00%	17.47%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2,139	15,555	11.70%	18.00%	13.75%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,485	16,419	18.48%	25.50%	21.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,393	15,850	7.96%	14.00%	8.79%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,065	15,034	6.75%	10.00%	7.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

NJ Department of Education Assessment Results: <https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/>

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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	30.75%	30.75%	31.25%	31.25%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	38.00%	38.00%	38.50%	38.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	31.25%	31.25%	31.75%	31.75%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	36.75%	36.75%	37.25%	37.25%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	17.75%	17.75%	18.25%	18.25%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	1,721	1,508	1,442
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	376	408	480

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	1,722	1,501	1,445
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	752	222	425

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	376	1,721	26.16%	30.75%	21.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	408	1,508	28.70%	38.00%	27.06%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	480	1,442	33.27%	31.25%	33.29%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Nationally, and within New Jersey, there continues to be challenges facing the evaluation and determination 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. When examining the slippage across 3C in the area of reading for 4th grade, we consider our approach to the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) around early literacy to include a focus on interventions and services for students that identify with significant cognitive disabilities. Additionally, our office has worked strategically with Local Education Agency (LEA) personnel and leadership to understand the requirements and purposes of the alternate assessment and curated resources throughout 2022-2023 that are housed on the following website (URL:

https://dynamiclearningmaps.org/nj_resource_library). The DLM Resource Library now includes guidance such as the "Self-Reflection Guide for LEAs Exceeding the 1% Participation Cap", a "Family Overview of Alternate Assessment", a "Roadmap to Determine Eligibility for the Alternate Assessment", an "eLearning video titled "Who are NJ Students with the Most Significant Intellectual Disabilities?", and a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) resource. We continue to monitor participation and proficiency rates to consider opportunities for differentiated targeted support and future collaboration with the state transformation specialist to consider this population when prioritizing systemic change in early literacy.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Nationally, and within the New Jersey Department of Education, there continues to be challenges facing the evaluation and determination 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. For example, students that are now in 8th grade may have experienced learning loss during pivotal years where literacy instruction was fundamental to their over success in reading. Students in 8th grade may require increased focus on accelerating learning and literacy interventions including a focus on interventions and services for students that identify with significant cognitive disabilities. Additionally, our office has worked strategically with Local Education Agency personnel and leadership to understand the requirements and purposes of the alternate assessment and curated resources throughout 2022-2023 that are housed on the following website (URL: https://dynamiclearningmaps.org/nj_resource_library). The DLM Resource Library now includes guidance such as the "Self-Reflection Guide for LEAs Exceeding the 1% Participation Cap", a "Family Overview of Alternate Assessment", a "Roadmap to Determine Eligibility for the Alternate Assessment", an "eLearning video titled "Who are NJ Students with the Most Significant Intellectual Disabilities?", and a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) resource. We continue to monitor participation and proficiency rates to consider opportunities for differentiated targeted support. Referencing the Early Literacy initiative, we consider equitable access to tailored literacy instruction for students taking the alternate assessment and continue to study the subsequent impacts on performance for students with significant cognitive disability in middle school who may still require literacy interventions.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	752	1,722	43.71%	36.75%	43.67%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	222	1,501	15.67%	17.75%	14.79%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	425	1,445	32.49%	10.50%	29.41%	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.

NJ Department of Education Alternate Assessment Results: <https://www.nj.gov/education/assessment/results/reports/2223/index.shtml>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response**3C - Required Actions**

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (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 ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	30.75	30.75	30.50	30.50
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	38.50	38.50	38.25	38.25
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	37.75	37.75	37.50	37.50
Math	A <=	Grade 4	24.50	24.50	24.25	24.25
Math	B <=	Grade 8	32.50	32.50	32.25	32.25
Math	C <=	Grade HS	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;
 - discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
 - facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	93,502	100,459	101,125
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,436	15,919	15,555
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	45,142	51,630	48,833
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,815	3,927	3,332
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,839	617	454
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,745	2,164	1,685

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	95,225	101,923	101,992
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,419	15,850	15,034
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	39,514	33,539	28,018
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,730	2,141	1,768
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,707	359	233
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,778	1,034	832

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.81%	51.29%	28.63	30.75	29.48	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	17.47%	55.30%	36.32	38.50	37.83	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	13.75%	51.58%	36.84	37.75	37.83	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.23%	44.36%	20.95	24.50	23.14	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.79%	35.01%	25.16	32.50	26.22	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	7.08%	29.20%	21.19	24.50	22.12	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 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	5.88%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	0.90%	0.80%	0.80%
Data	0.91%	0.76%	0.76%	0.30%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	5.90%	5.80%	5.80%	5.70%

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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

FFY 2022 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.

437

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
13	221	Not Valid and Reliable	5.90%	5.88%	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 children with disabilities that is greater than three (3) times the statewide average. In FFY21, the NJDOE determined the statewide rate of out-of-school suspensions of greater than 10 days for children with disabilities to be 0.02%. The NJDOE multiplied that outcome, 0.02%, by three (3) to determine the cutoff for an LEA to be identified for significant discrepancy as 0.06%.

Methodology: The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) determines whether significant discrepancies occurred in each LEA by comparing the proportion of children with disabilities who were removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in an LEA to three times the statewide rate at which children with disabilities were removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in that school year. When the LEA's rate exceeds three times the statewide rate, the LEA is identified as significantly discrepant. The NJDOE relies on 618 data reported via EdFacts file FS006, Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions, for these calculations. Data from the Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days of the Annual Report of Children Served were used in the process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NJ defines significant discrepancy as three times the statewide average in 2021 (0.02). LEAs that exceeded .06 (3 X .02) were identified. This change in methodology resulted in a change to the baseline and targets.

Baseline Year: 2022 New Baseline: 5.88%

Targets:

2022 5.9

2023 5.8

2024 5.8

2025 5.7

NJ will be meeting with stakeholders in advance of the FFY23 SPP/APR submission to discuss reductions in both the 'n' and cell sizes used to calculate significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A. The goal is to include more LEAs in the calculation. NJ anticipates changes to the methodology, baseline and targets in the next submission.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

After consulting with USOSEP in FY21 and reviewing our reasonable methodology for 4A and 4B, we anticipated bringing the risk ratio to stakeholders for input and reducing the N and Cell-size. However, given the timeline of district identification for disproportionality for FY22 and the opportunity to consult with stakeholders, the impact of reasonable methodology would not be reflected until FY23.

4A - OSEP Response

The State revised its methodology for this indicator and therefore must revise its baseline and targets through FFY 2025 for this indicator.

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.15%	0.15%	0.91%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

217

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
12	0	441	Not Valid and Reliable	0%	0.00%	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

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

Specifically, for each racial/ethnic group in each LEA, the NJDOE calculates the suspension rate by dividing the number of children with disabilities in the racial/ethnic group who were removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days by the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in the LEA. Next, the NJDOE compares the suspension rate for each racial/ethnic group to three (3) times the statewide suspension rate for all children with disabilities. The statewide suspension rate for all children with disabilities is calculated by dividing the total number of children with disabilities removed via out-of-school suspensions for more than 10 cumulative days in the school year in the state by the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in the state's LEAs. In FFY21, the NJDOE determined the statewide suspension rate of for children with disabilities to be 0.02%. The NJDOE multiplied that outcome, 0.02%, by three (3) to determine the cutoff for an LEA to be identified for significant discrepancy for any racial/ethnic group as 0.06%.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NJ defines significant discrepancy as three times the statewide average in 2021 (0.02). LEAs that exceeded .06 (3 X .02) were identified. This change in methodology resulted in a change to the baseline and targets.

Baseline Year: 2022 New Baseline: 0.00%

Targets:

2022 0

2023 0

2024 0

2025 0

NJ will be meeting with stakeholders in advance of the FFY23 SPP/APR submission to discuss reductions in both the 'n' and cell sizes used to calculate significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B. The goal is to include more LEAs in the calculation. NJ anticipates changes to the methodology, baseline and targets in the next submission.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

After consulting with USOSEP in FY21 and reviewing our reasonable methodology for 4A and 4B, we anticipated bringing the risk ratio to stakeholders for input and reducing the N and Cell-size. However, given the timeline of district identification for disproportionality for FY22 and the opportunity to consult with stakeholders, the impact of reasonable methodology would not be reflected until FY23.

4B - OSEP Response

The State revised its methodology for this indicator and therefore must revise its baseline and targets through FFY 2025 for this indicator.

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	50.00%	50.50%	50.50%	45.00%	45.00%
A	44.64%	Data	44.62%	45.12%	44.64%	45.23%	44.20%
B	2019	Target <=	15.00%	15.00%	14.00%	14.75%	14.75%
B	14.98%	Data	14.74%	14.44%	14.98%	15.60%	15.48%
C	2019	Target <=	7.10%	6.90%	6.90%	6.75%	6.75%
C	6.78%	Data	7.14%	7.02%	6.78%	6.62%	6.11%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	45.50%	45.50%	46.00%	46.00%
Target B <=	14.50%	14.50%	14.25%	14.25%
Target C <=	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more

efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	228,320
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	101,185
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	34,383
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	13,227
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	311
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	605

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	101,185	228,320	44.20%	45.50%	44.32%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	34,383	228,320	15.48%	14.50%	15.06%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	14,143	228,320	6.11%	6.50%	6.19%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

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

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	44.50%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	47.00%
A	Data	45.73%	47.44%	44.82%	45.14%	45.10%
B	Target <=	34.50%	34.00%	34.00%	38.75%	38.75%
B	Data	39.67%	38.75%	41.14%	40.91%	42.17%
C	Target <=				0.19%	0.19%
C	Data				0.19%	0.25%

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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

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.

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	6,460	7,760	495	14,715
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	2,623	3,827	244	6,694
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,678	2,702	138	5,518
b2. Number of children attending separate school	219	255	44	518
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	2	0	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	6	10	1	17

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2013	Target >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.00%	72.75%	72.75%
A1	72.60%	Data			25.00%	88.00%	Not Valid and Reliable

A2	2013	Target >=	78.00%	78.50%	78.50%	76.50%	76.50%
A2	76.25%	Data			40.00%	42.31%	Not Valid and Reliable
B1	2013	Target >=	69.00%	70.00%	70.00%	67.00%	67.00%
B1	66.67%	Data			50.00%	73.91%	Not Valid and Reliable
B2	2013	Target >=	53.00%	54.00%	54.00%	48.50%	48.50%
B2	48.25%	Data			20.00%	34.62%	Not Valid and Reliable
C1	2013	Target >=	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	55.00%	55.00%
C1	70.29%	Data			50.00%	79.17%	Not Valid and Reliable
C2	2013	Target >=	60.00%	61.00%	61.00%	56.00%	56.00%
C2	56.00%	Data			40.00%	46.15%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	73.00%	73.00%	73.25%	73.25%
Target A2 >=	76.75%	76.75%	77.00%	77.00%
Target B1 >=	67.50%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%
Target B2 >=	48.75%	48.75%	49.00%	49.00%
Target C1 >=	55.50%	55.50%	56.00%	56.00%
Target C2 >=	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

544

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	17	3.13%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	36	6.62%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	273	50.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	178	32.72%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	40	7.35%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	451	504	Not Valid and Reliable	73.00%	89.48%	Met target	N/A
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>	218	544	Not Valid and Reliable	76.75%	40.07%	Did not meet target	N/A

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	16	2.94%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	44	8.09%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	272	50.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	173	31.80%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	39	7.17%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	445	505	Not Valid and Reliable	67.50%	88.12%	Met target	N/A
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>	212	544	Not Valid and Reliable	48.75%	38.97%	Did not meet target	N/A

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	18	3.31%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	29	5.33%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	227	41.73%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	211	38.79%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	59	10.85%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	438	485	Not Valid and Reliable	55.50%	90.31%	Met target	N/A
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>	270	544	Not Valid and Reliable	56.50%	49.63%	Did not meet target	N/A

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	YES
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	FY22_Indicator7SamplingPlan_Approved

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

To meet the requirement of Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes, New Jersey implemented a multi-year plan to use the Child Outcome Summary (COS) Process, a team process for summarizing information about a child's functioning from multiple sources. This supports the local, state, and nation-wide goals for improved outcomes.

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

YES

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

In FY2019, New Jersey began a multi-year plan to use the Child Outcome Summary (COS) Process to collect data for Indicator 7. To date, the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Office of Special Education has trained 491 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. New Jersey has less than 50 LEAs to train on the COS Tool. The next training for LEAs will take place in March 2024, with the expectation for those districts to begin implementation of the COS Tool beginning the 2024/2025 school year.

After an LEA is trained in the COS Process, it is required that this process is implemented with any new eligible student that begins as a preschool student with a disability. The COS Summary Process is used in a team approach and a rating is decided upon within the first 60 days of a child starting services to ensure the data represents an accurate depiction of the child at the beginning of their preschool special education experience. Once data is collected for a student and ratings are decided, the LEA inputs the data into the internal data system by using a child's state identification number. When a child exits preschool special education and transitions to kindergarten, or if a child becomes declassified and is no longer receiving special education preschool services, their exit data is submitted within 60 days of the child exiting services. A child must have received special education and related services for a minimum of 6 months to have an exit rating. The exit data is submitted into the internal data system using the state identification number to show the students' ratings at exit point.

Once an LEA has attended the required training in the COS Tool, it is required for them to continue the use of the tool and the COS process with any

eligible, new preschool student who receives an IEP. Any data collected by the LEA for Indicator 7 is required to be submitted into the internal database at a minimum of 2 (two) times a year, the third Friday in December and the third Friday in June. However, the data system is open to LEAs all year, so they can upload data at any point if they choose to do it more frequently. In addition, a COS support email and assistance is available all year round for questions and concerns regarding the process.

It is recommended that someone who is familiar with the Indicator 7 process and outcomes uploads and submits the entry and exit ratings. The internal data system has been programmed to allow for only 1 entry and 1 exit per state identification number. This proactively reduces the number of errors and increases accurate data submission. Each December and June, data is extracted from the internal system, analyzed and determinations are made to ensure districts have entered data that is accurate and useable. Currently, the NJDOE provides a multi-tiered level of targeted assistance and through this process, provides feedback on data quality, overall data submissions and targeted support for each LEA to increase quality data. The NJDOE examines the two points of data to determine if students have made progress toward preschool outcomes with the special education and related services they were provided with during their time in preschool. The findings are used to make changes and improvements to systems and processes for highly effective preschool programming.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To support the efforts of LEAs in the implementation of the COS, a specific email account for technical assistance was developed for LEAs to reach out with questions and concerns at any time. Each concern is addressed on an individual basis and the LEA is provided with needed 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. The FAQ is sorted into 4 categories: Child Outcome Summary Overview, Child Outcome Summary Processes and Procedures, Child Outcome Summary Rating and Discussion, and NJDOE Homeroom.

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. There have been continued improvements within the data system since the last reporting cycle. New Jersey continues to make improvements with the system to ensure quality data is being captured from LEAs.

To ensure LEAs are submitting quality data is being submitted for Indicator 7, a data quality rubric is being created and given to each LEA at the end of each fiscal year. The data quality rubric will allow for LEAs to identify specific improvements that need to be made based off their LEA's submission that will be analyzed by the NJDOE. Specific improvements may include feedback on students that were not included in the submission and should have been or data that was submitted with errors and may not be included in the analysis. Each LEA will also be provided with a spreadsheet listing the specific student sample of those transitioning to kindergarten or turning 6 years of age that data is expected to be collected and submitted for.

In Fall of 2023, there were an additional 195 LEAs trained and began utilizing the Child Outcome Summary (COS) Process for Indicator 7 data, leaving 40 LEAs left to receive training. The training took place at the beginning of September 2023, with 3 dates and times available to choose from. Each virtual training had 200-300 participants. Participants included administration, Child Study Team (CST) Members and preschool general education staff from the LEAs who were assigned to be a part of Cohort 3. Cohort 3 was responsible for inputting data and completing the COS for all students who began the 2023-2024 school year as a new Preschool Student with an Individualized Education Program (IEP). They were not responsible for collecting COS data on any student who had an existing IEP prior to the 2023-2024 school year.

Cohort 4 will take place in March 2024 to include the remaining LEAs in New Jersey that have not received training for Indicator 7. There are 40 LEAs who will participate in that cohort and receive training. Indicator 7 training will take place virtually with multiple dates and times to allow LEAs flexibility to attend the training that works best for them.

Planning for training in the Fall of 2024, the NJDOE Preschool Team revised the Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes using a multi-tiered approach including a Learning Management System (LMS), online modules, and technical assistance to meet the needs of each LEA. The online LMS will allow for the NJDOE to provide a tiered approach for LEAs. When new staff begin within each LEA, they will be able to attend the training at their own pace and ensure completion and knowledge test for each section of the training prior to moving ahead. If there are LEAs who need further training on specific aspects of the indicator (i.e. the data system to store Indicator 7 data) they will be able to complete only the needed modules. By tailoring the training for all LEAs to include a variety of platforms the NJDOE is providing increased accountability for individual LEAs. The expectation is that each district will be held responsible for identifying the required staff to complete the appropriate training modules on an ongoing basis.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

After it was noted that the data for Indicator 7 was not reliable and valid for FFY 2021, the NJDOE moved to a sampling model this year instead of just reporting all of the cohort schools who had received training on the Child Outcome Summary. Since the NJDOE Office of Special Education is still approximately two years away from statewide data collection, a sampling methodology was developed using the collected data set from all trained cohort schools. The data reported for FFY 2022 was analyzed to determine its representativeness within +/- 3% in statewide demographic categories consistent with Indicators 8 and 14. The methodology and sampling plan (attached) are both included in the NJDOE reporting on Indicator 7 for FFY 2022.

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The New Jersey 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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed

the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	80.60%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	85.50%	86.00%	86.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	83.65%	84.74%	84.92%	84.16%	83.33%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
8,810	10,463	83.33%	85.30%	84.20%	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.

41,336

Percentage of respondent parents

25.31%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	24.68%	25.31%

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

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

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

When compared to other cohorts in the 16-year history, Cohort 17 resulted in one of the best years for primary disability representation, while gender and race were less representative than in Cohort 16. Two of the three demographic areas, primary disability and gender, were within the threshold (+/- 3.0%) for representativeness.

The primary disability numbers – learning disability (LD), emotional disability (ED), intellectual disability (ID), and all other disabilities (AO) – differ by absolute values between 0.12% and 1.51% in Cohort 17. Using +/- 3.0% as a guideline, all disability types –meet the threshold for representativeness in the sample.

In Cohort 17, the representativeness for gender was about average for the history of the cohorts – under-representing females by 0.94%. This number is within the +/- 3.0% threshold for representativeness. In other years, female representation differed by absolute values ranging from 0.04% to 4.42%.

Until Cohort 15, minorities had always been under-represented by a percentage outside of the designated +/- 3.0% threshold for representativeness. Cohort 16 was just the second time that the proportion was within that representativeness threshold, only being under-represented by 2.15%. Cohort 17 moved back outside of the threshold, with minorities being under-represented by 3.03%. The minority under-representation has ranged from 0.16% to 10.71% in other years.

The first table shows how the Cohort 17 respondents compare to the Cohort 17 target population.
Cohort 17 (2022-23)

Target Population Respondent Representation

Cohort 17 Respondents Versus Cohort 17 Target

Target Disability Representation

LD 29.06%
ED 2.87%
ID 2.38%
AO 65.68%
Female 33.64%
Minority 56.09%
Black 16.47%
Hispanic 31.42%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 8.20%

Respondent Representation

LD 27.56%
ED 3.73%
ID 2.50%
AO 66.21%
Female 32.71%
Minority 53.06%
Black 11.90%
Hispanic 29.95%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 11.21%

Difference

LD -1.51%
ED 0.86%
ID 0.12%
AO 0.52%
Female -0.94%
Minority -3.03%
Black -4.57%
Hispanic -1.47%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 3.01%

Cohort 17 Respondents Versus State Special Education Target

Target Disability Representation

LD 29.17%
ED 2.72%
ID 2.34%
AO 65.77%
Female 33.75%
Minority 56.87%
Black 16.12%
Hispanic 32.53%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 8.23%

Respondent Representation

LD 27.56%
ED 3.73%
ID 2.50%
AO 66.21%
Female 32.71%
Minority 53.06%
Black 11.90%
Hispanic 29.95%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 11.21%

Difference

LD -1.61%
ED 1.01%
ID 0.16%
AO 0.44%
Female -1.04%
Minority -3.81%
Black -4.21%
Hispanic -2.58%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 2.98%

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

NO

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

The Cohort 17 data collection was not representative of the 2022-23 NJ special education population. For reference, below are the differences in proportion for the responding parents versus the full special education population.

Learning Disability: -1.61%
Emotional Disturbance: 1.01%
Intellectual Disability: 0.16%
All Other: 0.44%
Female: -1.04%
Black: -4.21%
Hispanic: -2.58%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander): 2.98%

The lone category outside of the +/-3% threshold for representativeness was Black respondents. New Jersey is analyzing parental response rates and facilitation scores by demographic subgroups. Below is a look at the response rates.

White: 25.3%
Black: 17.1%
Hispanic: 22.6%
Other: 32.3%

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

While Black respondents were underrepresented in the data, they reported the second-highest facilitation score among the different racial categories.

White: 82.4%
Black: 85.3%
Hispanic: 86.4%
Other: 85.2%

In order to produce a more accurate facilitation score, the respondent data was statistically weighted so that all of the sampled categories (race/ethnicity, gender, and disability category) of the responding population matched the full special education population of NJ. When this was done, the overall facilitation score improved from 84.2% to 84.5% reporting that school districts facilitated parental involvement.

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

1. NJDOE will continue to work with the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN) and utilize their networking resources in order to promote and encourage parent participation and response to the survey.
2. In response to our stakeholders recommendations NJDOE contracted with a vendor and now provides translated surveys in the top 10 spoken languages in addition to English in NJ including: Arabic, Bengali, Mandarin Chinese, Gujarati, Haitian Creole, Hindi, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish, and Urdu.
3. NJDOE will continue providing participating districts with suggestions to increase parent access to the survey such as distributing and collecting surveys at school events, using parent email addresses, and inviting parents into the school computer lab to complete the survey electronically.

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

Line A (in gray) refers to the final Cohort 17 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, 99.80% provided an apparent Postal mailing address. Of those that provided a Postal mailing address, 1.77% 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, 88.63% of the address lines had email address information. This is similar to last year's 85.68%. 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, 3.53% of the cases that provided an email address had invalid information. This is a significant decrease from last year's 10.31%.

Line B combines the results of the Postal and email address quality check to account for cases where all of the provided contact information was proven to be invalid – letters returned as undeliverable for Postal addresses and email bounce-backs for the email addresses that were provided. Overall, 0.61% of the Cohort 17 sample could not be contacted, which is a decrease from the 1.46% unable to contact from Cohort 16. Line C represents the remaining contact information lines in Cohort 17 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 17, almost three-quarters of all the completed surveys were done online through the web survey (73.17%). This is similar to last year when 72.73% of the surveys were web responses and is also the sixth time that the majority of surveys were done electronically as opposed to on paper.

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

17 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 25.39%.

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 25.55%.

The administration schedule for Cohort 17 was similar to Cohort 16, but still not back to the standard schedule used before 2020. Cohorts 14 and 15 had experienced significant schedule changes due to COVID-19 school closures, and Cohorts 16 and 17 moved closer to the typical schedule by opening data collection in June.

Cohort 17 had a slightly shorter timeframe for data collection than is typical, compared to even shorter data collection periods in 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. Cohorts 16 and 17 returned to the standard project timeline in 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.

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

USOSEP Clarification Feedback: The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, and identify the steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children with disabilities receiving special education services, as required by the Measurement Table.

NJDOE's Response:

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

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

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

3) The respondent data is statistically weighted to demographically match the full special education population data of the state in order to produce a more accurate result.

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

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

We are always considering new ways to improve response rates. The higher the response rate, the more likely the results are to be representative. Below are two new additions we are planning for the next cohort.

1) We plan to implement live response rate monitoring by demographic characteristics and variable effort adjustment for underperforming groups. For example, if the response rate for Black respondents is lower than that for other groups, we can schedule additional contact attempts for school districts with high populations of this demographic group.

2) Work with school districts to promote and stress the importance of the survey beyond the initial letter notifying parents, particularly in underperforming districts.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not, as required by the Measurement Table, include an analysis by race/ethnicity of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include this analysis. Additionally, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The potential for nonresponse bias in the final Indicator 8 measures does exist, however many steps are being implemented to mitigate this as much as possible. NJ uses a stratified sampling scheme to divide the state's special education population into 6 demographically representative cohorts. Prior to the data collection process, NJ works with school districts to ensure sample accuracy as much as possible. Multiple modes are offered (mail and web) and several invitations are sent (mail and email) to encourage parents to participate.

Once the data has been collected, a demographic analysis was performed which compared the proportions for the survey responses against both the FFY 2022 Cohort 17 sample targets as well as the whole special education population of the state for FFY 2022. When survey responses are compared against the cohort 17 sample targets, gender and disability type were both within the +/- 3% threshold for representativeness. For race, the lone category outside of the +/- 3% threshold was for the African-American population (-4.57%). It is important to remember that the results should be compared to the special education population of the state and not just the cohort sample, since this is what the responses are meant to represent. When the FFY 2022 Cohort 17 responses are compared to the full special education population of the state, the results are similar. Gender and disability type are within the +/- 3% threshold, while the lone category for race that fell outside this threshold was the African-American group (-4.21%).

While African-Americans are the lone underrepresented group among responses, they have the second-highest facilitation score among the racial demographic categories. In descending order, the facilitation scores were: Hispanic (86.4%), African-American (85.3%), Other (85.2%), and White (82.4%).

Currently, NJ does not collect separate demographic information about the respondent (parent or guardian of the child receiving special education services). However, in order to encourage participation from as many parents as possible, NJ expanded the availability of the survey in recent years to include 8 additional languages for a total of 10 different language options.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

30

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	631	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 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	1.57%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

87

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
29	3	574	1.57%	0%	0.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

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

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. Three (3) LEAs identified noncompliance through the self-assessment submitted to and verified by OSE. Review of the self-assessments indicate that the noncompliance was the result of a breakdown in LEA procedures. All LEAs have revised their procedures and provided training to appropriate staff.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9		0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As required by OSEP QA 23-01, NJDOE aggregates data for this indicator for the full reporting period at the LEA level to determine which LEAs demonstrate noncompliance. Individual instances of noncompliance are grouped by finding to make findings at the LEA level. LEAs with findings are required to determine the root cause of the noncompliance, as appropriate, and to implement corrective actions to address any root causes identified and to correct any noncompliance policies, procedures or practices that may have contributed to the noncompliance.

To verify correction of noncompliance, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit and/or interviews, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a desk audit consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the LEAs indicating the dates of completion of evaluations, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the LEAs regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2022. 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 QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

1. was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data that demonstrate compliance; and
2. had corrected each individual case of noncompliance

All findings of noncompliance with Indicator 10 identified in FFY 2021 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the nine districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the three districts identified in FFY 2022 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.29%	93.41%	79.86%	90.07%	92.97%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
34,279	31,756	92.97%	100%	92.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

2,523

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

Delay Range by Days

Delay Reason 1: Incomplete Residency

Between 1-5 Days: 21

Between 6-15 Days: 21

Between 16-30 Days: 21

Between 31-60 Days: 12

Between 61-90 Days: 6

Between 91-120 Days: 3

More than 120 Days: 4

Eligibility not yet determined: 6

TOTAL: 94

Delay Reason 2: Additional Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 69

Between 6-15 Days: 76

Between 16-30 Days: 78

Between 31-60 Days: 88

Between 61-90 Days: 22

Between 91-120 Days: 19

More than 120 Days: 15

Eligibility not yet determined: 36

TOTAL: 403

Delay Reason 3: Specialized Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 61

Between 6-15 Days: 71

Between 16-30 Days: 78

Between 31-60 Days: 72

Between 61-90 Days: 25

Between 91-120 Days: 14

More than 120 Days: 9

Eligibility not yet determined: 19

TOTAL: 349

Delay Reason 6: Vacancies of Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel

Between 1-5 Days: 40

Between 6-15 Days: 43

Between 16-30 Days: 36

Between 31-60 Days: 37

Between 61-90 Days: 17

Between 91-120 Days: 10

More than 120 Days: 7

Eligibility not yet determined: 26

TOTAL: 216

Delay Reason 7: Child Study Team or Related Services Personnel were Unavailable

Between 1-5 Days: 232

Between 6-15 Days: 220

Between 16-30 Days: 152

Between 31-60 Days: 114

Between 61-90 Days: 46

Between 91-120 Days: 21

More than 120 Days: 8

Eligibility not yet determined: 25

TOTAL: 818

No Delay Code or Invalid Delay Code

Between 1-5 Days: 252

Between 6-15 Days: 245

Between 16-30 Days: 83
 Between 31-60 Days: 32
 Between 61-90 Days: 4
 Between 91-120 Days: 6
 More than 120 Days: 5
 Eligibility not yet determined: 16
 TOTAL: 643

TOTAL FOR ALL DELAY REASONS: 2523

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, 2022 to June 30, 2023 as reported by districts on October 15, 2023.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1,933	1,933		0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

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

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

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the 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 2022. A review of data and 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 QA 23-01, the NJDOE monitors determined, through desk audit or onsite visit, that each LEA with a finding of noncompliance:

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

All findings of noncompliance with Indicator 11 identified in FFY 2021 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.04%	81.22%	67.48%	70.19%	70.65%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,687
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	39

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,385
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.	279
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	2,385	3,369	70.65%	100%	70.79%	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

984

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

Delay Reason 01: Incomplete Residency

Between 1-5 Days: 4

Between 6-15 Days: 5

Between 16-30 Days: 1

Between 31-60 Days: 5

Between 61-90 Days: 4

Between 91-120 Days: 3

More than 120 Days: 1

Eligibility not determined: 2

TOTAL: 25

Delay Reason 02: Additional Evaluations Needed

Between 1-5 Days: 0

Between 6-15 Days: 4

Between 16-30 Days: 13

Between 31-60 Days: 3

Between 61-90 Days: 4

Between 91-120 Days: 0

More than 120 Days: 1

Eligibility not determined: 3

TOTAL: 28

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: 1

Between 91-120 Days: 0

More than 120 Days: 0

Eligibility not determined: 1

TOTAL: 12

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

Between 1-5 Days: 0

Between 6-15 Days: 1

Between 16-30 Days: 2

Between 31-60 Days: 2

Between 61-90 Days: 2

Between 91-120 Days: 0

More than 120 Days: 0

Eligibility not determined: 3

TOTAL: 10

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

Between 1-5 Days: 3

Between 6-15 Days: 7

Between 16-30 Days: 5

Between 31-60 Days: 4

Between 61-90 Days: 6

Between 91-120 Days: 8
 More than 120 Days: 2
 Eligibility not determined: 4
 TOTAL: 39

Delay Reason 09: Late Referrals
 Between 1-5 Days: 1
 Between 6-15 Days: 1
 Between 16-30 Days: 1
 Between 31-60 Days: 2
 Between 61-90 Days: 1
 Between 91-120 Days: 1
 More than 120 Days: 0
 Eligibility not determined: 1
 TOTAL: 8

No Delay Code or Invalid Delay Code
 Between 1-5 Days: 12
 Between 6-15 Days: 49
 Between 16-30 Days: 74
 Between 31-60 Days: 35
 Between 61-90 Days: 104
 Between 91-120 Days: 74
 More than 120 Days: 486
 Eligibility not determined: 28
 TOTAL: 862

TOTAL FOR ALL DELAY REASONS: 984

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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
857	857		0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

1. 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 QA 23-01.

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

The specific actions taken to verify correction included review of data submitted by the districts indicating the dates of completion of IEP implementation, although late, and the review of updated data submitted by the districts regarding referrals conducted subsequent to FFY 2022.

NJDOE analyzes subsequent data submitted through NJSMART to determine whether each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The data must demonstrate 100% compliance. The amount of data reviewed varies based on the level of the noncompliance and the size of the LEA.

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

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

All findings of noncompliance with Indicator 12 identified in FFY 2021 were verified as corrected in accordance with OSEP QA 23-01 within one year of identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.72%	92.81%	90.10%	92.86%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
374	374	100.00%	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 2021**

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target ≥	47.00%	47.50%	48.00%	48.00%	48.00%
A	45.00%	Data	52.20%	47.67%	51.93%	49.57%	42.35%
B	2009	Target ≥	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%	74.00%	74.00%
B	74.00%	Data	83.67%	78.57%	80.12%	78.30%	79.81%
C	2009	Target ≥	86.50%	86.50%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
C	84.00%	Data	89.55%	86.92%	87.15%	84.97%	87.15%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	48.50%	48.50%	49.00%	49.00%
Target B ≥	74.50%	74.50%	75.00%	75.00%
Target C ≥	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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council’s priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	2,518
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	58.42%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	770
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	437
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)	74
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).	58

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	770	1,471	42.35%	48.50%	52.35%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,207	1,471	79.81%	74.50%	82.05%	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)	1,339	1,471	87.15%	87.50%	91.03%	Met target	No Slippage

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	2021	2022
Response Rate	70.25%	58.42%

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

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

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

Representativeness: Using the NPSO Response Calculator, see below, the NJOSE calculated the representativeness of respondents to all student exiters from Cohort IIIV districts (from the 2021-2022 school year). Representativeness is calculated for each demographic category by subtracting the percentage of respondents from the percentage of all student exiters for each category. A difference of $\pm 3\%$ is considered a statistical difference.

Comparison of Representativeness: Student exiters who responded to the survey were representative of all student exiters from 2021-2022 in the disability, gender, and race categories. Student exiters who responded to the survey and were in placement out-of-district at the time of exit were under-represented, Student exiters who dropped out were also under-represented.

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

Target Lever Representation

LD 39.63%
ED 6.43%
CI 1.83%
AO 52.10%
Female 34.35%
Minority 44.04%
Black 15.97%
Hispanic 23.07%
Other (Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander) 3.34%
OOD 8.34%
Dropout 12.87%
Abbott 3.85%

Respondent Representation

LD 42.62%
ED 4.83%
CI 1.22%
AO 51.33%
Female 34.06%
Minority 42.69%
Black 15.16%
Hispanic 22.77%
Other 3.47%
OOD 4.96%
Dropout 3.20%
Abbott 2.58%

Difference

LD 2.99%
ED -1.61%
CI -0.60%
AO -0.78%
Female -0.29%
Minority -1.35%
Black -0.81%
Hispanic -0.30%
Other 0.13%
OOD -3.38%
Dropout -9.67%
Abbott -1.27%

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 except out-of-district placement and dropout. Both categories were under-represented in the group of respondents.

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)

NO

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

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

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. The Bloustein Center at Rutgers University (BCSR) continues to work with the NJDOE Office of Special Education to analyze district data and demographic data to inform efforts towards increasing response rates such as increased TA and outreach to district directors of special education. For this cohort, multiple districts indicated that there had been staff turnover which led to a delayed start date to data collection and in many cases, an inability to collect data from student exiters. The technical assistance sessions will be updated to highlight which groups have been historically underrepresented in the data collection. These sessions will also place an emphasis on the importance of timely submission of district Data Verification Forms which NJ uses to confirm the target leaver group number. With the confirmed number and demographic data of target leavers before the start of data collection, it will be possible to monitor progress towards collection of data from historically underrepresented groups to ensure representativeness moving forward. The NJDOE and BCSR are also considering additional outreach methods to collect data, including email. If this moves forward, an additional technical assistance session is likely to be held for all districts in NJ, not just those in the next data collection cohort to ensure that this information is being collected at the time a student exits. It is also recommended that districts report effort of level variables which will allow the NRBA app to be more fully utilized moving forward.

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

Response rates were analyzed using the NRBA app from the IDEA Data Center. Response rates were calculated separately by race/ethnicity, exit manner, placement, gender, and disability type. This analysis found that students in an out-of-district placement and students who dropped out were underrepresented in our respondent group. Analysis also found that responders from these two groups were less likely than other exiters to be engaged within one year of leaving high school. The strategies being implemented to increase the response rate year over year will also assist in reducing bias, specifically using existing technical assistance sessions to highlight underrepresented groups and stress the importance of collecting data from these exiters. Changes will also be made to the timeline for confirming the demographics and eligibility of all target leavers. This will make it possible to monitor progress towards collection of data from students in an out-of-district placement and students who dropped out while data collection is ongoing. Additional follow-up will be made with districts who submit respondent data for less than 50% of student exiters in these groups.

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

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	83
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	12

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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	77.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	59.00%	60.00%	75.00%	77.00%-85.00%	77.00%-85.00%

Data	77.78%	93.75%	30.00%	14.91%	8.15%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-------

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
12	83	8.15%	77.25%	14.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	716
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	72
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	92

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;
- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and

guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	38.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=	39.00%	39.00%	39.50%	38.00%	38.00%
Data	38.86%	37.91%	30.09%	24.44%	26.62%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
72	92	716	26.62%	38.25%	22.91%	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, expedited due process hearings and emergency relief due process hearings. NJDOE makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial level appropriate. Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school districts regarding the identification, evaluation, placement, services, or the provision of a FAPE to a child with a disability. Parents or school districts may request mediation independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents. Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school districts with the help of an impartial third person who has been trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediators are highly trained and experienced intermediaries assigned on a rotational basis. Mediation is voluntary, and all parties must agree to participate for the mediation session to occur. The mediation sessions are scheduled promptly and held either in person or virtually. Mediation services are provided at no cost to parents and school districts. A mediator does not make decisions; instead, he or she facilitates discussion and decision-making. The State's failure to meet its target for this indicator is likely because often parties that participate in mediation engage in meaningful and productive dialogue, but may need to finalize the terms, so the mediator does not necessarily draft an agreement. Additionally, a review of data for Indicator 15 indicates that more people have opted to attempt to resolve their disputes through resolution sessions offered by the school districts, which may also explain the slippage and State's failure to meet its target.

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) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

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

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

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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 the 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 employing targeted school data, stakeholder input and feedback, and following implementation science principles, New Jersey analyzed various data sources to pinpoint districts for the initial Transformation Zones (TZ) cohort. Selection criteria included targeting schools for students with disabilities, having comprehensive schools, having schools below the 10th percentile in the statewide accountability system, a high percentage of students with disabilities (at least 20%), being on remote instruction in Spring 2021, and having a low graduation rate (bottom 10% statewide). All five selected districts met at least two of these criteria.

Out of the five districts, four committed to participating in the initiative. Participating TZ districts receive training and support in implementing evidence-based instructional practices in early literacy, using implementation science to enhance student learning outcomes effectively and sustainably.

The demographic description of participating TZ districts which is based on the most recent NJ School Performance Report is as follows:

District 1, Asbury Park, located in Monmouth County, has 4 schools and serves approximately 1608 students. Currently, approximately 51.5% of students are identified as economically disadvantaged, 18.9% qualified for special education services, 14.6% are English Language Learners, and 4.3% are experiencing homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 3.2% White, 47.3% Hispanic, and 48.7% Black or African American.

District 2, Willingboro, located in Burlington County, has 8 schools and serves approximately 3506 students. Approximately 56.3% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 22.8% qualified for special education services, 4.1% are English Language Learners, and 0.7% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 2.1% White, 13.3% Hispanic, and 81.1% Black or African American.

District 3, Palisades Park, located in Bergen County, has 3 schools and serves approximately 1776 students. Approximately 34.0% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 11.1% qualified for special education services, 30.1% are English Language Learners, and 0.5% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 8.3% White, 60.2% Hispanic, 1.6% Black or African American, and 28.8% Asian.

District 4, Bridgeton, located in Cumberland County, has 8 schools and serves approximately 6113 students. Currently, approximately 0.2% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged, 8.5% qualified for special education services, 32.6% are English Language Learners, and 1.7% experienced homelessness. The percentage of students by racial and ethnic group is 19.4% Black or African American, 2.7% White, and 76.1% 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 describes a strategic plan for improving K-3 literacy support within the Literacy Transformation Zone, with the goal of enhancing statewide third grade reading achievement proficiency for students with disabilities. The plan is structured around the implementation science framework and utilizes resources developed under the New Jersey Tiered System of Supports - Early Reading (NJTSS-ER) state personnel development grant. This includes evidence-based practices, assessments, and interventions.

-By using the implementation science framework and the NJTSS Early Literacy resources and menus of evidence-based assessment and interventions; by engaging stakeholder input, fostering collaboration with other NJDOE offices and divisions, and aligning technical assistance resources and supports, SEA capacity will be increased to provide K-3 literacy supports to schools within the Literacy Transformation Zone.

-By providing support and coaching to Literacy Transformation Zone districts in the identification and effective implementation of evidence based early literacy practices, the SEA will impact LEAs by assisting in the development of:

- a) establishing system building for the successful adoption and integration of evidence-based literacy instruction;
- b) their enhanced understanding and self-efficacy to identify and facilitate the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices;
- c) identifying and utilizing evidence-based literacy screening tools;
- d) strengthening their ability to integrate inclusive instructional practices and a coaching model to support access and fidelity of implementation;
- e) building capacity for an NJTSS-ER structure of interventions; and
- f) utilizing 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 and evidence-based literacy instruction;
- b) fidelity of implementation of evidence-based literacy instruction and interventions tailored to student need;
- c) inclusive instructional practices; and
- d) goal setting and progress monitoring.

-These classroom-level changes will lead to:

- a) an increase in individualized instruction and student growth in literacy;
- b) an increase in the number of students with disabilities accessing quality, evidence-based instruction in literacy; and
- c) an increase in the number of students with disabilities performing at or above benchmark at the end of the third grade within the Literacy Transformation Zone.

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	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%
Target B	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Part	Total number of Students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone Scoring Proficient or Better on the A) NJSLA (Spring 2023) and B) NJ Start Strong (Fall 2023)	Total number of Students with IEPs in the Transformation Zone Who Took the A) NJSLA (Spring 2023) and B) NJ Start Strong (Fall 2023)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	5	116	4.55%	6.00%	4.31%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	2	95	4.79%	6.00%	2.11%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A slippage, if applicable

Slippage in reading assessment performance within the Transformation Zone (TZ) can be attributed to a combination of factors that impact the educational experience of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). One significant challenge lies in instructional strategies. There is a notable absence of targeted approaches tailored to address the specific literacy needs of students with IEPs within the TZ schools. Throughout the needs assessment phase, it has become evident that curriculum selection in TZ districts exacerbates challenges in addressing the unique literacy needs of students with IEPs. This issue is further compounded by potential curriculum misalignment, where the instructional content fails to address the specific literacy needs of these students, resulting in a disconnect between the curriculum and individual learning requirements. The lack of flexibility in adapting the curriculum to accommodate student needs further exacerbates the challenges. This has been noted and observed throughout Phase I of the SSIP and has become part of the planning (Phase II) process of implementation.

Provide reasons for B slippage, if applicable

Slippage in reading assessment performance within the Transformation Zone (TZ) can be attributed to a combination of factors that impact the educational experience of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). One significant challenge lies in instructional strategies. There is a notable absence of targeted approaches tailored to address the specific literacy needs of students with IEPs within the TZ schools. Throughout the needs assessment phase, it has become evident that curriculum selection in TZ districts exacerbates challenges in addressing the unique literacy needs of students with IEPs. This issue is further compounded by potential curriculum misalignment, where the instructional content fails to address the specific literacy needs of these students, resulting in a disconnect between the curriculum and individual learning requirements. The lack of flexibility in adapting

the curriculum to accommodate student needs further exacerbates the challenges. This has been noted and observed throughout Phase I of the SSIP and has become part of the planning (Phase II) process of implementation.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

-The NJSLA-ELA evaluates students' proficiency in grade-level English Language Arts skills, knowledge, and concepts essential for college and career readiness. During the assessments, students engage with authentic fiction and nonfiction texts, analyzing passages. The tests may incorporate multimedia elements, such as video or audio. Emphasizing the significance of close reading, synthesizing ideas across texts, understanding contextual meanings of words and phrases, and effective writing using and/or analyzing sources, the NJSLA-ELA assessments aim to foster comprehensive language arts skills.

-The Start Strong Assessments in English Language Arts offer educators and parents an initial overview at the beginning of the school year, highlighting potential conceptual or skill gaps in a student's grasp of the previous year's New Jersey Student Learning Standards (NJSLS). This assessment helps determine the level of support students may require, guiding informed instructional strategies.

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

Data is 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.

In FFY 22, the NJDOE focused on completing Phase I (analysis) and entering began Phase II (Planning) in the Transformation Zone schools. An evaluation plan will be developed in FFY 23 and will be included in the February 1, 2025 SSIP submission.

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 New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) is dedicated to enhancing early literacy and fostering positive outcomes for all students, including those with disabilities. Across the department, interdivisional teams collaborate consistently, drawing on varied expertise to identify initiatives aligned with this focus. The NJDOE employs a holistic approach where teams explore and evaluate programs and innovations to improve early literacy and overall student outcomes, particularly addressing the diverse needs of students, including those with disabilities. The following infrastructure improvements highlight this collaborative and holistic approach to align efforts to enhance early literacy while contributing to broader academic and developmental success:

The NJ State Plan for Literacy Education is currently in development and aims to improve literacy levels and equip students with essential literacy skills. Six objectives include involving parents, refining K-12 ELA curricula, focusing on early childhood literacy, supporting educators, guiding struggling readers, and leveraging assessments for progress monitoring.

Progress has been made in enhancing early literacy support with the creation of an educational services endorsement in pre-K through third-grade reading instruction. A cross-divisional team of literacy experts is working to advance the goals of this endorsement.

The Office of Standards supports early literacy through initiatives like RAPID and RAPID Plus, offering professional development in literacy. ELA standards were revised in 2023, emphasizing foundational reading and writing skills, digital shifts, and culturally responsive practices.

The NJ Tiered System of Supports for Early Reading (NJTSS-ER) initiative, in partnership with Rutgers University, continues to involve select district leadership teams in improving reading interventions. The initiative continues to build resources that inform the work of the SSIP.

The Early Literacy Initiative (SISEP) Initiative fosters collaboration between the Office of Comprehensive Support (OCS) and key departments, supporting school plans and ensuring long-term improvement. The Division of Early Childhood Services actively contributes to early literacy through various initiatives.

The NJDOE Learning Acceleration Guide focuses on enhancing student outcomes in foundational skills, including literacy. The guide provides evidence-based practices and examples from NJ schools. <https://www.nj.gov/education/acceleration/>

The Office of Special Education (OSE) in the NJDOE has implemented significant infrastructure improvements, particularly in the transformation of Learning Resource Centers (LRCs). Initially conceived as traditional libraries, the LRCs have evolved into comprehensive hubs that support teaching, learning, and collaboration. Advancements in technology have led to the inclusion of digital resources such as e-books and remote and hybrid professional learning. The redesigned LRCs emphasize collaboration, offering open spaces and technology-equipped areas for educators and families to work together on projects. This transformation aligns with the initiatives of the NJDOE's OSE leadership, including a focus on Early Literacy, Disproportionality, Equity, and Least Restrictive Environment. The leadership within the office actively promotes flexibility and adaptability, collaborating

with institutions of higher education and hiring experts to ensure that the LRCs meet the changing needs of students, educators, and families, embracing modern technologies, pedagogical approaches, and learning trends.

As part of the SISEP project, the NJDOE began developing a new webpage to enhance district capacity for evidence-based literacy practices. This webpage aims to introduce the science of reading through explanations, theoretical models, definitions, videos, podcasts, and additional resources for further study.

The OSE has also undertaken extensive efforts to address Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) concerns over the last decade. These efforts include increased monitoring, supervision, and partnerships with TA providers. The onboarding of an Inclusion Specialist in 2020, with an additional focus on early literacy, reflected the commitment to improve outcomes, and this role has helped ensure alignment between the SISEP work, the SSIP, NJTSS-ER and the priorities of the OSE, NJDOE and the NJ State Special Education Advisory Council (NJ-SSEAC). NJ-SSEAC has identified LRE as a council priority, leading to the development of a Comprehensive, Multi-Phase Plan for systemic improvement. Key elements ensuring project maintenance and equity include stakeholder engagement, research and evaluation, data quality and literacy, professional development, supervision, and capacity building. An LRE facilitator position was created and onboarded and an LRE Data Dashboard was also developed to assist in district-level LRE data literacy.

TZ Infrastructure Improvement Strategies

Since Spring 2022, New Jersey has initiated TZ Infrastructure Improvement Strategies to establish partnerships with districts to identify evidence-based literacy practices aligning with specific school and district needs. The approach is methodical and involves district engagement and readiness assessments, the formulation of training and coaching plans, and the establishment of communication protocols. The objective is to build an infrastructure for organizational readiness to effectively implement literacy practices in TZ districts.

The SISEP Initiative, part of the TZ Infrastructure Improvement, is in the installation stage, focusing on enhancing the capacity of district teams. The initiative supports efficient operation, classroom selection, and participant training, emphasizing fidelity criteria for precise program implementation. Data collection, analysis, and effective use are prioritized to continuously improve the chosen program. Policies and procedures supporting practice utilization are developed along with effective communication channels among practitioners, leaders, community partners, and stakeholders.

To enhance efforts, the OSE has hired an early literacy specialist. Ongoing coaching and support, along with Communities of Practice sessions, are provided to TZ districts. The initiative is developing a coaching plan for behavior change among teachers and administrative staff, utilizing a self-paced training program focusing on critical components.

A data-driven approach is implemented using a Power BI dashboard, encompassing various data elements for continuous improvement. The dashboard focuses on process inputs, such as training data and School Improvement Allocation funding, rather than immediate student learning outcomes. In Fall 2023, criteria for district inclusion were updated based on assessment data, demographic information, and federal accountability data. The SISEP Initiative is scaling up its efforts in Cohort Two after two years without statewide assessment results revealed acute needs for early literacy support. In fall 2023, inclusion criteria were updated based on the most recent available data, considering multiple years of statewide assessment data, demographic information, and federal accountability data. Among districts meeting inclusion criteria, two met all five, and three met four criteria. The plan is to engage with districts meeting the most inclusion criteria through a mutual selection process, transparently presenting the initiative to senior leadership with aims, a tentative timetable, and anticipated resources and support.

Additionally, there will be close collaboration with the OCS to identify TZ districts most ready to participate in ongoing training and coaching. Recognizing the importance of district readiness for the initiative's success, the aim is to avoid premature implementation pitfalls that could lead to inefficacy and poor student outcomes.

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.

The immediate effects observed align with ongoing efforts to establish frameworks and systems, engage in reflective practices on current methodologies, and translate theoretical concepts into practical application. The NJDOE is steadfast in its commitment to apply the principles of implementation science. This commitment involves enhancing the capacity of each Local Education Agency (LEA) to offer inclusive and high-quality educational opportunities to every student. It also encompasses the use of metrics to evaluate the effectiveness and suitability of evidence-based practices and leveraging diverse forms of data for decision-making and impact assessment. In pursuing these efforts, the State actively sought and incorporated stakeholder input in the infrastructure improvement process.

The following short-term outcomes have been observed:

Increased capacity to analyze and utilize data for continuous improvement across NJDOE divisions and districts.

Enhanced capacity of district leaders in selecting and implementing evidence-based practices for early literacy.

Quality literacy standards now emphasize intensified focus on decoding, encoding words, analyzing word parts, reinforcing awareness of speech sounds' connection to letters, developing reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, and emphasizing broad oral language skills.

Ongoing coaching and Communities of Practices (CoPs) to build the capacity of district leaders, implementation teams, and teachers.

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

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

During the reporting period, the SISEP initiative achieved several infrastructure strategies in the TZ schools, including the establishment of the District Implementation Team (DIT) to facilitate early literacy work, ensuring engagement of diverse stakeholders. The development of district Terms of Reference and Communication Protocol was successfully implemented. District Implementation Teams conducted initiative inventories, providing

insights into past and current literacy initiatives, mandates, and resource commitments. This information supports decision-making, explores the fit of additional initiatives, and guides alignment efforts. In addition, district teams assessed the fit and feasibility of evidenced-based programs or practices and adopted a formal procedure for selecting innovations. The completion of the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) is planned for Spring 2023 to align efforts and resources around practices intended to impact student outcomes.

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 TZ infrastructure improvement strategies:

Next Steps

- Scaling up initiative by engaging with identified cohort two districts who have met most of the inclusion criteria.
- Identifying the selection criteria for participating classrooms by identifying specific behavioral characteristics needed to carry out the work, then developing methods for recruiting and selecting practitioners.
- Early Literacy training and coaching provided to all participating teachers.
- Co-creation of a coaching plan aimed at encouraging practical implementation of a new program or practice in the classroom, ensuring that practitioners effectively utilize these strategies for consumers' benefit.
- Continued revision of the communication protocol to ensure communication is taking place between all involved in the installation.
- Completion of the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) (Ward et al., 2015) to align efforts and resources around practices intended to impact student outcomes.
- Build district leadership capacity in the using data to inform decision-making and improve implementation of the practice.

Anticipated Outcomes

Anticipated outcomes for the upcoming initiatives include increasing the number of participants. The deliberate identification of districts using the inclusion criteria, and the collaborative determination of readiness will contribute to a more comprehensive and representative cohort. This process aims to ensure that districts engaged in the initiative align with the specific criteria, fostering a targeted and effective approach. Also, the collaborative determination of readiness will involve assessing district capacity and commitment, promoting a strategic selection of participants well-prepared to participate in the initiative. By carefully considering inclusion criteria and readiness, the initiative aims to enhance the overall quality and impact of the participating districts in implementing evidence-based practices for early literacy.

NJDOE anticipates that early literacy training and coaching will result in the enhancement of knowledge and skills among participating teachers and districts. The expectation is that teachers, through this training, will acquire a deeper understanding of evidence-based practices literacy practices, leading to improved implementation in the classroom. In addition, the co-creation of a coaching plan is anticipated to contribute to the effective implementation of new programs or practices in classrooms; this collaborative effort aims to increase the utilization of strategies.

The continuous revision of the communication protocol enhances communication and collaboration among stakeholders involved in the installation process. The expectation is that refining and updating the protocol will lead to more effective information exchange, coordination, and shared understanding among all parties.

By conducting the DCA, the goal is to gain insights into the current state of district capacities, allowing for informed decision-making. The results of the assessment are expected to guide strategic planning, resource allocation, and overall efforts to improve student outcomes based on a thorough understanding of existing capacities and areas for enhancement.

Building district leadership capacity in the use of data for decision-making supports the implementation of practices with informed leadership. By strengthening leadership capacity, district leaders will be better equipped to analyze and interpret data, make informed decisions based on evidence, and effectively oversee the implementation of practices. This can lead to more strategic and data-driven approaches, ultimately contributing to positive impacts on student literacy outcomes and overall success.

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

Data Informed Decision Making

The Following Evidence-Based Practices in Reading Instruction:

- Phonemic Awareness
- Phonics
- Vocabulary Development
- Reading Comprehension Strategies
- Fluency

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Data Informed Decision Making:

The NJDOE extensively utilizes data-informed decision-making to support school districts. This evidence-based approach involves analyzing various types of data, including demographic and academic information, to gain insights into the unique needs and challenges of each district. By relying on accurate, measurable information, the NJDOE aims to guide its direction effectively while recognizing the limitations of data alone in decision-making. In addition to supporting districts in making informed decisions based on data, the NJDOE is committed to enhancing their data-informed literacy. This includes providing training and resources to district staff to improve their ability to interpret and utilize data effectively. By fostering data literacy skills, the NJDOE ensures that districts can independently leverage data for decision-making, contributing to a culture of continuous improvement and informed strategic planning.

Evidence-Based Practices in Reading Instruction:

The NJDOE Early Literacy (SISEP) team is currently supporting and training and coaching districts in the following evidenced-based literacy practices:

Phonemic Awareness – Teaching children to understand and work with individual sounds in spoken language.

Phonics- Helping children understand the relationship between written and spoken language by teaching the sounds of letters and groups of letters.

Vocabulary Development – Using a variety of techniques to help children understand and use a wide range of words.

Reading Comprehension Strategies – Teaching children to understand, remember, and communicate what they read.

Fluency – Helping children read accurately, quickly, and with expression.

In addition, Transformation Zone districts are implementing the following evidenced based curricula: 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.

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.

Data-informed decision-making supports early literacy by providing educators with valuable insights into students' needs and the effectiveness of instructional practices. By analyzing various types of data, including demographic and academic information, educators can identify areas that require attention and tailor their instruction to meet the specific needs of each student. This approach helps in the early identification of students at risk, allowing for timely and targeted interventions to prevent academic challenges. Additionally, data-informed decision-making can guide the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices, ensuring that instructional strategies are aligned with students' needs and supported by scientific evidence.

Evidence-based early literacy practices support literacy outcomes by leveraging proven instructional approaches to improve teaching and cultivate students' literacy skills. Research demonstrates that early literacy skills are connected to positive outcomes in reading and school success. Educators and families can maximize their impact by using evidence-based practices at home and in the classroom, focusing on key emergent literacy building blocks such as phonological awareness, print knowledge, oral language, and vocabulary. These practices include assessment-based and student-based approaches to improve areas of early literacy such as vocabulary, phonological awareness, word recognition, comprehension, and writing skills. By implementing evidence-based early literacy instruction, educators can effectively support young learners in developing essential literacy skills, ultimately contributing to improved literacy outcomes.

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

We are still in the installation stage of this initiative, and as such, 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.

The NJDOE has collected additional data to enhance our understanding and inform decision-making in various evidence-based practices. The collected information includes demographic data, offering insights into the percentage of students within distinct groups in our TZ districts. This data is further detailed by disability categories to tailor support effectively. Financial data is also recorded to track resource allocation and expenditures. Attendance records are utilized to assess contact hours for literacy instruction, while periodic surveys facilitate bi-directional communication and feedback from TZ districts. Training data encompasses contact hours related to DIT meetings, implementation training, planning, and engagement with TZ districts. Additionally, an assessment tab captures specific skill acquisition, particularly focusing on phonological awareness. This comprehensive dataset serves as a foundation for our early literacy work and supports the ongoing decision-making process.

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)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

We have not reached Phase III yet and are still developing evaluation procedures to drive decision making regarding modifications to the SSIP.

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;

- discussion of SPP indicators, targets, and initiatives towards improving statewide outcomes for students with disabilities; and,
- facilitation of presentations that are requested by council members and aligned to the council's priority subcommittee annual work plan.

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 four 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 FFY20, the OSE reported 24 organizations as stakeholder representatives. For FFY21, 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. For FFY22, the OSE developed the OSE monthly bulletin and began tabling events at various statewide conferences. These strategies resulted in an increase to 105 stakeholder representatives. 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. The following stakeholders are provided with ongoing opportunity to engage with our council on the unmet needs of students with disabilities and stay abreast of discussions, opportunities, events, and guidance disseminated by the Office of Special Education:

- 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
- Center on Sensory and Complex Disabilities
- 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
- Family Voices NJ
- 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 Department of Juvenile Justice
- 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

Stakeholder and NJ-SSEAC meetings remained online during the 2022-23 school year following feedback from members suggesting that it was a more efficient use of their time and did not require travel from various regions of the state. There were three opportunities where members were invited to come for in-person meetings at the Central Learning Resource Center (LRC). A remote/hybrid option was provided as an alternative.

The primary method utilized to engage stakeholders at the state level in SSIP activities was through the NJ State Special Education Advisory Council (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 annual updates (unless more frequent updates are requested by the council) have been provided to the SSEAC members since FFY 2020. On August 23-24, 2023, the SSEAC held its first summer retreat and updates on all initiatives, including the SSIP were provided to the council. Also, opportunities were given to establish new priority areas for subcommittees for the new council year and align these areas with the work of the SSIP. NJ-SSEAC meetings include the sharing of SPP/APR indicator data each month to provide updates, discuss upcoming changes, review aligned initiatives, and gain feedback. Input into future targets is also collected when appropriate. 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 in Introduction section of SPP/APR)?
- received suggestions to examine additional available data; and
- engaged in a collaborative dialogue about the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.?

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.

Efforts to engage stakeholders will be aligned to each TZ school's individual needs. A systemic approach will also utilize tools and partnerships that the NJDOE has already established which helps ensure sustainability such as providing audiobooks through Learning Ally that allow families to engage in reading activities at home. Also, the SPAN already has established partnerships with the NJTSS-ER schools which can be used as a framework for creating engagement activities for the TZ schools moving forward.

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.

Staffing shortages, a lack of release time for participants in training activities, and related difficulties scheduling team meetings because of class coverages and operational needs continue to present the most significant barriers to the SSIP work. As a result, the pacing of the project and installation phase has been slow, yet methodical. This is a consistent barrier that the NJDOE has also encountered with our TA partners that provide coaching and training around various topics as well as attendance at Learning Resource Center professional development sessions. As a result, the OSE has recently identified a vendor to provide a platform for asynchronous training modules with the option to provide on-site coaching and consultation activities. This approach allows schools to engage in foundational learning activities without the barriers of scheduling and release time while providing the knowledge needed to maximize the effectiveness of coaching and consultation activities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

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 A. Murray

Title:

Director, Office of Special Education

Email:

kimberly.murray@doe.nj.gov

Phone:

609-376-3766

Submitted on:

04/25/24 2:16:07 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

New Jersey 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
90.00%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	18	90.00%
Compliance	20	18	90.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	33%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	86%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	44%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	90%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	52%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	92%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	26%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	95%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	7	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	47	0

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ⁽³⁾	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 ⁽⁴⁾	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.52%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	92.64%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	70.79%	YES	0
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	100.00%	N/A	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

New Jersey

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

New Jersey

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	165
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	56
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	35
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	44
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	12
(1.2) Complaints pending.	8
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	101

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	845
(2.1) Mediations held.	716
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	420
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	72
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	296
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	92
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	129

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	853
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	83
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	12
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	46
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	36
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	10
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	241
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	566

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	4
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	2
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	2
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	2
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	2

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

New Jersey

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Kevin Dehmer
Acting Commissioner
New Jersey Department of Education
100 River View Plaza
Trenton, NJ 08625

Dear Acting Commissioner Dehmer :

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that New Jersey meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of New Jersey's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

New Jersey's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for New Jersey).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of New Jersey's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your New Jersey-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access New Jersey's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that New Jersey is required to take. The actions that New Jersey is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) New Jersey's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated New Jersey's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the New Jersey's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, New Jersey's 2024 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless OSEP has imposed programmatic Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, New Jersey must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in New Jersey on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after New Jersey's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, New Jersey must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, New Jersey must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes New Jersey's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates New Jersey's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with New Jersey over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Valerie C. Williams

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

cc: New Jersey Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.