
LEONOR ALCANTARA, individually and as)	
Guardian ad Litem for E.A.; LESLIE)	
JOHNSON, individually and as Guardian)	
ad Litem for D.J.; JUANA PEREZ,)	
individually and as Guardian ad Litem)	
for Y.P.; TATIANA ESCOBAR)	
individually; and IRA SCHULMAN,)	
individually and as Guardian ad Litem)	OAL DOCKET No:
for A.S.)	EDU 11069-2014S
)	
Petitioners,)	
)	
v.)	Agency Ref. No.:
)	156-6/14
DAVID HESPE, COMMISSIONER OF THE NEW)	
JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; the)	
NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION;)	
and the NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF)	
EDUCATION)	
)	
Respondents.)	
-----)	

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

ARTHUR H. LANG
918 East Kennedy Blvd.
Lakewood, NJ 08701
(732) 609-5530
lakewoodlaw@gmail.com
Attorney for Petitioners

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPLICABLE RULES. 3

APPLICABLE CASES. 4

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT. 5

PROCEDURAL HISTORY. 6

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS. 6

STANDARD FOR SUMMARY DECISION. 11

LEGAL ARGUMENT

POINT I. THE CALCULATION OF THE COST OF EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY IN LAKEWOOD FAILS TO REFLECT ACTUAL MANDATED EXPENSES NECESSARY FOR THE SYSTEM OF FREE PUBLIC SCHOOLS THEREBY DEPRIVING THE CHILDREN OF LAKEWOOD THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT EDUCATION. 13

A. RESPONDENTS CALCULATE THE ADEQUACY BUDGET IN LAKEWOOD AS \$119 MILLION BASED ON THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. 16

B. RESPONDENTS FAIL TO INCLUDE THE COST OF PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION AND A FREE AND APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION FOR SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN IN A BASE POPULATION FIVE TIMES THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN COUNTED IN THE CALCULATION OF ADEQUACY. .16

C. THE FAILURE TO INCLUDE THE EXPENSE OF SERVING THE UNIQUE DEMOGRAPHY OF LAKEWOOD IN THE ADEQUACY BUDGET HAS CAUSED SIGNIFICANT BUDGETARY DEFICITS, LOW TEACHER SALARIES, THE ELIMINATION OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS, AND UNACCEPTABLY LOW TEST SCORES AND LOW ENROLLMENT IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS. . 21

POINT II. RESPONDENTS FAIL TO PROVIDE THE CHILDREN OF LAKEWOOD WITH A THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT EDUCATION BECAUSE LAKEWOOD IS A LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICT, STUDENTS IN LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS REQUIRE MORE FUNDING THAN STUDENTS IN HIGHER INCOME OR SUBURBAN DISTRICTS, AND LAKEWOOD IS FUNDED SIGNIFICANTLY LESS THAN LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS OR SUBURBAN DISTRICTS RESULTING IN UNACCEPTABLY LOW STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. 25

A. LAKEWOOD IS A LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICT. 25

B. STUDENTS IN LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS REQUIRE MORE FUNDING THAN STUDENTS IN HIGHER INCOME OR SUBURBAN DISTRICTS. . . .27

C. LAKEWOOD IS FUNDED SUBSTANTIALLY LOWER THAN EVERY LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICT 29

POINT III. THE TAX BASE OF LAKEWOOD DOES NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY TO FILL THE DEFICIENCY IN ITS ADEQUACY BUDGET.30

CONCLUSION. 34

APPLICABLE RULES

N.J.A.C. 1:1-10.4 (c) No later than 15 days from receipt of a notice requesting discovery, the receiving party shall provide the requested information, material or access or offer a schedule for reasonable compliance with the notice; or, in the case of a notice requesting admissions, each matter therein shall be admitted unless within the 15 days the receiving party answers, admits or denies the request or objects to it pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:1-10.4(d).

N.J.A.C.1:1-12.5 Motion for summary decision; when and how made; partial summary decision (a) A party may move for summary decision upon all or any of the substantive issues in a contested case. Such motion must be filed no later than 30 days prior to the first scheduled hearing date or by such date as ordered by the judge.(b) The motion for summary decision shall be served with briefs and with or without supporting affidavits. The decision sought may be rendered if the papers and discovery which have been filed, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact challenged and that the moving party is entitled to prevail as a matter of law. When a motion for summary decision is made and supported, an adverse party in order to prevail must by responding affidavit set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue which can only be determined in an evidentiary proceeding. Such response must be filed within 20 days of service of the motion. A reply, if any, must be filed no later than 10 days thereafter. If the adverse party does not so respond, a summary decision, if appropriate, shall be entered.(c) Motions for summary

decision shall be decided within 45 days from the due date of the last permitted responsive filing. Any motion for summary decision not decided by an agency head which fully disposes of the case shall be treated as an initial decision under N.J.A.C. 1:1-18. Any partial summary decision shall be treated as required by (e) and (f) below. (d) If, on motion under this section, a decision is not rendered upon all the substantive issues in the contested case and a hearing is necessary, the judge at the time of ruling on the motion, by examining the papers on file in the case as well as the motion papers, and by interrogating counsel, if necessary, shall, if practicable, ascertain what material facts exist without substantial controversy and shall thereupon enter an order specifying those facts and directing such further proceedings in the contested case as are appropriate. At the hearing in the contested case, the facts so specified shall be deemed established.

APPLICABLE CASES

Brill v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America, 142 N.J. 520, (N.J., 1995). 11, 12

Abbott ex rel. Abbott v. Burke (Abbott XX), 199 N.J. 140, 152 (N.J., 2009)..13, 14, 15, 27

Abbott v. Burke (Abbott XXI), 206 N.J. 332 (N.J., 2011). 16, 36

Abbott by Abbott v. Burke (Abbott II), 119 N.J. 287, 381 (N.J., 1990).25, 28

Abbott v. Burke, EDU 5581-85 (initial decision), Aug. 24, 1988. 26, 27

Robinson v. Cahill, 62 N.J. 473 (N.J., 1973). 30

State v. Allen, 73 N.J. 132 (N.J., 1977). 34, 35

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The core issue in this case is the way the State calculates the funding necessary for a Thorough and Efficient system of public schools in Lakewood. New Jersey school budgets are based solely on the number of children in the public schools. However, the school budget must statutorily provide for transportation and special education of all children who reside in the District. Lakewood is unique because it has approximately 25,000 children who attend nonpublic schools and only 6,020 who attend public schools. Almost half the total school budget is spent on statutorily mandated transportation and special education. Lakewood does not have the means to provide an adequate education for its public school students because of these expenses. As noted, the mandated costs consume half the budget, eviscerating public school curriculum, programs and courses. The latest census data show Lakewood as one of the lowest income communities in New Jersey. Consequently, a multiplication based on public school students short-changes them dramatically.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 24, 2014, Petitioners who are students of public and nonpublic schools in Lakewood and their parents filed a petition challenging the allocation method and the amount of State funding received by the Lakewood School District.

On July 7, 2014 Petitioners submitted an Amended Petition.

On September 2, 2014 the Respondents moved to dismiss the Petition for failure to name the Lakewood Board of Education as a party, for failure to allege a sufficient factual basis to demonstrate the Petitioners' standing, and because the remedies sought are not available in this type of proceeding. The Commissioner of Education subsequently sent the matter to the Office of Administrative Law.

On January 14, 2015 Professor Paul L. Tractenberg moved for leave to participate.

On March 11, 2015 the Court granted Professor Tractenberg leave to participate.

On July 23, 2015 the Court denied Respondents' motion to dismiss.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

The facts in this case are undisputed. They are matters of public record for administrative notice, and respondents have not denied their existence.

1. Lakewood is ranked 555 out of 564 New Jersey municipalities in per capita income (Appendix 1, Column 3, hereafter 1:3).
2. 6,020 students attend Lakewood public schools (1:4).
3. 90% of Lakewood public school students are classified as low-income whereas the average of the Abbott districts is 76.0%. (1:8).
4. 83.4% of 2015 Lakewood public school students are Hispanic and 10% are African-American (Request for Admissions, paragraph 1, hereafter RA:1).
5. 25.9% of Lakewood public school students are classified as Limited English Proficiency while the average of the Abbott districts is 10.0% (1:10).
6. The tax levy per pupil in Lakewood is \$15,008, whereas the tax levy per pupil in Abbott districts is \$2,560 and the tax levy in Toms River Regional is \$8,846. (1:14).
7. The 2015-2016 Operating Budget in Lakewood is \$120,830,423 (1:21).
8. The Adequacy Budget in Lakewood public schools is \$119,334,752 (1:22).
9. 24,996 children attend nonpublic schools. (Exhibit B, page 47; hereafter Exh.B,47).

10. 17,377 or 70% of children attending nonpublic schools are low-income (Exh.B,47).

11. 3,577 students attending nonpublic schools are classified as students with disabilities (Exh.B,48).

12. 4,730 children in Lakewood are classified as students with disabilities (Exh.B,48).

13. The 2015-2016 budgeted regular education transportation and special education tuition cost of serving 31,000 children, \$46,066,401, consumed 38.1% of the Operating Budget in Lakewood. (1:27,28).

14. The documents presented by State Monitor David Shafter show that the actual 2015-2016 regular education transportation cost is \$19,659,741 and the special education transportation cost is \$4,862,460 totaling \$24,522,201 in transportation costs (Exh.C,59).

15. The documents presented by State Monitor David Shafter show that the actual 2015-2016 tuition costs are \$29,448,564 (Exh.C,50). The \$53,970,765 total cost of transportation and tuition consumes 44.7% of the Operating Budget in Lakewood.

16. The 2015-16 Budgetary Comparative Per Pupil Cost in Lakewood is \$12,348, the average of Abbott districts is \$17,793, and the statewide average of New Jersey districts is \$15,348. (1:34).

17. The 2015-16 Total Classroom Instruction Cost Per Pupil in Lakewood is \$6,600, the the average of Abbott districts is \$10,017, and the average of all New Jersey districts is \$8,933(1:35).

18. Lakewood has the lowest average and lowest median teacher salary of all 103 large K-12 districts with 3,500 or more students. (1:37,38,40,41).

19. The average teacher experience in Lakewood is 8.3 years compared with the 11.8 median of all New Jersey districts.

20. The ratio of students to teachers in Lakewood is 13.1 whereas the average ratio of students to teachers in Abbott districts is 11.3. (1:42).

21. Lakewood spends \$128 for classroom supplies per student, the 3rd lowest ranking large district, whereas the average Abbott district spends \$384 and the statewide average is \$321. (1:44).

22. Lakewood spends \$131 per pupil for legal services, the most of any large district. (1:46).

23. Lakewood is mandated to provide 19,904 children with remote transportation (Exh.B,53).

24. Lakewood sends 260 pupils to private schools for the handicapped (1:67).

25. Lakewood spends \$9,289,304 on Speech, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy and Related Services; Other Support Services, and the Child Study Team (1:73).

26. The \$53,970,765 cost of transportation and tuition together with the \$9,289,304 cost of Speech, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy and Related Services; Other Support Services, and the Child Study Team is a total cost of \$63,260,069 out of an operating budget of \$120,830,423 or 52.4%.

27. The average composite SAT score for Lakewood students is 1101 whereas the Abbott average is 1191 and the state average is 1514. (Appendix 2, Column C; hereafter 2:C),

28. Only 45.6% Lakewood students are in post-secondary education 16 months after graduation whereas the Abbott average is 62.7%. (2:I).

29. Lakewood births have risen over the last twenty years with 3,966 births in 2011 compared to 2,663 births in Paterson, 4,440 in Jersey City and 4,353 in Newark. (Appendix 3, Page 24; hereafter Apx.3,24).

30. 20,902 students attended nonpublic schools in Lakewood in 2013-14 and 22,688 in 2014-15 and 24,996 in 2015-16, 20% increase over two years. (Request for Admissions, paragraph 2 and 3; hereafter RA:2,3)

31. The percent of the Lakewood operating budget consumed by transportation and tuition has grown from 25.6% in 2006 to 38.1% in 2015 (Appendix 3, page 15; hereafter Apx.3,15).

32. The High School Proficiency Assessment Language Arts scores for Lakewood from 2008-2014 were lower than the average and median scores of the Abbott districts (Apx.4,26).

33. The High School Proficiency Assessment Mathematics scores for Lakewood were about half the points of the state average and more than ten points lower than the average and median of the Abbott districts every year since 2009 (Apx.4,27).

34. The Grade 8 GEPA and NJ ASK Language Arts score for Lakewood was below the average and median of the Abbott districts every year since 2004. (Apx.5,32).

35. The Grade 8 GEPA and NJ ASK Mathematics score for Lakewood was below the average and median of the Abbott districts every year since 2006. (Apx.5,33).

36. The Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate was at or below the average and median of the Abbott district for the last four years. (Apx.6,39)

37. The School Report Card posted on Respondents website compares Lakewood schools with Abbott district schools in the same demographic peer group. (Apx.7,41-47).

STANDARD FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

The legal standard for summary judgment is found in Brill v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America, 142 N.J. 520, (N.J., 1995). A court must make "a determination whether there exists a 'genuine issue' of material fact that precludes summary judgment requir[ing] the motion judge to consider whether the competent evidential materials presented, when viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, are sufficient to permit a rational factfinder to resolve the alleged disputed issue in favor of the non-moving party." Id. at 540.

The Uniform Administrative Procedure Rules provide for summary judgment:

"(a) A party may move for summary decision upon all or any of the substantive issues in a contested case. . . . (b)When a motion for summary decision is made and supported, an adverse party in order to prevail must by responding affidavit set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue which can only be determined in an evidentiary proceeding. Such response must be filed within 20 days of service of the motion. A reply, if any, must be filed no later than 10 days thereafter. If the adverse party does not so respond, a summary decision, if appropriate, shall be entered."
N.J.A.C. § 1:1-12.5

Petitioners incorporate by reference their Request for Admissions in Exhibit A, including Appendices 1-7, submitted to Respondents on December 28, 2015, which pursuant to N.J.A.C. §1:1-10.4, "in the case of a notice requesting

admissions, each matter therein shall be admitted unless within the 15 days the receiving party answers, admits or denies the request or objects to it pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:1-10.4(d).” It has been 53 days since Petitioners have made their request for admissions. The data in the Request for Admissions were collected from the Respondents’ and other public sources and should be considered admitted, uncontroversial and administratively noticed.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

POINT I. THE CALCULATION OF THE COST OF EDUCATIONAL ADEQUACY IN LAKEWOOD FAILS TO REFLECT ACTUAL MANDATED EXPENSES NECESSARY FOR THE SYSTEM OF FREE PUBLIC SCHOOLS THEREBY DEPRIVING THE CHILDREN OF LAKEWOOD THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT EDUCATION.

The New Jersey Constitution entitles the children of this State to a "thorough and efficient education." *N.J. Const.* art. VIII, § 4. To meet its constitutional duty, the School Finance Reform Act of 2008 (SFRA) "allocates state resources to school districts, while also requiring certain levels of funding at the local level." Abbott ex rel. Abbott v. Burke (Abbott XX), 199 N.J. 140, 152 (2009). The Adequacy Budget is the core calculation of the money needed to provide T & E.

"SFRA identifies a base cost associated with the education of an elementary pupil without any particular special needs. Once identified, the per-

pupil amount is increased to reflect characteristics that are widely accepted as increasing the cost of education. Those characteristics are: 1) grade level, and whether the pupil is 2) an at-risk pupil (defined as one eligible for a free- or reduced-price lunch), 3) a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) pupil, or 4) a special education student of mild, moderate, or severe classification." Id. at 152.

The grade level multipliers are provided by N.J.S.A 18A:7F-50. The at-risk and LEP multipliers are provided by N.J.S.A 18A:7F-51.

The State share in the Adequacy Budget is referred to as Equalization Aid provided by N.J.S.A 18A:7F-52 and N.J.S.A 18A:7F-53.

"Equalization Aid is State-provided aid to support the Adequacy Budget by funding the difference between a district's Local Fair Share (LFS) and its Adequacy Budget. A district's LFS is the amount it is required to contribute in support of the Adequacy Budget. That amount is determined by adding a district's equalized property wealth and its equalized income wealth. Under SFRA, a district must provide the lesser of either its LFS, as calculated using SFRA's formula, or the local share it raised in the previous year. In short, Equalization Aid is the difference between a district's LFS and its Adequacy Budget." Id. at 155.

The SFRA also provides districts with additional aid known as Categorical Aid.

"Categorical Aid is a separate funding stream provided on a per-pupil basis for certain expenses. Categorical Aid covers: (1) one-third of census-based costs for special education; (2) security; (3) preschool aid; (4) extraordinary aid for special

education; and (5) various additional aid categories." Id. at 155.

Categorical and extraordinary special education aid is provided by N.J.S.A 18A:7F-55; security aid by N.J.S.A 18A:7F-56; and preschool aid by N.J.S.A 18A:7F-54. The various additional aid categories the "formula also provides for [are] transportation aid, choice aid, and debt service on the basis of per-pupil categorical aid factors." Id. at 155. (N.J.S.A 18A:7F-57, N.J.S.A 18A:7F-62 and N.J.S.A 18A:7G-9 respectively.)

One-third of the SFRA expense to educate each special education child is funded as Categorical Aid. It is not part of the SFRA Adequacy Budget and therefore not subject to the deduction of the Local Fair Share in determining equalization aid. Nonetheless, it is important to include this expense in determining the cost of T & E. "To determine whether a district is over or under adequacy, the DOE compares the sum of a district's adequacy budget plus Special Education Categorical Aid and Security Aid to the district's spending in the current year." Abbott v. Burke (Abbott XXI), 206 N.J. 332, 433 ft. nt. 35 (N.J., 2011).

A. RESPONDENTS CALCULATE THE ADEQUACY BUDGET IN LAKEWOOD AS \$119 MILLION BASED ON THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Respondents calculated the Adequacy Budget for the Lakewood School District in 2016 as \$119,334,752 (Appendix 1, Column 22, hereafter 1:22). This amount is based on the number of children attending the public schools. It does not take account of the number of nonpublic school children served by the district. The SFRA makes no provision for counting nonpublic school students in determining adequacy. If we include the \$2,975,869 (1:49) in special education categorical aid and the \$2,161,835 in security aid (1:50) the total amount needed to meet Respondents' measure of adequacy is \$124,472,456. The Operating Budget of the Lakewood School District is \$120,830,423. Based on these two figures, Lakewood appears to be more or less providing its students with an adequate education.

B. RESPONDENTS FAIL TO INCLUDE THE COST OF PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION AND A FREE AND APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION FOR SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN IN A BASE POPULATION FIVE TIMES THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN COUNTED IN THE CALCULATION OF ADEQUACY.

Currently, 6,020 students attend Lakewood Public Schools (1:4). Adequacy is calculated for Lakewood solely using the number of students enrolled in the public schools even though 31,000 K-12 students attend schools in Lakewood and are eligible for district services. All 31,000 children are entitled to evaluation and a Free and Appropriate Public Education should they have special needs under the child find

provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004. "All children with disabilities residing in the State, including . . . children with disabilities attending private schools, regardless of the severity of their disabilities, and who are in need of special education and related services, are identified, located, and evaluated. . . ." 20 U.S. Code § 1412. All 31,000 children, including nonpublic students, are entitled to remote transportation if they live 2 miles away from their elementary school and 2 ½ miles away from their secondary school consistent with N.J.S.A. 18A:39-1.

The Lakewood School District is mandated to provide 19,904 students with remote transportation (Exhibit B, Page 53). The transportation cost to the district submitted in the Requests for Admissions is \$17,972,788 (1:25). Evidence of Lakewood's and the various other districts' transportation expenses was collected from each district's User Friendly Budget line item "Undist. Expend.-Student Transportation." This the expense for transportation of regular education students. Apparently, the budgeted expense for Lakewood was too low. The actual expense is \$19,659,741 for regular education children. Some of this expense includes discretionary non-remote hazardous transportation pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:39-1.5. If we include

the mandated transportation expense of special education children, the total transportation expense is \$24,522,201. Lakewood spends 20.5% of its adequacy budget of \$119,334,752 on transportation of regular education and special education students.

The disproportionately high expense for a district of only 6,020 children is due to the unique demography of Lakewood in which less than one-fifth of the 31,000 resident K-12 children attend the public schools. Had the SFRA included all 31,000 children in its calculation of adequacy, the expense would have been much less disproportionate. Paterson, with 27,310 students enrolled in the public schools (1:4), spends \$18,590,554 on transporting regular education children (1:25) out of an adequacy budget of \$526,053,418 (1:22) or 3.5%.

An even larger deduction out of the budget comes from providing a Free and Appropriate Education to children with extraordinary needs in the base population of 31,000 children. Many school districts are not equipped with the facilities necessary to handle their most severely handicapped resident children. The cost often runs into the millions. For example, Patterson, with 27,310 children, sends 254 students to schools for children with special needs (1:64). Lakewood, with over 31,000 children, sends 260 students to schools for children

with special needs. The drain on the budget is \$29,448,564 out of an adequacy budget of \$119,334,752 and an operating budget of \$120,830,423. The cost of transportation and tuition together is \$53,970,765. This is 44.7% of the Lakewood operating budget.

Out of the nonpublic population of 25,000 children, 3,547 who have been found eligible to receive special education services remain in nonpublic schools (AP:68). The number of special education students enrolled in the public schools is 1,128 (1:5). Together, close to 4,700 children in Lakewood have special needs. The User Friendly Budgets show and Respondents constructively admit that the Lakewood cost of Speech, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy and Related Services; Other Support Services, and the Child Study Team, is \$9,289,304 (1:73). This cost together with the cost of tuition and the cost of transporting regular education and special education students is \$63,260,069 consuming 52.4% of the operating budget of \$120,830,423.

Needless to mention, the limited resources available in a district serving a population of over 31,000 children with an adequacy budget designed for 6,020 children has led to increased litigation. Respondents' own data and their constructive admission shows that Lakewood spends \$131 per

pupil for legal services, the most of any large district.
(1:46).

The SFRA does not contemplate expenses of such magnitude and their effect on T & E in Lakewood because it *fails to count all the children* in its adequacy formula. Certainly many districts suffer insufficient state aid for transportation and extraordinary special education expenses but the deficiency in those districts is offset by a proportional and commensurate regular public school student count in the T & E budget. Lakewood, by contrast, serves a base of 31,000 resident children while its SFRA student count is 6,020.

The drain on a budget designed for 6,020 students is certain to increase leading to more deficits as the population increases. Lakewood births have risen over the last twenty years with 3,966 births in 2011 compared to 2,663 births in Paterson, 4,440 in Jersey City and 4,353 in Newark. (Page 15, Appendix 3). The number of children attending nonpublic schools has increased 20% in just the last two years. The amount of funding remaining for the public schools will significantly decrease unless Respondents change their methodology of calculating adequacy in Lakewood.

This, of course, is common knowledge. In a CD recording submitted by Participant Paul L. Tractenberg on March 25,

2015, Respondents' State Monitor, "Mr. Azzara[,] makes explicit that the Lakewood School District has a revenue problem not a spending problem." (Letter Brief of participant in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss, page 5). That is not the only time that Respondents proverbially threw up their hands in despair. On January 12, 2016, another state monitor, David Shafter, announced that as of June 30, 2016, the Lakewood School District will have a \$12,389,288 deficit (Exhibit C, page 50).

This most recent deficit comes after Respondents' state monitors controlled the Lakewood district's finances for two years. The document included as Exhibit C was not available to Petitioners when they submitted their Requests for Admissions in December 2015. Reduction of this deficit will likely require elimination of more public school courses, staff and programs before the end of the budgetary year.

C. THE FAILURE TO INCLUDE THE EXPENSE OF SERVING THE UNIQUE DEMOGRAPHY OF LAKEWOOD IN THE CALCULATION OF ADEQUACY HAS CAUSED SIGNIFICANT BUDGETARY DEFICITS, LOW TEACHER SALARIES, THE ELIMINATION OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS, AND UNACCEPTABLY LOW TEST SCORES AND LOW ENROLLMENT IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS.

The drain on the budget has made it impossible for the district to provide its public school students with T & E. Petitioners allege that the district does not provide its special education students with adequate special education and

Limited English Proficiency support (Amended Petition, paragraphs 18-22, hereafter AP:18-22), intervention and remediation specialists (AP:23), its teachers with in-house curriculum supervisors (AP:26), closed down its industrial arts program (AP:28), decimated its rich curriculum (AP: 29) and has oversized classes (AP:31).

Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the 2015-16 Budgetary Comparative Per Pupil Cost in Lakewood is \$12,348, the average of Abbott districts is \$17,793, and the average of all New Jersey districts is \$15,348. (1:34). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the 2015-16 Total Classroom Instruction Cost Per Pupil in Lakewood is \$6,600, the average of Abbott districts is \$10,017, and the average of all New Jersey districts is \$8,933 (1:35). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that Lakewood has the lowest average and lowest median teacher salary of 103 large K-12 districts with 3,500 or more students. (1:37,38,40,41). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the average teacher experience in Lakewood is 8.3 years compared with the 11.8 median of all New Jersey districts. Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the ratio of students to teachers in Lakewood is 13.1

whereas the average ratio of students to teachers in Abbott districts is 11.3. (1:42). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that Lakewood spends \$128 for classroom supplies per student, the 3 lowest ranking large district, whereas the average Abbott district spends \$384 and the statewide average is \$321(1:44).

This has led to such dismal underachievement and failure to prepare students for post-secondary education that constitutional standard of providing T & E cannot possible have been met. Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the High School Proficiency Assessment Language Arts scores for Lakewood from 2008-2014 were lower than the average and median scores of the Abbott districts and significantly lower than the state average. (Appendix 4, Page 26; hereafter Apx.4,26). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the High School Proficiency Assessment Mathematics scores for Lakewood were about half the points of the state average and more than ten points lower than the average and median Abbott districts every year since 2009 (Apx.4,27). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the Grade 8 GEPA and NJ ASK Language Arts scores for Lakewood was below the average and median score for the Abbott districts every year since 2004. (Apx.5,32).

Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show that the Grade 8 GEPA and NJ ASK Mathematics scores for Lakewood students were below the average and median scores for the Abbott districts every year since 2006 (Apx.5,33).

Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate was at or below the average (mean) and the median of the Abbott districts for the last four years (Apx.6,39). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show the average composite SAT score for Lakewood is 1101 whereas the Abbott average is 1191 and the state average is 1514. (Apx.2,22 Column C). Respondents' own data and their constructive admission show only 45.6% Lakewood students are in post-secondary institutions 16 months after graduation whereas the Abbott average is 62.7%. (Apx.2,22 Column I).

The evidence before this Court of lack of funding in Lakewood and the resulting underachievement all point to the conclusion that Respondents have failed to provide the constitutional required system of thorough and efficient public schools in Lakewood.

"We therefore adhere to the conventional wisdom that money is one of the many factors that counts. Staff ratios, breadth of course offerings, teacher experience and qualifications, and availability of equipment make a real difference in educational opportunity. We do not mean that money guarantees a

thorough and efficient education, nor that, given the approach recommended by the Commissioner, a lower spending district with an effective schools program will not do better than a higher spending district without it. All we mean is that if 'effective schools' is a desirable approach, it should be superimposed on a structure that starts out equal." Abbott by Abbott v. Burke (Abbott II), 119 N.J. 287, 381 (N.J., 1990)

POINT II. RESPONDENTS FAIL TO PROVIDE THE CHILDREN OF LAKEWOOD WITH A THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT EDUCATION BECAUSE LAKEWOOD IS A LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICT, STUDENTS IN LOW-INCOME URBAN DISRICTS REQUIRE MORE FUNDING THAN STUDENTS IN HIGHER INCOME OR SUBURBAN DISTRICTS, AND LAKEWOOD IS FUNDED SIGNIFICANTLY LESS THAN LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS OR SUBURBAN DISTRICTS RESULTING IN UNACCEPTABLY LOW STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

A. LAKEWOOD IS A LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICT.

Lakewood is a low-income urban district and is recognized by Respondents as a peer of the Abbott districts for the purpose of comparison in Respondents' school report cards. One hundred forty seven schools from almost every Abbott district are listed as peers of Lakewood schools. Only four non-Abbott DFG A or B schools are listed as peers of any Lakewood school. (Apx.7, 41-45).

The 2010 Census counted 92,843 in Lakewood. The population of Lakewood, estimated now at 108,900, is more than twice the median population of the Abbott districts (AP:35). Lakewood's population is expected to reach 225,000 by 2030 (AP ft.1). The population density of Lakewood Census Designated Place (CDP), the area in which almost all public and nonpublic

students live, according to the 2010 Census is 7,602, about seven times the state average but slightly less than the Abbott median. (1:95).

The percent of the population 17 and under in Lakewood CDP is 48.4% compared to the Abbott average of 24.6% (1:92). The Lakewood labor force of 28,809 (1:88) is only 30.3% of the 2010 population whereas the labor force of the average urban district is 38.1% and of New Jersey is 51.3%. This means that only 30 working people provide for the shelter and sustenance of every 100 people in Lakewood.

Lakewood is ranked 555 out of 564 New Jersey municipalities in per capita income (1:3). Per capita income in Lakewood is \$16,430. The average Abbott district's per capita income is \$22,585. Per capita income in the state as whole is \$39,940. This means that Lakewood per capita income is just 41.1% of the state average. In the Abbott administrative decision, Judge Lefelt found that the "plaintiffs' districts have per capita income that ranges from 49% to 81% of the State average per capita income, and urban aid cities have, on average, 72% of the State average." Abbott v. Burke, EDU5581-85 (initial decision), August 24, 1988
<http://njlegallib.rutgers.edu/legallib/njar/v13/p0001.pdf>
(hereafter Lefelt) at 265. The per capita income of Lakewood

CDP is \$11,895, or 29.8% of the State average. The median family income in Lakewood CDP is \$38,493 compared to \$50,995 in the Abbott districts and \$114,265 statewide. The average family size in Lakewood CDP is 5.23. The average Abbott district family size is 3.33 (1:94). Hence, \$38,493 supports the average family of 5.23 members. 93.6% of Lakewood public school students are classified as low-income whereas the average of the Abbott districts is 76.0% (1:8). 25.9% of Lakewood public school students are classified as Limited English Proficiency whereas the average of the Abbott districts is 10.0% (1:10). 83.4% of 2015 Lakewood public school students are Hispanic and 10% are African-American (Request for Admissions, paragraph 1). Many minority children come to school with disadvantages far beyond their white counterparts. "Indeed, the term 'urban schools' has become a euphemism for minority schools. . . . [T]he urban public school population often contains a higher minority percentage than is present in the surrounding municipality." Lefelt at 26-27.

The evidence shows that Lakewood is in fact a low-income urban district.

B. STUDENTS IN LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS REQUIRE MORE FUNDING THAN HIGHER INCOME OR SUBURBAN DISTRICTS.

Lakewood students face all the challenges, if not more, than students in low-income urban districts. The Abbott II Court made clear that student coming from low-income urban districts require more resources to even the playing field.

"[W]e conclude that a significant number of poorer urban districts do not provide a thorough and efficient education for their students; that the measurement of the constitutional requirement must account for the needs of the students; that in most poorer urban districts, the education needed to equip the students for their roles as citizens and workers exceeds that needed by students in more affluent districts; that the education provided depends to a significant extent on the money spent for it, and on what that money can buy--in quality and quantity--and the ability to innovate." Abbott by Abbott v. Burke, 119 N.J. 287, 319 (N.J., 1990)

Student in lower income districts require more funding for increased resources than students in the average New Jersey district.

"If the educational fare of the seriously disadvantaged student is the same as the 'regular education' given to the advantaged student, those serious disadvantages will not be addressed, and students in the poorer urban districts will simply not be able to compete." *Id.* at 374

The SFRA extends the reasoning of the Abbott Court to all New Jersey districts by providing increased funding in each district for every at-risk or low-income student and for every LEP student in its calculation of adequacy.¹

¹At-risk is defined by N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-45 as "those resident pupils from households with a household income at or below the most recent

"For each at-risk pupil, a base at-risk weight of .47 is applied. Also, as described by the Special Master, the [State Department of Education (DOE)] employed a sliding scale to recognize the additional challenges faced by districts with high concentrations of at-risk students. The sliding scale applies a base at-risk weight of .47 to the base student cost for at-risk pupils in districts with an at-risk student population between zero and 20%. The weight then increases incrementally. The scale levels off at 60%—applying a weight of .57 to at-risk pupils in districts with an at-risk population over 60%. Although the at-risk weight levels off, the districts will still receive the additional funding for each at-risk student; therefore, the formula does provide more funding to districts with higher concentrations of at-risk students. The formula applies weights also to LEP students (although the PJP panel suggested .47, SFRA applies a weight of .50) and yet another weight for students who are both at-risk and LEP to support non-duplicative resources required by such students (although calculated during the PJP process to be 22.6% of the LEP weight, SFRA uses 25%)." 199 N.J. at 154.

The weights for at-risk and LEP funding of children counted in the adequacy budget is washed out by the costs of serving the children that Respondents do not count.

C. LAKEWOOD IS FUNDED SUBSTANTIALLY LOWER THAN EVERY LOW-INCOME URBAN DISTRICT.

The additional SFRA funding to remedy the disadvantages of low-income and Limited English Proficiency in each district is

federal poverty guidelines available on October 15 of the prebudget year multiplied by 1.85." At-risk students are also known as those eligible for free or reduced lunch. "The income guidelines for determining eligibility for reduced price lunches for any school year shall be 185 percent of the applicable family size income levels. . . ." 42 U.S.C. §1758(b)(1)(B). The terms "at-risk," "low-income" and "free and reduced lunch" designate the same pupils.

swallowed up in the case of Lakewood because of the expense of serving a population in which 80% of resident children attend nonpublic schools. This drain on the budget has drastically harmed public school students in Lakewood. As mentioned, 93.6% of Lakewood students are classified as at-risk or low-income, more than the 76.0% average of the Abbott districts and the 28.5% average of all New Jersey districts (1:8). 25.9% of Lakewood students are Limited English Proficiency, more than the 10.0% average of the Abbott districts and the 2.0% average of all New Jersey districts (1:10).

The evidence also shows that the 2015-16 Budgetary Comparative Per Pupil Cost in Lakewood is \$12,348, whereas the average of all New Jersey districts is \$15,348 and the Abbott average is \$17,793 (1:34). The 2015-16 Total Classroom Instruction Cost Per Pupil in Lakewood is \$6,600. The average of the Abbott districts is \$10,017 (1:35). Districts surrounding Lakewood in all four directions, each with substantially less than 40% of students at-risk (1:8), spend at least 16% more per pupil: Brick \$8,438, Howell \$9,592, Jackson \$7,989, and Toms River Regional \$7,631. Lakewood is ranked as the lowest spending district of 103 New Jersey districts with 3500 students or more (1:37).

This level of funding is unacceptable. Without any other criteria to show compliance with the constitutional mandate, the Supreme Court in Robinson noted, "The trial court found the constitutional demand had not been met and did so on the basis of discrepancies in dollar input per pupil. We agree." Robinson v. Cahill, 62 N.J. 473, 515 (N.J., 1973).

This Court need not rely solely on the evidence of low funding. Respondents own criteria: standardized test scores, enrollment in post-secondary education, graduation rates, teacher salary and experience, classroom supplies, SAT scores, all evidence compiled by Respondents, show that the deprivation is on a constitutional scale.

POINT III. THE TAX BASE OF LAKEWOOD DOES NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY TO FILL THE DEFICIENCY IN ITS ADEQUACY BUDGET.

The adequacy budget is paid by both the state and by local taxpayers. The state share, known as equalization aid, is the difference between the adequacy budget and the local share (N.J.S.A 18A:7F-52). The statute provides that half of the local share is determined by multiplying the aggregate income of the residents of a district by the Statewide income rate (.0092690802 in 2008) and the other half of the local share is determined by multiplying equalized property value by the Statewide property value rate (.04546684 in 2008). Property

wealth and income are thereby reflected in equalization aid because they determine the size of local share, which is deducted from the adequacy budget to determine the state share.

At the time this petition was filed, the local share for Lakewood was \$71,198,357 (AP:5). The Lakewood tax levy was \$84,693,837, 18.8% *more* than the local share. Since then, Respondents raised the Statewide income rate and equalized property value rate so dramatically that the local share of many districts in the State increased beyond their statutory authority to increase taxes under the tax caps of N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-38. The local share of Lakewood increased to \$96,735,200. In April 2015 the state monitor ordered the tax levy to be increased for the current budget year to \$90,350,168, the maximum allowable under the law. The district had already exhausted its banked cap reserve before this petition was filed (AP:6). This \$5.7 million tax increase was not sufficient to prevent the \$12 million deficit as of the end of the budgetary year.

The \$5.7 million tax increase hit Lakewood families hard. The Lakewood tax base, the ninth lowest in per capita income in the State, spends \$172,155,093 (1:98), 11.34% of its aggregate income of \$1,518,509,794 (1:99), on municipal,

school and county taxes. Statewide, taxpayers spend 8.53% of their income on municipal, school and county taxes. Taxpayers in the Abbott district, noted for their overburden of excess municipal expenses, spend only 9.30%.

The traditional depiction of municipal overburden made much ado about the higher school, municipal and county taxes in the low-income urban areas. These taxes already consume a larger percent of income in Lakewood than in the Abbott districts, yet they only account for about half of the burden of families making up the Lakewood tax base. The financial strain of sending over 25,000 children to nonpublic schools, of course, falls solely on Lakewood families. Together with municipal, school and county taxes, approximately one-quarter of all income in the tax base is consumed. Considering that there is only one worker for every four residents, that 41.8% of the entire population in the tax base is 17 and under, and that the median family income is among the lowest in the state, the municipal overburden on Lakewood taxpayers is beyond the pale. Local taxpayers do not have, and have not had, the capacity to prevent the expenses of transportation and special education services from draining programs, staff and curriculum out of the public schools over the last decade.

To add insult to injury, Respondents removed Lakewood from its District Factor Group (DFG) ratings because a majority of children attend nonpublic schools. 70% of nonpublic school students in Lakewood receive federal free and reduced lunch and would be funded as at-risk had they been public school students (Ex.B,47). In fact, had all 25,000 nonpublic children attended the public schools, the local share would remain the same \$96 million but the SFRA adequacy budget would increase to over \$550 million (AP:41). Respondents' share would be over \$450 million of the adequacy budget. Lakewood would be a DFG A, the lowest income rating for state districts. Since the vast majority of children in reality attend nonpublic schools, 70% of whom are low-income, a district that Respondents would have otherwise considered to be one of the lowest income in the state had these children attended public schools, is arbitrarily determined not worthy of low-income status.

CONCLUSION

It has been almost two years since the Petitioners brought their petition. Since then, Respondents have done everything possible to prevent the merits of this case from being heard. They motioned for dismissal questioning the standing of

Petitioners. They opposed the participation of an amicus curiae with decades of experience navigating the complexity of school funding litigation. Most recently, they have barraged Petitioners with interrogatories targeting their standing, harassing them by asking for names of the parents' supervisors at work, for seven years of Petitioners' transcripts, course schedules, IEPs and other personal information. We still do not know after almost two years if Respondents have any defense to the allegations in the Petition.

If Respondents' strategy is to somehow disqualify the individual students named in the petition, to show that they do not suffer any personal harm, or perhaps to delay the litigating the merits until Petitioners graduate, then Petitioners point out that New Jersey does not have a case and controversy clause in its constitution. In State v. Allen, 73 N.J. 132 (N.J., 1977), the appeal of a restrictive order on news reporters was allowed to proceed even though the same order had been lifted by the Chief Justice. In other words, the individual reporters named in the suit no longer suffered harm. "Preliminarily, we reject any notion that the appeals before us should be treated as moot and dismissed. The issues are of great public importance and are bound to recur time and again unless and until this Court by its decision determines

what a trial court may or may not do regarding news media coverage of a public trial.” Id. at 138.

In the case at hand, even if the students named in the Petition had seven years of low grades and poorly designed course schedules, while the majority of the students in the district maintained high achievement and were offered a rich curriculum from which to choose courses, then the claims of Petitioners would have no merit despite their own individual harm and lack of achievement. On the other hand, if Petitioners had high grades and exemplary course schedules while the rest of the students collectively did poorly and had a limited curriculum from which to choose, then the claims made in the petition would have merit. In such case, if necessary, Counsel would simply change petitioners. But that is not necessary under the law of this state, particularly where the “issues are of great public importance and are bound to recur time and again. . . .”

Petitioners came to this Court primarily to create a record of constitutional deprivation for the Superior Court so that ultimately the legislature will correct the adequacy formula as applied to Lakewood. It should be noted, that under the SFRA, Respondents’ share of Lakewood’s current adequacy budget of \$119,334,752, after deducting the local share of

\$96,735,200, is \$22,599,552. However, due to statewide budgetary freezes, Lakewood has received only \$15 million for the last three several years (Exhibit C, page 52). This is because Respondents have not fully funded the SFRA since 2010. Although the \$7.6 million shortfall would not come close to filling the \$52 million deficiency and would not even begin to restore the public schools to T & E, just as the \$5.6 million tax increase did not prevent the current year's \$12 million deficit, it might prevent more loss. This Court and the Commissioner have the authority to authorize full funding as an interim measure until the legislature fixes the formula. The Supreme Court ordered Respondents to fully fund the Abbott districts because they had "status akin to that given to wards of the State." Abbott v. Burke (Abbott XXI), 206 N.J. 332,340 (2011). Lakewood faces this \$12 million deficit going into next year's budget and its students face the same challenges of the urban Abbott districts. There is no reason why a court cannot order full funding under the current law as an interim remedy, at the very least, to prevent further cuts when the budget is prepared in April 2016.

The State has controlled the finances of Lakewood for two years. The finances have only grown worse. The problem is not mismanagement. The discrepancy between how Respondents

calculate adequacy under the present system and the reality in Lakewood has increased every year. "Were we confident that a thorough and efficient education were likely to be achieved in the near future under the present system, we would not dream of intervening." 119 N.J. at 321. The constitutional deprivation in Lakewood will only get worse unless a court intervenes.

The facts in this case are a matter of public record and not subject to controversy. Despite the historic complexity of school funding litigation, the issues to be decided in this case are relatively simple. The method of determining the necessary funding for education adequacy in Lakewood is so obviously miscalculated that a decision can be rendered on the papers. If, on the other hand, should this Court find, in viewing the facts most favorable toward the unmoving party, genuine issues of material facts do exist, a decision can be made determining the issues to be decided facilitating the resolution of this matter. This is entirely appropriate.

According to N.J.A.C. § 1:1-12.5 (d)

"If, on motion under this section, a decision is not rendered upon all the substantive issues in the contested case and a hearing is necessary, the judge at the time of ruling on the motion, by examining the papers on file in the case as well as the motion papers, and by interrogating counsel, if necessary, shall, if practicable, ascertain what material facts exist without substantial controversy and shall

thereupon enter an order specifying those facts and directing such further proceedings in the contested case as are appropriate. At the hearing in the contested case, the facts so specified shall be deemed established."

WHEREFORE Petitioners respectfully move for summary decision determining:

1. Lakewood is a low-income urban district.
2. The educational needs of Lakewood public school students are greater than the educational needs of students in higher income non-urban districts.
3. The funding necessary to provide for the educational needs of Lakewood public school students exceeds the funding necessary to provide for the educational needs of students in higher income non-urban districts.
4. The School Finance Reform Act of 2008 (SFRA) calculates the funding necessary to meet the needs of the 6,020 public school students in Lakewood but does not account for the costs of transportation and special education serving a population of 31,000 school age children in Lakewood.
5. The failure to include the cost of serving 31,000 school age children, currently \$52 million a year, in an adequacy budget designed for 6,020 students has led to recurring budgetary deficits, termination of academic and vocational courses, staff and programs, and a general inability to

adequately address the educational needs of public school students in Lakewood.

6. The money actually spent on the educational needs of students in Lakewood public schools is less than the amount of money spent on the educational needs of students in non-urban districts.

7. The academic achievement of students in Lakewood is lower than the achievement of students in non-urban districts and as low or lower than students in low-income urban districts.

8. Lakewood students are less prepared for college, for the job market, for participation in society and in the life of their community than students in non-urban districts and as low or lower than students in low-income urban districts.

9. The State of New Jersey is not providing students in Lakewood with a constitutionally adequate thorough and efficient public education because its method of calculating adequate funding fails to account for \$52 million a year in expenditures serving a K-12 population six times the size of the public school enrollment.

10. The Lakewood tax base does not have the capacity to fill the deficiency in the amount necessary for adequate funding.

11. The adequacy budget for Lakewood should be calculated to include the cost of providing mandated transportation and special education services.

12. In the alternative, Respondents should fully appropriate the adequacy budget and the local share should fully appropriate the cost of transportation and tuition for special education.

13. The administrative forum is primarily charged with presenting a record and making recommendations as to whether the State of New Jersey is providing a constitutionally adequate education for the 6,020 children attending Lakewood public schools. The academic achievement, course schedules, Individual Education Plans for special education students, transcripts, employment information of parents, and other personal information of the individual Petitioners have no bearing on the resolution of the issues.

FURTHERMORE Petitioners respectfully request that the Court transmit its findings of fact to the Commissioner of Education with the following recommendations:

1. To recommend that the legislature provide for an adjustment to the School Funding Reform Act of 2008 that will account for all of the children in Lakewood in the calculation

of the adequacy budget because it is impossible to provide a thorough and efficient education under a formula designed for 6,020 children when in reality the district serves a resident population of 31,000 children.

2. To recommend to the legislature in the alternative to change the School Funding Reform Act of 2008 so that the local share of certain school districts defined to specify Lakewood is not deducted from the adequacy budget in determining equalization aid but rather local taxation is raised to appropriate the cost of transportation and tuition for special education.

3. To recommend to the governor the creation of new categorical aid in his budget and/or to implement any and all remedies within his authority to fill the deficiencies in the adequacy budget of Lakewood.

4. To issue a declaratory ruling that the provision of \$15,263,034 in equalization aid is inadequate given that the cost of mandated services to a school age population five time the number of students counted in determining SFRA adequacy is depleting the operating budget in Lakewood and to implement any and all interim remedies for the state to absorb more of the cost and to provide full equalization aid to Lakewood

under the SFRA as currently written for the 2016-17 school year.

5. To issue a declaratory ruling that the provision of \$3,600,000 in extraordinary aid is inadequate given that extraordinary special education costs are depleting the operating budget in Lakewood and to implement any and all interim remedies for the state to absorb more of the cost and to provide full extraordinary aid to Lakewood under the SFRA as currently written for the 2016-17 school year.

6. To issue a declaratory ruling that the provision of \$3,934,658 in transportation aid is inadequate given that transportation costs are depleting the operating budget in Lakewood and to implement any and all interim remedies for the state to absorb more of the cost and provide full transportation aid to Lakewood under the SFRA as currently written for the 2016-17 school year.


7. To issue a declaratory ruling that the state aid growth limitation is inapplicable to any and all administrative remedies.

8. To recommend legislation that the state aid growth limitation (NJSA 18A:7F-47) is inapplicable to any and all legislative remedies.

9. To classify Lakewood as a DFG A urban district.

10. To issue a declaratory ruling that Lakewood is retroactively eligible for education opportunity aid or preschool expansion aid in the 2007-2008 school year and to recommend to the legislature that Lakewood qualify for 100% facility financing under the School Development Authority (SDA) pursuant to *NJSA 18A:7G-3* and qualify prospectively for the same full preschool expansion aid as the other urban low-income SDA districts.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Arthur H. Lang". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Arthur H. Lang
Attorney at Law

Dated: February 19, 2016

ARTHUR H. LANG
918 East Kennedy Blvd.
Lakewood, NJ 08701
(732) 609-5530
lakewoodlaw@gmail.com
Attorney for Petitioners

LEONOR ALCANTARA, individually and as)
Guardian ad Litem for E.A.; LESLIE)
JOHNSON, individually and as Guardian)
ad Litem for D.J.; JUANA PEREZ,)
individually and as Guardian ad Litem)
for Y.P.; TATIANA ESCOBAR)
individually; and IRA SCHULMAN,)
individually and as Guardian ad Litem) OAL DOCKET No:
for A.S.) EDU 11069-2014S
Petitioners,)
v.) Agency Ref. No.:
DAVID HESPE, COMMISSIONER OF THE NEW) 156-6/14
JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; the)
NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION;)
and the NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF)
EDUCATION)
Respondents.)
-----)

I, Arthur H. Lang, of full age, certify as follows:

1. The annexed documents are true copies of what they purport to be.


2. Exhibit A is Petitioners' request for admission, sent via email on December 28, 2015, appending the appendices 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Counsel advises the Court that on Appendix 1, the columns were numbered before submission to the Court for the convenience of reference.

3. Exhibit B was printed off the New Jersey Department of Education Electronic Web-Enabled Grant System (EWEG) on February 17, 2016 found at <https://njdoe.mtwgms.org/NJDOEGmsWeb/StaticPages/IDEAAAllocation.aspx>

4. Exhibit C is a document distributed by Lakewood's state monitor at a public meeting on January 12, 2016.

5. As of this time. Respondents have not responded to the request for admissions and the facts contained therein are deemed admitted by operation of N.J.A.C. 1:1-10.4.

I am aware that if the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.



Arthur H. Lang
Attorney at Law
Dated: February 19, 2016

Exhibit A

ARTHUR H. LANG
 918 East Kennedy Blvd.
 Lakewood, NJ 08701
 (732) 609-5530
 lakewoodlaw@gmail.com
 Attorney for Petitioners

```

-----
LEONOR ALCANTARA, individually and as )
Guardian ad Litem for E.A.; LESLIE )
JOHNSON, individually and as Guardian )
ad Litem for D.J.; JUANA PEREZ, )
individually and as Guardian ad Litem ) OAL DOCKET No:
for Y.P.; TATIANA ESCOBAR ) EDU 11069-2014S
individually; and IRA SCHULMAN, )
individually and as Guardian ad Litem ) Agency Ref. No.:
for A.S. ) 156-6/14
          Plaintiffs, )
          v. ) REQUEST FOR
          ) ADMISSIONS
DAVID HESPE, COMMISSIONER OF THE NEW )
JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; the )
NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION; )
and the NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF )
EDUCATION )
          Respondents )
-----
  
```

To: GEOFFREY N. STARK, DAG
 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
 DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY
 DIVISION OF LAW
 25 MARKET STREET
 PO BOX 112
 TRENTON, NJ 08625-0112

Pursuant to the provisions of N.J.A.C. 1:10-10.2, respondent is hereby requested to admit the following facts, all pertaining to the time encompassed in the charges herein and if a fact is denied, respondent is requested to explain the facts on which the denial is based:

1. 83.4% of 2015 Lakewood public school students are Hispanic and 10% are African-American.

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

2. NCLB Title I Part A in 2014-15 provided Lakewood public school students with \$7,164,029, and non-public school students with \$8,487,874 out of \$16,475,687, to serve 5,391 public school children and 22,688 non-public students of which 4,855 public school and 15,821 non-public students are low-income.

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

3. NCLB Title I Part A in 2013-14 provided Lakewood public school students with \$9,367,786 and non-public school students with \$8,666,422 out of \$18,759,801, to serve 4,907 public school children and 20,902 non-public students of which 4,655 public school and 14,715 non-public students are low-income.

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

4. 1,204 public school students are receiving special education services as of September 2015 of which 290 are sent out-of-district.

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

5. The 2015 value of taxable property (ratables) in Lakewood is \$6,271,965,700.

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

6. The 2014 value of taxable property (ratables) in Lakewood is \$6,151,919,800.

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

7. The data in **Appendix 1--Low Income Urban and Neighboring Districts 2016** is accurate.

(The data entries were compiled from the following sources:
PER CAPITA INCOME AND RANK is from 2010 Census data

<http://lwd.dol.state.nj.us/labor/lpa/industry/incpov/2010income.html>;

DISTRICT PROFILES: FY 2015 and FY2016 Spreadsheets were prepared by Susan Ecks, Supervisor of State Aid Research and Data Analysis, of the NJ DOE;

2015-16 OPERATING BUDGETS, LOCAL TAX LEVY, TRANSPORTATION, TUITION AND OTHER COSTS: Obtained from User Friendly Budgets posted on each district's website; MUNICIPAL TAX INFORMATION: http://www.state.nj.us/dca/divisions/dlgs/resources/property_tax.html;

PERSONS BELOW POVERTY, MUNICIPAL DENSITY: As available in Quick Facts on the US Census website at

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/34/3430210.html>;

17 AND UNDER, MEDIAN AGE, HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY SIZES: NJ DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

http://lwd.dol.state.nj.us/labor/lpa/census/2010/gdp_index.html#stcnty;

2014 MUNICIPAL LABOR FORCE: Spreadsheet Annual Municipal Labor Force Estimates: 2010-2014 downloaded from

http://lwd.dol.state.nj.us/labor/lpa/employ/uirate/lfest_index.html;

STATE AID: 2015-16 K-12 PROJECTED STATE SCHOOL AID Spreadsheet found at <http://www.state.nj.us/education/stateaid/1415/>;

2015 TAXPAYERS GUIDE TO EDUCATION SPENDING

<http://www.state.nj.us/education/guide/2015/ind.shtml>;

AVERAGE OF TEACHERS' SALARIES AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE:

<http://www.njspotlight.com/stories/14/08/14/interactive-map-salaries-for-nj-teachers-staff-and-administrators-dip-slightly/>;

2014-15 CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION COST AND RANK, MEDIAN TEACHERS' SALARY AND RANK, RATIO OF STUDENTS TO TEACHERS AND RANK, CLASSROOM SUPPLIES TEXTBOOKS AND RANK: NJDOE TAXPAYER GUIDE TO

EDUCATION SPENDING:

<http://www.state.nj.us/education/guide/2015/ind.shtml#ind1>)

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

8. The data in **Appendix 2--2014 performance report Urban and Neighboring Districts** is accurate. (Data compiled from individual school reports found on DOE website).

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

9. The data in **Appendix 3--Births, transportation and tuition by year** is accurate. (New Jersey Birth Certificate Database, Office of Vital Statistics and Registry, New Jersey Department of Health, <https://www26.state.nj.us/doh-shad/query/builder/birth/BirthPopMuni/BirthRate.html>;

Transportation and Tuition from district END OF YEAR CAFRS and

User Friendly Budgets.)

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

10. The data compiled in **Appendix 4--HSPA BY TEST YEAR** is accurate. (HSPA results compiled from data on NJDOE website: <http://www.state.nj.us/education/assessment/hs/hspa/results/> and from district OPRA request)

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

11. The data compiled in **Appendix 5--EIGHTH GRADE PROFICIENCY TEST BY YEAR** is accurate. (GEPA results compiled from data on NJDOE website:

<http://www.state.nj.us/education/assessment/ms/gepa/results/>

NJASK results compiled from data on NJDOE website:

<http://www.nj.gov/education/schools/achievement/prior.htm>)

_____ Admitted

_____ Denied because _____

12. The data compiled in **Appendix 6--Low Income Urban and Neighboring Districts Four Year Graduation Rates** is accurate.

_____ Admitted
_____ Denied because _____

13. The data in **Appendix 6--Low Income Urban and Neighboring Districts Four Year Graduation Rates** is accurate.

_____ Admitted
_____ Denied because _____

14. The information in **Appendix 7--Peer Schools** is accurate.

_____ Admitted
_____ Denied because _____

SIGNATURE LINE: _____

Dated:

Appendix 1

COUNTY		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
		PER CAPITA INCOME US CENSUS DFG 2010	PER CAPITA INCOME 564 NJ MUNICIPALITIES	PER CAPITA INCOME RANK of 564 NJ MUNICIPALITIES	RESIDENTIAL ENROLLMENT (ENR)	PUBLIC SPECIAL ED PUPILS	SPEC ED % OF ENR	PUBLIC LOW INCOME PUPILS	LOW INCOME % OF ENR	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP)	LEP % OF ENR.	LEP LOW INCOME	LEP LOW INCOME % OF ENR	FY 2016 LOCAL FAIR SHARE	2015-16 LOCAL TAX LEVY	TAX LEVY/ ENR	2015-16 LOCAL EFFORT
LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS																	
CUMBERLAND	BRIDGETON CITY	A	\$12,418	564	5,385	530	9.8%	4,967	92.2%	1,132	21.0%	1,078	20.0%	\$9,625,854	\$3,637,144	\$675	\$5,178,460
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	A	\$12,807	563	15,265	2,798	18.3%	13,601	89.1%	1,285	8.4%	1,084	7.1%	\$28,068,813	\$7,449,009	\$488	\$10,786,200
PASSAIC	PASSAIC CITY	A	\$14,424	562	13,674	2,134	15.6%	13,080	95.7%	3,504	25.6%	3,422	25.0%	\$47,311,355	\$16,818,577	\$1,230	\$17,737,957
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	A	\$15,543	560	27,310	3,852	14.1%	22,376	81.9%	3,623	13.3%	2,764	10.1%	\$97,149,177	\$38,955,956	\$1,426	\$42,466,070
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	A	\$16,395	556	9,036	1,402	15.5%	8,554	94.7%	1,667	18.4%	1,507	16.7%	\$39,399,366	\$27,862,800	\$3,084	\$28,562,800
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP		\$16,430	555	6,020	1,128	18.7%	5,632	93.6%	1,561	25.9%	1,433	23.8%	\$96,735,200	\$90,350,168	\$15,008	\$91,024,977
OCEAN	LAKWOOD CENSUS DESIGNATED PLACE		\$11,895														
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	A	\$17,367	554	49,687	7,569	15.2%	36,596	73.7%	4,073	8.2%	2,914	5.9%	\$183,863,588	\$115,650,165	\$2,328	\$122,107,444
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	A	\$17,400	553	13,997	2,425	17.3%	12,251	87.5%	1,703	12.2%	1,477	10.6%	\$41,692,620	\$21,115,662	\$1,509	\$22,115,662
SALEM	SALEM CITY	A	\$17,733	552	950	189	19.9%	813	85.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$2,904,245	\$2,392,321	\$2,520	\$3,787,547
HUDSON	UNION CITY	A	\$18,506	549	11,688	1,364	11.7%	10,997	94.1%	2,865	24.5%	2,736	23.4%	\$48,593,609	\$15,418,637	\$1,319	\$15,568,637
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	A	\$18,527	548	3,586	572	16.0%	3,099	86.4%	386	10.8%	337	9.4%	\$13,079,411	\$8,311,512	\$2,318	\$9,265,163
ESSEX	EAST ORANGE	A	\$20,298	540	10,060	1,539	15.3%	8,196	81.5%	289	2.9%	259	2.6%	\$44,660,845	\$18,950,050	\$1,884	\$19,725,050
UNION	ELIZABETH CITY	A	\$19,196	546	23,901	2,794	11.7%	20,846	87.2%	3,963	16.6%	3,532	14.8%	\$98,295,965	\$59,813,124	\$2,503	\$60,687,303
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	A	\$19,816	544	5,154	880	17.1%	4,339	84.2%	611	11.9%	517	10.0%	\$21,661,608	\$11,692,295	\$2,269	\$12,002,295
MIDDLESEX	PERTH AMBOY CITY	A	\$20,162	541	9,957	1,068	10.7%	7,678	77.1%	1,843	18.5%	1,561	15.7%	\$43,047,549	\$21,762,553	\$2,186	\$22,011,586
MONMOUTH	ASBURY PARK CITY	A	\$20,368	538	2,376	525	22.1%	1,913	80.5%	211	8.9%	174	7.3%	\$16,502,549	\$6,635,736	\$2,793	\$6,653,380
ESSEX	IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	A	\$20,520	536	7,314	942	12.9%	5,730	78.3%	845	11.6%	659	9.0%	\$37,723,297	\$17,459,529	\$2,387	\$17,959,529
MONMOUTH	KEANSBURG BORO	A	\$21,246	530	1,359	312	23.0%	934	68.7%	38	2.8%	37	2.7%	\$8,204,527	\$4,868,294	\$3,582	\$4,924,838
WARREN	PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	B	\$21,291	529	2,500	486	19.4%	1,747	69.9%	110	4.4%	101	4.0%	\$12,550,417	\$10,728,711	\$4,291	\$26,941,777
HUDSON	HARRISON TOWN	B	\$21,857	527	2,021	328	16.2%	1,636	81.0%	137	6.8%	124	6.1%	\$16,256,355	\$9,229,913	\$4,567	\$11,640,113
CAMDEN	GLOUCESTER CITY	B	\$22,718	522	1,810	350	19.3%	1,311	72.4%	42	2.3%	40	2.2%	\$8,751,000	\$4,210,000	\$2,326	\$5,182,058
CUMBERLAND	MILLVILLE CITY	A	\$23,364	516	4,957	997	20.1%	3,253	65.6%	61	1.2%	57	1.2%	\$26,258,781	\$11,319,609	\$2,284	\$19,067,956
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	B	\$23,767	514	8,981	1,353	15.1%	7,983	88.9%	2,653	29.5%	2,493	27.8%	\$41,356,707	\$22,731,000	\$2,531	\$23,027,565
BERGEN	GARFIELD CITY	B	\$24,022	512	4,905	872	17.8%	3,274	66.7%	235	4.8%	144	2.9%	\$30,296,266	\$25,989,445	\$5,299	\$26,939,445
HUDSON	WEST NEW YORK TOWN	A	\$24,419	508	7,303	1,046	14.3%	6,099	83.5%	823	11.3%	625	8.6%	\$42,681,660	\$14,860,598	\$2,035	\$14,960,598
CUMBERLAND	VINELAND CITY	A	\$24,512	506	9,853	1,606	16.3%	6,835	69.4%	767	7.8%	703	7.1%	\$63,736,430	\$22,166,068	\$2,250	\$23,640,205
BURLINGTON	BURLINGTON CITY	B	\$24,612	503	1,368	286	20.9%	853	62.4%	25	1.8%	19	1.4%	\$9,741,821	\$10,899,878	\$7,968	\$14,090,477
BURLINGTON	PEMBERTON TWP	B	\$26,240	475	4,411	748	17.0%	2,089	47.4%	47	1.1%	26	0.6%	\$23,198,586	\$12,942,946	\$2,934	\$13,643,696
MONMOUTH	LONG BRANCH CITY	B	\$30,381	395	4,902	591	12.1%	4,023	82.1%	639	13.0%	586	12.0%	\$51,681,518	\$37,901,052	\$7,732	\$38,256,052
HUDSON	JERSEY CITY	B	\$30,490	388	31,134	4,486	14.4%	22,136	71.1%	2,774	8.9%	2,009	6.5%	\$335,745,966	\$112,161,139	\$3,603	\$114,126,625
MONMOUTH	NEPTUNE TWP	CD	\$30,656	382	3,812	122	3.2%	268	7.0%	21	0.6%	20	0.5%	\$45,045,336	\$36,035,649	\$9,454	\$41,110,984
HUDSON	HOBOKEN CITY	FG	\$69,085	29	2,470	318	12.9%	1,276	51.7%	26	1.1%	13	0.5%	\$187,075,236	\$41,004,666	\$16,601	\$41,794,290
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS																	
			\$22,585	505	9,714	1,435	15.7%	7,701.7	76.0%	1,174.1	10.0%	1,000.6	8.8%	\$54,069,692	\$24,870,130	\$3,496	\$26,966,508
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS																	
			\$20,520	536	5,385	942	15.6%	4,967.0	81.0%	639.0	8.9%	586.0	7.1%	\$39,399,366	\$16,818,577	\$2,387	\$19,067,956
STANDARD DEVIATION LOW INCOME DISTRICTS																	
			\$9,810	101	10,574	1,563	4.0%	\$8,251	17.4%	\$1,330	8.0%	\$1,132	7.6%	\$68,328,162	\$27,115,552	\$3,191	\$27,669,500
SUM LOW INCOME DISTRICTS																	
					301,123	44,484	14.8%	238,753	79.3%	36,398	12.1%	31,018	10.3%	\$1,676,160,457	\$770,974,038	\$2,560	\$835,961,762
			NJ PER CAPITA														
	SUM OF ALL NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNICIPALITIES		\$39,940		1,357,267	202,857	14.9%	522,578	38.5%	64,837	4.8%	49,937	3.7%	\$17,098,258,876			
	MEAN OF NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.				2,297	343	15.3%	884	28.5%	110	2.0%	84	1.9%	\$29,996,945			
	MEDIAN NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.				1,165	168	15.1%	203	22.0%	11	0.6%	6	0.5%	\$17,228,195			
	STAND. DEV.				3,391	542	4.1%	2,604	24.6%	426	3.8%	347	3.8%	\$37,190,174			
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP		\$16,430	555	6,020	1,128	18.7%	5,632	93.6%	1,561	25.9%	1,433	23.8%	\$96,735,200	\$90,350,168	\$15,008	\$91,024,977
OCEAN	BRICK TWP	DE	\$33,258	325	9,169	1,694	18.5%	2,841	31.0%	162	1.8%	132	1.4%	\$135,153,356	\$97,622,590	\$10,648	\$99,049,087
MONMOUTH	HOWELL TWP	FG	\$35,439	280	6,085	942	15.5%	1,017	16.7%	110	1.8%	67	1.1%	\$62,967,187	\$68,864,597	\$11,317	\$70,187,463
OCEAN	JACKSON TWP	DE	\$34,521	295	8,784	1,238	14.1%	1,928	22.0%	79	0.9%	60	0.7%	\$94,823,415	\$77,701,924	\$8,846	\$78,440,658
OCEAN	TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	DE	\$33,423	321	15,820	2,246	14.2%	4,425	28.0%	140	0.9%	90	0.6%	\$201,605,057	\$137,569,026	\$8,696	\$139,227,030
OCEAN	TOMS RIVER CDP		\$33,105														

	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
	TAX LEVY/LOCAL FAIR SHARE	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LOCAL EFFORT AND LOCAL FAIR SHARE	RATIO OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TAX LEVY AND LOCAL SHARE TO LOCAL SHARE	RATIO OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TAX LEVY AND LOCAL SHARE TO LOCAL EFFORT	2015-16 OPERATING BUDGET	2016 ADEQUACY BUDGET	2015-16 TUITION COST	TUITION/ENR	TRANSPORTATION COST	TRANSP COST/ENR	2015-16 TRANSPORTATION AND TUITION	TRANS AND TUITION/OPER BUDG.	TRANSPORTATION AND TUITION/ENR
LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS													
BRIDGETON CITY	37.8%	-\$4,447,394	-62.2%	-46.2%	\$93,768,876	\$104,648,537	\$4,518,129	\$839	\$4,229,493	\$785	\$8,747,622	9.3%	\$1,625
CAMDEN CITY	26.5%	-\$17,282,613	-73.5%	-61.6%	\$300,483,997	\$293,315,255	\$18,367,348	\$1,203	\$10,410,983	\$682	\$28,778,331	9.6%	\$1,885
PASSAIC CITY	35.5%	-\$29,573,398	-64.5%	-62.5%	\$283,100,170	\$278,900,730	\$29,096,086	\$2,128	\$7,237,075	\$529	\$36,333,161	12.8%	\$2,657
PATERSON CITY	40.1%	-\$54,683,107	-59.9%	-56.3%	\$477,481,718	\$526,053,418	\$42,302,843	\$1,549	\$18,590,554	\$681	\$60,893,397	12.8%	\$2,230
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	70.7%	-\$10,836,566	-29.3%	-27.5%	\$168,482,568	\$186,760,837	\$9,230,990	\$1,022	\$7,477,500	\$828	\$16,708,490	9.9%	\$1,849
LAKEWOOD TWP	93.4%	-\$5,710,223	-6.6%	-5.9%	\$120,830,423	\$119,334,752	\$28,093,613	\$4,667	\$17,972,788	\$2,986	\$46,066,401	38.1%	\$7,652
LAKEWOOD CENSUS DESIGNATED PL													
NEWARK CITY	62.9%	-\$61,756,144	-37.1%	-33.6%	\$845,737,814	\$962,423,619	\$46,775,951	\$941	\$34,590,354	\$696	\$81,366,305	9.6%	\$1,638
TRENTON CITY	50.6%	-\$19,576,958	-49.4%	-47.0%	\$257,901,771	\$276,261,593	\$33,878,030	\$2,420	\$8,235,642	\$588	\$42,113,672	16.3%	\$3,009
SALEM CITY	82.4%	\$883,302	-17.6%	30.4%	\$21,518,383	\$17,612,259	\$1,600,866	\$1,686	\$730,584	\$769	\$2,331,450	10.8%	\$2,455
UNION CITY	31.7%	-\$33,024,972	-68.3%	-68.0%	\$222,330,974	\$250,306,432	\$9,409,501	\$805	\$3,826,161	\$327	\$13,235,662	6.0%	\$1,132
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	63.5%	-\$3,814,248	-36.5%	-29.2%	\$76,410,954	\$67,971,950	\$5,513,198	\$1,537	\$1,952,508	\$544	\$7,465,706	9.8%	\$2,082
EAST ORANGE	42.4%	-\$24,935,795	-57.6%	-55.8%	\$207,633,076	\$195,898,656	\$11,875,563	\$1,181	\$6,248,984	\$621	\$18,124,547	8.7%	\$1,802
ELIZABETH CITY	60.9%	-\$37,608,662	-39.1%	-38.3%	\$437,238,088	\$492,090,054	\$34,281,862	\$1,434	\$16,363,744	\$685	\$50,645,606	11.6%	\$2,119
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	54.0%	-\$9,659,313	-46.0%	-44.6%	\$89,200,495	\$103,985,943	\$6,043,287	\$1,173	\$3,159,211	\$613	\$9,202,498	10.3%	\$1,786
PERTH AMBOY CITY	50.6%	-\$21,035,963	-49.4%	-48.9%	\$299,191,734	\$193,146,552	\$16,448,450	\$1,652	\$6,087,405	\$611	\$22,535,855	7.5%	\$2,263
ASBURY PARK CITY	40.2%	-\$9,849,169	-59.8%	-59.7%	\$66,278,588	\$44,790,872	\$4,787,174	\$2,015	\$2,012,595	\$847	\$6,799,769	10.3%	\$2,862
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	46.3%	-\$19,763,768	-53.7%	-52.4%	\$137,529,541	\$142,210,640	\$17,919,946	\$2,450	\$6,568,550	\$898	\$24,488,496	17.8%	\$3,348
KEANSBURG BORO	59.3%	-\$3,279,689	-40.7%	-40.0%	\$34,400,298	\$24,373,270	\$3,088,399	\$2,273	\$1,323,510	\$974	\$4,411,909	12.8%	\$3,246
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	85.5%	\$14,391,360	-14.5%	114.7%	\$66,246,595	\$44,312,032	\$1,647,659	\$659	\$2,260,216	\$904	\$3,907,875	5.9%	\$1,563
HARRISON TOWN	56.8%	-\$4,616,242	-43.2%	-28.4%	\$38,903,938	\$40,490,965	\$3,709,888	\$1,836	\$997,950	\$494	\$4,707,838	12.1%	\$2,329
GLOUCESTER CITY	48.1%	-\$3,568,942	-51.9%	-40.8%	\$40,874,672	\$32,758,261	\$2,537,807	\$1,402	\$976,000	\$539	\$3,513,807	8.6%	\$1,941
MILVILLE CITY	43.1%	-\$7,190,825	-56.9%	-27.4%	\$90,183,729	\$84,758,894	\$3,786,587	\$764	\$3,882,969	\$783	\$7,669,556	8.5%	\$1,547
PLAINFIELD CITY	55.0%	-\$18,329,142	-45.0%	-44.3%	\$160,776,424	\$187,867,499	\$10,168,563	\$1,132	\$5,178,521	\$577	\$15,347,084	9.5%	\$1,709
GARFIELD CITY	85.8%	-\$3,356,821	-14.2%	-11.1%	\$87,741,972	\$91,082,349	\$5,867,619	\$1,196	\$2,125,717	\$433	\$7,993,336	9.1%	\$1,630
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	34.8%	-\$27,721,062	-65.2%	-64.9%	\$111,909,229	\$149,829,479	\$6,079,510	\$832	\$1,900,360	\$260	\$7,979,870	7.1%	\$1,093
VINELAND CITY	34.8%	-\$40,096,225	-65.2%	-62.9%	\$170,511,207	\$173,853,434	\$6,126,939	\$622	\$10,498,332	\$1,065	\$16,625,271	9.8%	\$1,687
BURLINGTON CITY	111.9%	\$4,348,656	11.9%	44.6%	\$33,451,640	\$23,611,785	\$2,582,549	\$1,888	\$807,846	\$591	\$3,390,395	10.1%	\$2,478
PEMBERTON TWP	55.8%	-\$9,554,890	-44.2%	-41.2%	\$103,606,323	\$72,093,084	\$3,448,130	\$782	\$4,621,772	\$1,048	\$8,069,902	7.8%	\$1,829
LONG BRANCH CITY	73.3%	-\$13,425,466	-26.7%	-26.0%	\$83,186,640	\$95,682,831	\$2,595,801	\$530	\$2,821,344	\$576	\$5,417,145	6.5%	\$1,105
JERSEY CITY	33.4%	-\$221,619,341	-66.6%	-66.0%	\$567,025,112	\$601,290,845	\$19,710,007	\$633	\$13,723,721	\$441	\$33,433,728	5.9%	\$1,074
NEPTUNE TWP	80.0%	-\$3,934,352	-20.0%	-8.7%	\$78,250,113	\$67,414,051	\$7,022,257	\$1,842	\$2,645,351	\$694	\$9,667,608	12.4%	\$2,536
HOBOKEN CITY	21.9%	-\$145,280,946	-78.1%	-77.7%	\$53,466,416	\$43,400,969	\$1,801,889	\$730	\$1,313,468	\$532	\$3,115,357	5.8%	\$1,261
Average Low Income Urban Dist.	54.1%	-27,103,183.7	-45.9%	-34.9%	\$184,026,550	\$189,328,939	\$12,007,188	\$1,328	\$6,219,304	\$665	\$18,226,492	0.1	\$1,993
Median Low Income Urban Dist.	50.6%	-13,425,466.0	-49.4%	-44.3%	\$103,606,323	\$104,648,537	\$6,079,510	\$1,196	\$3,882,969	\$621	\$9,202,498	0.1	\$1,849
Standard Deviation Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	20.4%	\$45,987,673	20.4%	38.3%	\$184,360,094	\$207,189,306	\$12,596,042	\$571	\$6,979,844	\$194	\$18,947,733	50	\$618
Sum Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	46.0%	-840,198,695	-54.0%	-50.1%	\$5,704,823,055	\$5,869,197,095	\$372,222,828	\$1,236	\$192,798,420	\$640	\$565,021,248	9.9%	\$1,876
SUM OF ALL NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI													
MEAN OF NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.													
MEDIAN NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.													
STAND. DEV.													
LAKEWOOD TWP	93.4%	-\$5,710,223	-6.6%	-5.9%	\$120,830,423	\$119,334,752	\$28,093,613	\$4,667	\$17,972,788	\$2,986	\$46,066,401	38.1%	\$7,652
BRICK TWP	72.2%	-\$36,104,269	-27.8%	-26.7%	\$140,472,182	\$135,112,603	\$6,380,458	\$696	\$8,048,580	\$878	\$14,429,038	10.3%	\$1,574
HOWELL TWP	109.4%	\$7,220,276	9.4%	11.5%	\$108,572,128	\$83,452,944	\$989,825	\$163	\$7,092,771	\$1,166	\$8,082,596	7.4%	\$1,328
JACKSON TWP	81.9%	-\$16,382,757	-18.1%	-17.3%	\$134,168,942	\$121,399,946	\$3,161,409	\$360	\$9,708,096	\$1,105	\$12,869,505	9.6%	\$1,465
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	68.2%	-\$62,378,027	-31.8%	-30.9%	\$218,972,877	\$225,424,120	\$4,305,719	\$272	\$12,794,944	\$809	\$17,100,663	7.8%	\$1,081
TOMS RIVER CDP													

	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43
	OPERATING BUDGET AFTER TRANSP AND TUITION COST	OPERATING BUDGET AFTER TRANSP AND TUITION COST /ENR	OPERATING BUDGET AFTER TRANSP AND TUITION COST: ABOVE OR BELOW ADEQUACY	% ABOVE OR BELOW ADEQUACY	2015-16 Total Budgetary Per Pupil Cost	2015-16 Total Classroom Instruction Per Pupil	2014-15 Total Classroom Instruction Cost Per Pupil	2014-15 Rank of 103 K-12 3500+ Districts from lowest to highest Classroom Instruction (UNLESS DIFFERENT DISTRICT GROUPING IS INDICATED)	2013-14 AVERAGE TEACHER SALARY	2013-14 TEACHERS' AVERAGE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	2014-15 MEDIAN TEACHERS' SALARY	MEDIAN SALARY RANK FROM LOWEST TO HIGHEST OF 103 K-12 3500+ DISTRICTS	2014-15 RATIO OF STUDENTS TO TEACHERS	STUDENT TO TEACHER RATIO RANK FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST OF 103 K-12 3500+ DISTRICTS
LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS														
BRIDGETON CITY	\$85,021,254	\$15,790	-\$19,627,283	-18.8%	\$15,961	\$9,343	\$9,401	71	\$61,244	12.2	\$59,175	17	11.2	83
CAMDEN CITY	\$271,705,666	\$17,800	-\$21,609,589	-7.4%	\$19,655	\$11,633	\$11,444	100	\$65,889	13.5	\$61,203	28	11.7	67
PASSAIC CITY	\$246,767,009	\$18,046	-\$32,133,721	-11.5%	\$17,187	\$9,974	\$10,483	93	\$79,212	12.0	\$67,693	62	13.0	29
PATERSON CITY	\$416,588,321	\$15,254	-\$109,465,097	-20.8%	\$15,629	\$8,602	\$9,087	61	\$64,156	11.6	\$53,672	4	11.3	79
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	\$151,774,078	\$16,797	-\$34,986,759	-18.7%	\$16,747	\$9,627	\$10,116	91	\$70,089	11.1	\$62,178	36	12.1	53
LAKEWOOD TWP	\$74,764,022	\$12,419	-\$44,570,730	-37.3%	\$12,348	\$6,600	\$6,680	1	\$54,639	8.3	\$51,436	1	13.1	23
LAKEWOOD CENSUS DESIGNATED PL														
NEWARK CITY	\$764,371,509	\$15,384	-\$198,052,110	-20.6%	\$15,961	\$8,195	\$8,280	26	\$72,726	13.4	\$62,003	35	12.9	30
TRENTON CITY	\$215,788,099	\$15,417	-\$60,473,494	-21.9%	\$17,154	\$10,135	\$10,941	97	\$70,946	7.2	\$69,250	67	11.1	84
SALEM CITY	\$19,186,933	\$20,207	\$1,574,674	8.9%	\$18,568	\$10,407	\$10,060	43/50	\$61,327	10.1	\$57,179	16/50	9.3	47/50
UNION CITY	\$209,095,312	\$17,890	-\$41,211,120	-16.5%	\$17,407	\$8,580	\$8,639	46	\$71,706	12.3				
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	\$68,945,248	\$19,226	\$973,298	1.4%	\$20,904	\$12,022	\$10,803	95	\$62,654	12.2	\$56,001	10	10.5	94
EAST ORANGE	\$189,508,529	\$18,839	-\$6,390,127	-3.3%	\$20,291	\$11,720	\$9,824	87	\$80,267	13.6	\$78,173	90	10.7	93
ELIZABETH CITY	\$386,592,482	\$16,175	-\$105,497,572	-21.4%	\$15,978	\$9,770	\$10,338	92	\$78,443	5.0	\$77,781	89	12.2	49
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	\$79,997,997	\$15,522	-\$23,987,946	-23.1%	\$15,871	\$8,837	\$8,838	56	\$60,532	9.4	\$55,341	9	11.1	84
PERTH AMBOY CITY	\$276,655,879	\$27,785	\$83,509,327	43.2%	\$16,821	\$10,504	\$9,985	90	\$68,973	10.8	\$60,500	23	12.4	44
ASBURY PARK CITY	\$59,478,819	\$25,033	\$14,687,947	32.8%	\$28,893	\$15,290	\$14,673	68/68	\$73,012	16.2	\$67,560	47/68	8.3	65/68
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$113,041,045	\$15,455	-\$29,169,595	-20.5%	\$16,270	\$9,369	9,634	77	\$68,611	13.0	\$68,976	65	13.1	23
KEANSBURG BORO	\$29,988,389	\$22,067	\$5,615,119	23.0%	\$23,688	\$13,135	\$11,791	49/50	\$63,908	11.0	\$57,035	15/50	7.6	48/50
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	\$62,338,720	\$24,935	\$18,026,688	40.7%	\$17,393	\$10,535	\$9,742	84	\$69,401	14.3	\$76,878	86	11.6	74
HARRISON TOWN	\$34,196,100	\$16,920	-\$6,294,865	-15.5%	\$15,840	\$8,804	\$9,126	55/68	\$77,065	14.6	\$69,386	56/68	12.6	22/68
GLOUCESTER CITY	\$37,360,865	\$20,641	\$4,602,604	14.1%	\$18,761	\$10,846	\$10,882	65/68	\$64,128	12.7	\$62,135	27/68	10.1	63/68
MILLVILLE CITY	\$82,514,173	\$16,648	-\$2,244,721	-2.6%	\$15,285	\$8,543	\$8,400	33	\$63,208	13.1	\$60,132	21	11.7	67
PLAINFIELD CITY	\$145,429,340	\$16,193	-\$42,438,159	-22.6%	\$16,242	\$8,794	\$9,194	66	\$67,888	12.5	\$61,597	30	12.5	39
GARFIELD CITY	\$79,748,636	\$16,259	-\$11,333,713	-12.4%	\$15,121	\$9,127	\$9,656	80	\$71,078	9.4	\$54,706	7	11.3	79
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	\$103,929,359	\$14,231	-\$45,900,120	-30.6%	\$14,263	\$8,411	\$8,915	57	\$77,523	13.7				
VINELAND CITY	\$153,885,936	\$15,618	-\$19,967,498	-11.5%	\$16,089	\$9,964	\$9,780	85	\$65,302	13.0	\$61,320	29	12.1	53
BURLINGTON CITY	\$30,061,245	\$21,975	\$6,449,460	27.3%	\$18,646	\$10,320	\$9,878	40/50	\$66,365	10.8	\$60,283	24	10.0	45
PEMBERTON TWP	\$95,536,421	\$21,659	\$23,443,337	32.5%	\$19,240	\$11,413	\$11,363	99	\$77,562	16.3	\$82,785	95	11.1	84
LONG BRANCH CITY	\$77,769,495	\$15,865	-\$17,913,336	-18.7%	\$14,828	\$8,850	\$9,192	65	\$63,071	10.1	\$60,266	22	11.6	74
JERSEY CITY	\$533,591,384	\$17,139	-\$67,699,461	-11.3%	\$17,500	\$10,384	\$10,642	94	\$78,123	12.6	\$64,658	49	11.8	63
NEPTUNE TWP	\$68,582,505	\$17,994	\$1,168,454	1.7%	\$16,144	\$8,925	\$8,564	42	\$61,250	11.7	\$54,817	8	11.8	63
HOBOKEN CITY	\$50,351,059	\$20,385	\$6,950,090	16.0%	\$23,250	\$11,296	\$10,863	64/68	\$75,039	10.3	\$72,274	62/68	9.9	64/68
Average Low Income Urban Dist.	\$165,800,058	18,359.6	-\$23,528,880	-2.8%	\$17,793	\$10,108	10,017.2	74.5	69,377.4	11.9	63,964.0	39.4	11.3	63.2
Median Low Income Urban Dist.	\$95,536,421	17,138.5	-\$17,913,336	-11.5%	\$16,821	\$9,964	9,824.0	82.0	68,973.0	12.2	61,597.0	29.0	11.6	67.0
Standard Deviation Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	\$166,816,158	\$3,330	\$49,227,954	21.3%	\$3,066	\$1,559	\$1,271		\$6,213		\$7,808	\$30		\$21
Sum Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	\$5,214,565,829	\$17,317	-\$773,966,018	-13.2%										
SUM OF ALL NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI														
MEAN OF NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.				2014-15	\$15,067		8,933		\$68,302	11.8				
MEDIAN NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.				2014-15	\$14,453		8,771							
STAND. DEV.														
LAKEWOOD TWP	\$74,764,022	\$12,419	-\$44,570,730	-37.3%	\$12,348	\$6,600	\$6,680	1	\$54,639	8.3	\$51,436	1	13.1	23
BRICK TWP	\$126,043,144	\$13,747	-\$9,069,459	-6.7%	\$13,355	\$8,438	\$8,308	28	\$64,553	11.9	\$63,531	41	11.7	67
HOWELL TWP	\$100,489,532	\$16,514	\$17,036,588	20.4%	\$16,005	\$9,592	\$9,058	23/41	\$71,697	11.9	\$63,050	46/82	11.1	56/82
JACKSON TWP	\$121,299,437	\$13,810	-\$100,509	-0.1%	\$13,762	\$7,989	\$7,801	15	\$62,935	13.4	\$57,850	14	13.3	12
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	\$201,872,214	\$12,761	-\$23,551,906	-10.4%	\$12,457	\$7,631	\$7,455	7	\$60,435	12.7	\$60,947	26	13.5	8
TOMS RIVER CDP														

	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56
	Classroom Supplies Textbooks	Classroom Supplies Textbooks Rank Lowest to Highest of 103 K-12 3500+ Districts	LEGAL SERVICE PER PUPIL	RANK OF 103 K-12 3500+ PUPIL DISTRICTS	EQUALIZATION AID	SPECIAL EDUCATION CATEGORICAL AID	SECURITY AID	ADJUSTMENT AID	UNDER ADEQUACY AID	TRANSPORT- ATION AID	OTHER STATE AID	TOTAL STATE AID	PUBLIC STUDENTS MANDATED REMOTE TRANSPORTA TION
LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS													
BRIDGETON CITY	\$810	103	\$15	4	\$70,303,534	\$2,692,474	\$2,030,338	\$0	\$311,832	\$605,810	\$4,008,458	\$79,952,446	448
CAMDEN CITY	\$776	102	\$23	19	\$214,776,464	\$8,244,198	\$5,949,022	\$46,068,696	\$0	\$4,511,837	\$297,380	\$279,847,597	2,213
PASSAIC CITY	\$479	97	\$13	2	\$192,253,769	\$7,822,139	\$5,836,727	\$0	\$177,430	\$1,952,300	\$20,272,339	\$228,314,704	572
PATERSON CITY	\$274	49	\$58	88	\$369,020,610	\$15,680,979	\$11,460,079	\$0	\$0	\$3,126,191	\$546,160	\$399,834,019	2,630
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	\$291	56	\$29	35	\$113,001,439	\$5,027,788	\$3,457,005	\$0	\$26,657	\$1,087,379	\$177,000	\$122,777,268	1,362
LAKEWOOD TWP	\$128	3	\$131	103	\$15,263,034	\$2,975,869	\$2,161,835	\$0	\$0	\$3,934,658	\$116,740	\$24,452,136	2,038
LAKEWOOD CENSUS DESIGNATED PL													
NEWARK CITY	\$350	67	\$77	97	\$645,243,822	\$28,180,824	\$19,309,359	\$13,306,175	\$0	\$6,754,710	\$2,476,629	\$715,271,519	5,572
TRENTON CITY	\$456	90	\$23	19	\$190,547,980	\$8,270,931	\$5,077,389	\$21,179,870	\$0	\$2,732,863	\$272,000	\$228,081,033	2,096
SALEM CITY	\$221	13/50	\$36	29/50	\$13,079,730	\$538,956	\$404,168	\$2,171,621	\$0	\$159,661	\$30,504	\$16,384,640	83
UNION CITY	\$404	82	\$45	79	\$164,712,713	\$6,724,737	\$5,226,396	\$0	\$447,622	\$475,331	\$231,880	\$177,818,679	19
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	\$443	89	\$64	91	\$46,591,510	\$2,156,890	\$1,332,096	\$14,090,235	\$0	\$593,318	\$73,550	\$64,837,599	619
EAST ORANGE	\$486	98	\$62	89	\$134,123,318	\$6,372,145	\$3,859,812	\$32,420,739	\$0	\$1,183,036	\$197,360	\$178,156,410	396
ELIZABETH CITY	\$383	77	\$73	94	\$308,295,204	\$13,260,027	\$9,919,445	\$0	\$500,000	\$2,976,954	\$28,994,328	\$363,945,958	2,067
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	\$370	74	\$24	22	\$60,692,109	\$2,860,412	\$1,838,577	\$0	\$265,589	\$545,602	\$7,252,531	\$73,454,820	27
PERTH AMBOY CITY	\$332	63	\$19	12	\$136,227,020	\$5,893,084	\$4,257,756	\$0	\$0	\$1,724,246	\$11,888,817	\$159,990,923	218
ASBURY PARK CITY	\$944	68/68	\$63	66/68	\$28,163,553	\$1,392,679	\$1,000,414	\$24,422,872	\$0	\$380,652	\$46,840	\$55,407,010	140
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$168	12	\$66	92	\$81,433,567	\$4,330,651	\$2,502,539	\$22,788,835	\$0	\$1,175,305	\$142,220	\$112,373,117	87
KEANSBURG BORO	\$512	45/50	\$39	34/50	\$16,973,265	\$901,656	\$535,157	\$8,642,285	\$0	\$244,350	\$37,946	\$27,334,659	25
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	\$275	50	\$77	97	\$25,057,290	\$1,371,130	\$769,147	\$9,997,105	\$0	\$188,706	\$58,034	\$37,441,412	101
HARRISON TOWN	\$498	61/68	\$46	55/68	\$23,080,693	\$1,254,537	\$822,910	\$0	\$40,247	\$145,453	\$39,940	\$25,383,780	0
GLOUCESTER CITY	\$325	46/68	\$34	31/68	\$18,865,262	\$995,008	\$585,469	\$9,360,582	\$0	\$232,091	\$36,080	\$30,074,492	30
MILLVILLE CITY	\$245	41	\$11	1	\$49,446,977	\$2,687,332	\$1,554,350	\$99,200	\$0	\$1,606,355	\$99,200	\$67,959,813	1,586
PLAINFIELD CITY	\$324	63	\$75	96	\$100,550,671	\$4,804,436	\$3,169,418	\$0	\$423,687	\$1,265,855	\$11,183,613	\$121,397,680	812
GARFIELD CITY	\$160	10	\$33	47	\$50,705,135	\$2,849,228	\$1,540,806	\$0	\$0	\$715,197	\$98,260	\$55,908,626	239
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	\$191	20	\$19	12	\$85,160,953	\$4,162,377	\$2,840,803	\$0	\$500,000	\$502,011	\$146,840	\$93,312,984	0
VINELAND CITY	\$395	78	\$16	7	\$89,507,454	\$5,190,051	\$3,028,970	\$34,392,237	\$0	\$4,314,688	\$253,210	\$136,686,610	4,517
BURLINGTON CITY	\$311	27/50	\$37	30/50	\$13,867,857	\$858,702	\$443,577	\$1,394,126	\$0	\$205,655	\$27,740	\$16,797,657	102
PEMBERTON TWP	\$251	41	\$27	28	\$44,411,804	\$2,619,559	\$1,269,289	\$32,419,492	\$0	\$2,475,702	\$285,379	\$83,481,225	2,877
LONG BRANCH CITY	\$252	42	\$17	9	\$36,768,086	\$2,795,051	\$1,823,590	\$0	\$76,031	\$627,703	\$97,560	\$42,188,021	877
JERSEY CITY	\$339	65	\$41	70	\$270,661,365	\$18,332,551	\$11,334,316	\$114,452,158	\$0	\$2,953,347	\$737,553	\$418,471,290	2,072
NEPTUNE TWP	\$182	18	\$22	17	\$25,407,093	\$2,404,326	\$1,222,886	\$2,234,768	\$0	\$1,363,716	\$77,300	\$32,710,089	48
HOBOKEN CITY	\$455	48/68	\$107	68/68	\$0	\$1,463,760	\$725,704	\$5,392,689	\$0	\$124,289	\$2,950,118	\$10,656,560	3
Average Low Income Urban Dist.	\$384	62	\$42	47.0	\$116,739,685	\$5,552,859	\$3,713,791	\$13,138,712	\$89,326	\$1,514,526	\$3,001,186	\$143,750,085	1,027
Median Low Income Urban Dist.	\$339	64	\$36	31.5	\$70,303,534	\$2,860,412	\$2,030,338	\$2,234,768	\$0	\$1,087,379	\$197,360	\$83,481,225	396
Standard Deviation Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	\$184	29	\$24	\$38	\$135,270,308	\$6,032,800	\$4,198,634	\$22,771,357	\$167,321	\$1,570,945	\$6,642,558	\$154,995,194	1,400
Sum Low Inc. Urb. Dist.					\$3,634,193,281	\$175,114,487	\$117,289,349	\$407,300,084	\$2,769,095	\$50,884,971	\$93,153,509	\$4,480,704,776	33,876
SUM OF ALL NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI					6,070,003,740	763,303,976	195,490,797	555,769,732	16,763,431	177,878,057	\$736,571,346	\$7,960,011,347	354,795
MEAN OF NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.	\$321		\$39		\$10,184,570	\$1,280,711	328,005	932,500	28,127	\$298,453	\$1,235,858	\$13,355,724	671
MEDIAN NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.	\$324		\$36		\$1,073,503	\$629,555	58,333	0	0	\$84,365	\$80,830	\$2,762,081	233
STAND. DEV.					\$40,117,662	\$2,124,119	1,258,162	5,960,129	94,898	\$646,259	\$6,200,024	\$47,275,166	1,031
LAKEWOOD TWP	\$128	3	\$131	103	\$15,263,034	\$2,975,869	\$2,161,835	\$0	\$0	\$3,934,658	\$116,740	\$24,452,136	2,038
BRICK TWP	\$166	11	\$41	70	\$9,463,269	\$5,393,423	\$1,039,800	\$14,934,026	\$0	\$4,922,064	\$186,246	\$35,938,828	3,476
HOWELL TWP	\$195	7 of 82	\$24	22/82	\$27,465,312	\$3,740,074	\$517,479	\$0	\$0	\$619,299	\$757,956	\$33,100,120	2,785
JACKSON TWP	\$259	43	\$32	46	\$42,102,240	\$5,211,500	\$854,977	\$0	\$0	\$1,013,961	\$368,458	\$49,551,136	5,200
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	\$222	32	\$15	4	\$39,889,745	\$9,141,043	\$1,820,980	\$11,839,961	\$433,801	\$4,586,531	\$311,660	\$68,023,721	5,133
TOMS RIVER CDP													

	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71
	PUBLIC SPECIAL ED W/O SPECIAL NEEDS MANDATED REMOTE TRANSPORTATION	SPECIAL ED WITH SPECIAL NEEDS	NON-PUBLIC MANDATED REMOTE TRANSPORTATION	TOTAL MANDATED REMOTE TRANSPORTATION	AID IN LEIU	TOTAL MANDATED REMOTE TRANSPORTATION	TRANSP AID	TRANSP AID/TOTAL MANDATED REMOTE TRANSPORTATION	PUPILS SENT PRIV SCH FOR HANDICAPPED	EXTRAORDINARY AID	ENR/PUPILS SENT TO PRIV SCH FOR HANDICAPPED	SPEECH, OT, PT AND RELATED SERVS	SPEECH, OT, PT AND RELATED SERVS/ENR	OTHER SUPP SERV STD-EXTRA SERV	CHILD STUDY TEAMS
LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS															
BRIDGETON CITY	79	127	0	654	46	654	\$605,810	\$926	28	\$0	192.3	\$803,662	\$149	\$41,410	\$1,492,179
CAMDEN CITY	773	684	242	3,912	161	3,912	\$4,511,837	\$1,153	170	\$0	89.8	\$850,000	\$56	\$600,000	\$3,173,073
PASSAIC CITY	137	611	0	1,320		1,320	\$1,952,300	\$1,479	228	\$2,000,000	60.0	\$8,852,852	\$647	\$4,883,578	\$5,588,562
PATERSON CITY	173	1,543	275	4,621	394	4,621	\$3,126,191	\$677	254	\$2,362,008	107.5	\$3,436,711	\$126	\$7,413,402	\$9,841,622
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY		218	104	1,684	74	1,684	\$1,087,379	\$646	69	\$368,956	131.9		\$0		\$4,109,400
LAKEWOOD TWP	278	392	15,982	18,690	286	18,690	\$3,934,658	\$211	260	\$4,500,000	23.2	\$3,437,855	\$571	\$3,158,951	\$2,692,498
LAKEWOOD CENSUS DESIGNATED PL															
NEWARK CITY	3,283	533	2,507	11,895	762	11,895	\$6,754,710	\$568	309	\$2,027,468	160.8	\$4,617,071	\$93	\$4,630,572	\$17,002,425
TRENTON CITY	4	1,631	342	4,073	142	4,073	\$2,732,863	\$671	182	\$939,943	77.1	\$1,988,922	\$142	\$1,500,000	\$4,992,920
SALEM CITY	5	61	0	149		149	\$159,661	\$1,072	7	\$100,000	135.6	\$302,817	\$319	\$315,011	\$532,890
UNION CITY	207	104	0	330		330	\$475,331	\$1,440	83	\$500,000	140.8		\$0		\$5,964,669
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	47	188	28	882	41	882	\$593,318	\$673	15	\$0	239.1	\$391,338	\$109	\$578,038	\$1,460,950
EAST ORANGE	280	208	0	884		884	\$1,183,036	\$1,338	138	\$685,000	72.9	\$766,742	\$76	\$763,800	\$5,108,459
ELIZABETH CITY	1,399	443	184	4,093	168	4,093	\$2,976,954	\$727	182	\$2,920,297	131.3	\$4,453,810	\$186	\$14,225,970	\$6,548,079
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	297	146	0	470		470	\$545,602	\$1,161	65	\$432,340	79.3	\$20,000	\$4		\$2,883,079
PERTH AMBOY CITY	36	650	0	903		903	\$1,724,246	\$1,909	62	\$21,762,553	160.6	\$0	\$0		\$2,700,000
ASBURY PARK CITY	48	233	2	423		423	\$380,652	\$900	47	\$0	50.6	\$808,675	\$340	\$321,457	\$1,746,864
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP		446	16	549		549	\$1,175,305	\$2,141	191	\$1,000,000	38.3	268,570	\$37	\$0	2,444,487
KEANSBURG BORO	22	77	0	124		124	\$244,350	\$1,971	31	\$0	43.8	586,642	\$432	\$247,499	\$1,257,702
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	283	19	21	424	9	424	\$188,706	\$445	12	\$200,000	208.3	\$495,928	\$198	\$537,035	\$1,761,331
HARRISON TOWN	0	70	0	70		70	\$145,453	\$2,078	40	\$0	50.5	\$112,362	\$56		\$947,832
GLOUCESTER CITY	41	53	0	124		124	\$232,091	\$1,872	27	\$0	67.0	\$3,000	\$2		\$1,236,875
MILLVILLE CITY	384	224	83	2,277	93	2,277	\$1,606,355	\$705	22	\$185,870	225.3	\$214,311	\$43	\$736,297	\$2,862,778
PLAINFIELD CITY	440	203	292	1,747	169	1,747	\$1,265,855	\$725	68	\$1,000,000	132.1	\$436,111	\$49	\$0	\$3,520,265
GARFIELD CITY	115	128	23	505		505	\$715,197	\$1,416	24	\$1,072,000	204.4	\$789,172	\$161	\$721,219	\$2,071,890
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	127	230	0	357		357	\$502,011	\$1,406	52	\$280,000	140.4	\$1,682,647	\$230	\$1,490,179	\$2,866,990
VINELAND CITY	916	491	521	6,445	137	6,445	\$4,314,688	\$669	60	\$700,000	164.2	\$1,511,200	\$153	\$136,321	\$2,461,595
BURLINGTON CITY	32	42	0	176		176	\$205,655	\$1,168	16	\$45,000	85.5	\$451,962	\$330	\$125,720	\$1,099,429
PEMBERTON TWP	586	170	0	3,633	72	3,633	\$2,475,702	\$681	44	\$112,368	100.3	\$914,904	\$207	\$1,368,337	\$3,225,630
LONG BRANCH CITY	145	97	271	1,390	115	1,390	\$627,703	\$452	38	\$200,000	129.0	\$244,407	\$50	\$532,991	\$3,017,691
JERSEY CITY	779	509	1	3,361	798	3,361	\$2,953,347	\$879	128	\$1,785,679	243.2	\$4,696,988	\$151	\$1,812,227	\$14,573,351
NEPTUNE TWP	145	24	0	217		217	\$1,363,716	\$6,284	85	\$200,000	44.8	\$871,406	\$229		\$1,118,097
HOBOKEN CITY	74	26	0	103		103	\$124,289	\$1,207	24	\$135,355	102.9	\$905,395	\$367	\$989,162	\$1,433,893
Average Low Income Urban Dist.	374	329	158	1,864	212	1,864	\$1,514,526	\$1,272	87.1	\$1,323,059	122.9	1,430,262.2	\$159	1,832,092.7	3,840,161.5
Median Low Income Urban Dist.	145	203	1	882	137	882	\$1,087,379	\$1,072	60.0	\$280,000	129.0	789,172.0	\$142	660,609.5	2,862,778.0
Standard Deviation Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	650	391	456	2,509	247	2,509	\$1,570,945	\$1,054	\$80	\$3,875,526	\$61	\$1,984,006	\$150	\$3,202,503	\$3,778,935
Sum Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	11,134	10,581	20,894	76,485	3,467	76,485	\$50,884,971	\$665	2,960	\$45,514,837	3,833	\$44,915,460	\$149	\$47,129,176	\$121,737,505
SUM OF ALL NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI	58,847	44,821	54,134	512,597	31,430		\$177,878,057	\$347							
MEAN OF NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.	136	82	142	1,031	73		\$298,453								
MEDIAN NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.	40	38	39	350	37		\$84,365								
STAND. DEV.	261	142	840	2,274	102		\$646,259								
LAKEWOOD TWP	278	392	15,982	18,690	286	18,690	\$3,934,658	\$211	260	\$4,500,000	23.2	\$3,437,855	\$571	\$3,158,951	\$2,692,498
BRICK TWP	1,368	501	718	6,063	43	6,063	\$4,922,064	\$812	89	\$900,000	103.0	\$2,825,552	\$308	\$3,416,227	\$3,220,414
HOWELL TWP	485	464	88	3,822	109	3,822	\$619,299	\$162	15	\$500,000	405.7	\$1,960,550	\$322	\$523,110	\$3,172,101
JACKSON TWP	904	555	302	6,960	160	6,960	\$1,013,961	\$146	53	\$900,000	167.3	\$1,375,240	\$157	\$3,225,338	\$3,330,420
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	865	569	561	7,127	142	7,127	\$4,586,531	\$644	69	\$561,500	230.9	\$3,312,595	\$209	\$9,500	\$3,340,424
TOMS RIVER CDP															

	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
	CHILD STUDY TEAM/ENR	TOTAL SPEECH, OT, PT AND RELATED SERVICE; OTHER SUPP SERV STD-EXTRA SERV; CHILD STUDY TEAM	TOTAL SPEECH, AND RELATED SERVICE; OTHER SUPP SERV STD-EXTRA SERV; CHILD STUDY TEAM/ENR	TRANSPORTATION; TUITION; SPEECH, OT, PT AND RELATED SERVS; OTHER SUPP SERV STD-EXTRA SERV; CHILD STUDY TEAM COSTS	TRANSPORTATION; TUITION; SPEECH, OT, PT AND RELATED SERVS; OTHER SUPP SERV STD-EXTRA SERV; CHILD STUDY TEAM COSTS/OPERATING BUDGET	TRANSPORTATION; TUITION; SPEECH, OT, PT AND RELATED SERVS; OTHER SUPP SERV STD-EXTRA SERV; CHILD STUDY TEAM COSTS/ENR	ADJUSTED OPERATING BUDGET (OPERATING BUDGET MINUS TRANSPORTATION; TUITION; SPEECH, OT, PT AND RELATED SERV; OTHER SUPP SERV STD-EXTRA SERV; CHILD STUDY TEAM COSTS)	ADJUSTED OPERATING BUDGET/ENR	ADJUSTED OPERATING BUDGET ABOVE OR BELOW ADEQUACY	ADJUSTED OPERATING BUDGET % ABOVE OR BELOW ADEQUACY	FY 2015 LOCAL FAIR SHARE	2014-15 LOCAL TAX LEVY	LOCAL TAX LEVY/LOCAL FAIR SHARE	2015-16 TAX CHANGE
LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS														
BRIDGETON CITY	\$277	\$2,337,251	\$434	\$11,084,873	11.8%	\$2,059	\$82,684,003	\$15,356	-\$21,964,534	-21.0%	\$9,596,275	\$3,637,144	37.9%	\$0
CAMDEN CITY	\$208	\$4,623,073	\$303	\$33,401,404	11.1%	\$2,188	\$267,082,593	\$17,497	-\$26,232,662	-8.9%	\$27,460,109	\$7,449,009	27.1%	\$0
PASSAIC CITY	\$409	\$19,324,992	\$1,413	\$55,658,153	19.7%	\$4,070	\$227,442,017	\$16,633	-\$51,458,713	-18.5%	\$46,313,048	\$16,818,577	36.3%	\$0
PATERSON CITY	\$360	\$20,691,735	\$758	\$81,585,132	17.1%	\$2,987	\$395,896,586	\$14,496	-\$130,156,832	-24.7%	\$96,356,637	\$38,955,956	40.4%	\$0
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	\$455	\$4,109,400	\$455	\$20,817,890	12.4%	\$2,304	\$147,664,678	\$16,342	-\$39,096,159	-20.9%	\$37,345,374	\$27,326,591	73.2%	\$536,209
LAKEWOOD TWP	\$447	\$9,289,304	\$1,543	\$55,355,705	45.8%	\$9,195	\$65,474,718	\$10,876	-\$53,860,034	-45.1%	\$85,419,632	\$84,693,837	99.2%	\$5,656,331
LAKEWOOD CENSUS DESIGNATED PL														
NEWARK CITY	\$342	\$26,250,068	\$528	\$107,616,373	12.7%	\$2,166	\$738,121,441	\$14,855	-\$224,302,178	-23.3%	\$179,577,518	\$113,382,515	63.1%	\$2,267,650
TRENTON CITY	\$357	\$8,481,842	\$606	\$50,595,514	19.6%	\$3,615	\$207,306,257	\$14,811	-\$68,955,336	-25.0%	\$40,586,655	\$21,115,662	52.0%	\$0
SALEM CITY	\$561	\$1,150,718	\$1,212	\$3,482,168	16.2%	\$3,667	\$18,036,215	\$18,995	\$423,956	2.4%	\$3,118,432	\$2,392,321	76.7%	\$0
UNION CITY	\$510	\$5,964,669	\$510	\$19,200,331	8.6%	\$1,643	\$203,130,643	\$17,379	-\$47,175,789	-18.8%	\$44,823,222	\$15,418,637	34.4%	\$0
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	\$407	\$2,430,326	\$678	\$9,896,032	13.0%	\$2,760	\$66,514,922	\$18,549	-\$1,457,028	-2.1%	\$13,452,876	\$8,148,542	60.6%	\$162,970
EAST ORANGE	\$508	\$6,639,001	\$660	\$24,763,548	11.9%	\$2,462	\$182,869,528	\$18,179	-\$13,029,128	-6.7%	\$44,763,085	\$18,950,050	42.3%	\$0
ELIZABETH CITY	\$274	\$25,227,859	\$1,056	\$75,873,465	17.4%	\$3,174	\$361,364,623	\$15,119	-\$130,725,431	-26.6%	\$91,673,797	\$52,313,124	57.1%	\$7,500,000
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	\$559	\$2,903,079	\$563	\$12,105,577	13.6%	\$2,349	\$77,094,918	\$14,958	-\$26,891,025	-25.9%	\$20,800,481	\$10,874,799	52.3%	\$817,496
PERTH AMBOY CITY	\$271	\$2,700,000	\$271	\$25,235,855	8.4%	\$2,534	\$273,955,879	\$27,514	\$80,809,327	41.8%	\$41,863,440	\$21,762,553	52.0%	\$0
ASBURY PARK CITY	\$735	\$2,876,996	\$1,211	\$9,676,765	14.6%	\$4,073	\$56,601,823	\$23,822	\$11,810,951	26.4%	\$14,196,885	\$6,505,623	45.8%	\$130,113
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$334	\$2,713,057	\$371	\$27,201,553	19.8%	\$3,719	\$110,327,988	\$15,084	-\$31,882,652	-22.4%	\$38,559,808	\$17,459,529	45.3%	\$0
KEANSBURG BORO	\$925	\$2,091,843	\$1,539	\$6,503,752	18.9%	\$4,786	\$27,896,546	\$20,527	-\$3,523,276	14.5%	\$8,105,967	\$4,772,838	58.9%	\$95,456
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	\$705	\$2,794,294	\$1,118	\$6,702,169	10.1%	\$2,681	\$59,544,426	\$23,818	\$15,232,394	34.4%	\$12,323,996	\$10,013,119	81.2%	\$715,592
HARRISON TOWN	\$469	\$1,060,194	\$525	\$5,768,032	14.8%	\$2,854	\$33,135,906	\$16,396	-\$7,355,059	-18.2%	\$14,894,717	\$9,229,913	62.0%	\$0
GLOUCESTER CITY	\$683	\$1,239,875	\$685	\$4,753,682	11.6%	\$2,626	\$36,120,990	\$19,956	\$3,362,729	10.3%	\$8,890,263	\$3,484,198	39.2%	\$725,802
MILVILLE CITY	\$578	\$3,813,386	\$769	\$11,482,942	12.7%	\$2,317	\$78,700,787	\$15,878	-\$6,058,107	-7.1%	\$26,559,924	\$11,097,656	41.8%	\$221,953
PLAINFIELD CITY	\$392	\$3,956,376	\$441	\$19,303,460	12.0%	\$2,149	\$141,472,964	\$15,752	-\$46,394,535	-24.7%	\$40,592,822	\$22,731,000	56.0%	\$0
GARFIELD CITY	\$422	\$3,582,281	\$730	\$11,575,617	13.2%	\$2,360	\$76,166,355	\$15,528	-\$14,915,994	-16.4%	\$29,307,459	\$25,232,470	86.1%	\$756,975
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	\$393	\$6,039,816	\$827	\$14,019,686	12.5%	\$1,920	\$97,889,543	\$13,404	-\$51,939,936	-34.7%	\$39,126,167	\$14,860,598	38.0%	\$0
VINELAND CITY	\$250	\$4,109,116	\$417	\$20,734,387	12.2%	\$2,104	\$149,776,820	\$15,201	-\$24,076,614	-13.8%	\$61,567,430	\$21,731,439	35.3%	\$434,629
BURLINGTON CITY	\$804	\$1,677,111	\$1,226	\$5,067,506	15.1%	\$3,704	\$28,384,134	\$20,749	\$4,772,349	20.2%	\$9,361,252	\$10,488,485	112.0%	\$411,393
PEMBERTON TWP	\$731	\$5,508,871	\$1,249	\$13,578,773	13.1%	\$3,078	\$90,027,550	\$20,410	\$17,934,466	24.9%	\$22,896,538	\$11,778,974	51.4%	\$1,163,972
LONG BRANCH CITY	\$616	\$3,795,089	\$774	\$9,212,234	11.1%	\$1,879	\$73,974,406	\$15,091	-\$21,708,425	-22.7%	\$48,735,599	\$36,131,331	74.1%	\$1,769,721
JERSEY CITY	\$468	\$21,082,566	\$677	\$54,516,294	9.6%	\$1,751	\$512,508,818	\$16,461	-\$88,782,027	-14.8%	\$311,145,670	\$109,961,901	35.3%	\$2,199,238
NEPTUNE TWP	\$293	\$1,989,503	\$522	\$11,657,111	14.9%	\$3,058	\$66,593,002	\$17,472	-\$821,049	-1.2%	\$43,678,116	\$35,329,068	80.9%	\$706,581
HOBOKEN CITY	\$581	\$3,328,450	\$1,348	\$6,443,807	12.1%	\$2,609	\$47,022,609	\$19,037	\$3,621,640	8.3%	\$168,536,229	\$39,426,390	23.4%	\$1,578,276
Average Low Income Urban Dist.	\$480	6,596,543.1	\$770	\$24,823,035	13.6%	\$2,763	\$159,203,515	\$17,589	-\$30,125,423	-6.9%	\$51,490,638	\$24,154,194	53.9%	715,936.3
Median Low Income Urban Dist.	\$455	3,795,089.0	\$678	\$13,578,773	12.7%	\$2,609	\$90,027,550	\$16,461	-\$21,708,425	-14.8%	\$38,559,808	\$16,818,577	52.0%	162,970.0
Standard Deviation Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	\$179	\$7,371,983	\$356	\$25,679,738	3.1%	\$774	\$160,351,017	\$3,204	\$55,325,432	20.2%	\$63,513,781	\$26,340,247	19.8%	\$1,424,126
Sum Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	\$404	\$213,782,141	\$710	\$778,803,389	13.7%	\$2,586	\$4,926,019,666	\$16,359	-\$943,177,429	-16.1%	\$1,681,629,423	\$833,473,849	49.6%	-\$62,499,811
SUM OF ALL NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI											\$16,621,147,265	\$13,810,752,454	83.1%	
MEAN OF NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.											\$28,028,916	\$23,408,055	90.2%	
MEDIAN NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.											\$16,435,701	\$12,844,716	91.6%	
STAND. DEV.											\$34,182,768	\$28,596,500	68.9%	
														\$0
LAKEWOOD TWP	\$447	\$9,289,304	\$1,543	\$55,355,705	45.8%	\$9,195	\$65,474,718	\$10,876	-\$53,860,034	-45.1%	\$85,419,632	\$84,693,837	99.2%	\$5,656,331
BRICK TWP	\$351.25	\$9,462,193	\$1,032	\$23,891,231	17.0%	\$2,606	\$116,580,951	\$12,715	-\$18,531,652	-13.7%	\$132,275,583	\$97,622,590	73.8%	\$0
HOWELL TWP	\$521.30	\$5,655,761	\$929	\$13,738,357	12.7%	\$2,258	\$94,833,771	\$15,585	\$11,380,827	13.6%	\$60,410,689	\$67,540,789	111.8%	\$1,323,808
JACKSON TWP	\$379.17	\$7,930,998	\$903	\$20,800,503	15.5%	\$2,368	\$113,368,439	\$12,907	-\$8,031,507	-6.6%	\$90,695,988	\$76,178,357	84.0%	\$1,523,567
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	\$211.16	\$6,662,519	\$421	\$23,763,182	10.9%	\$1,502	\$195,209,695	\$12,340	-\$30,214,425	-13.4%	\$192,846,973	\$132,197,482	68.6%	\$5,371,544
TOMS RIVER CDP														

	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99
	% TAX CHANGE	UNEMPLOYMENT	2014 LABOR FORCE	2010 CENSUS	MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME	MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME	PERCENT OF POPULATION 17 AND UNDER	MEDIAN AGE	AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	2010 POPULATION DENSITY	2014 MUNICIPAL TAX LEVY	2014 COUNTY TAX LEVY	TOTAL COUNTY, MUNICIPAL AND SCHOOL LEVY	INCOME
LOW INCOME URBAN DISTRICTS														
BRIDGETON CITY	0.0%	11.4%	8,357	25,349	\$31,044	\$38,750	27.9%	29.7	3.85	4,102	\$12,031,906	\$5,221,621	\$20,890,671	\$233,997,658
CAMDEN CITY	0.0%	12.7%	27,003	77,344	\$27,027	\$29,118	31.0%	28.5	3.56	8,670	\$24,665,230	\$14,212,894	\$46,327,133	\$616,653,691
PASSAIC CITY	0.0%	9.4%	30,221	69,781	\$31,135	\$34,934	31.5%	29.2	4.02	22,181	\$59,219,316	\$22,823,025	\$98,860,918	\$936,517,930
PATERSON CITY	0.0%	11.9%	62,767	146,199	\$34,086	\$39,003	27.9%	32.1	3.71	17,347	\$153,854,281	\$43,951,180	\$236,761,417	\$1,832,397,728
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	2.0%	6.2%	26,382	55,181	\$44,543	\$44,555	21.1%	23.3	3.91	10,557	\$28,822,867	\$12,549,178	\$69,234,845	\$602,882,977
LAKEWOOD TWP	6.7%	6.3%	28,809	92,843	\$41,527	\$45,420	41.8%	23.9	4.49		\$53,095,472	\$28,709,453	\$172,155,093	\$1,518,509,794
LAKEWOOD CENSUS DESIGNATED PL				53,805	\$36,516	\$38,493	48.4%	19.1	5.23	7,602				
NEWARK CITY	2.0%	10.2%	118,917	277,140	\$35,659	\$41,684	25.6%	32.3	3.36	11,458	\$201,233,897	\$67,813,075	\$384,697,137	\$3,143,709,567
TRENTON CITY	0.0%	9.1%	38,548	84,913	\$36,601	\$41,491	25.1%	32.6	3.40	11,103	\$75,447,307	\$14,707,989	\$111,270,958	\$908,555,174
SALEM CITY	0.0%	15.3%	1,849	5,146	\$25,682	\$38,286	28.2%	34.4	3.05		\$4,280,499	\$2,118,791	\$8,791,611	\$58,276,253
UNION CITY	0.0%	8.0%	35,043	66,455	\$40,173	\$43,101	23.7%	33.9	3.39	51,797	\$66,838,013	\$16,042,048	\$98,298,698	\$941,656,047
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	2.0%	13.2%	9,519	20,249	\$39,560	\$48,873	27.5%	33.0	3.53	5,556	\$20,761,093	\$4,471,096	\$33,543,701	\$248,233,261
EAST ORANGE	0.0%	9.9%	30,454	64,270	\$40,358	\$50,995	25.7%	35.0	3.33	16,379	\$87,793,839	\$14,985,117	\$121,729,006	\$900,407,693
ELIZABETH CITY	14.3%	8.4%	63,858	124,969	\$43,770	\$46,891	25.6%	33.2	3.43	10,144	\$141,721,616	\$33,998,354	\$235,533,094	\$1,796,641,800
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	7.5%	9.1%	14,274	32,868	\$40,818	\$44,645	25.0%	34.4	3.38		\$39,887,778	\$7,256,875	\$58,836,948	\$416,248,922
PERTH AMBOY CITY	0.0%	10.6%	24,981	50,814	\$47,696	\$53,792	27.3%	32.4	3.65	10,807	\$56,178,003	\$12,629,164	\$90,569,720	\$746,662,013
ASBURY PARK CITY	2.0%	9.6%	7,573	16,116	\$33,527	\$33,140	23.8%	34.0	3.33	11,317	\$15,198,698	\$3,682,123	\$25,516,557	\$222,273,725
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	0.0%	10.2%	25,710	53,926	\$42,580	\$50,798	25.4%	34.0	3.33		\$70,008,083	\$12,417,864	\$99,885,476	\$813,537,377
KEANSBURG BORO	2.0%	8.4%	5,248	10,105	\$39,206	\$52,128	23.4%	36.8	3.24	9,453	\$10,334,462	\$1,720,050	\$16,922,806	\$157,763,327
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	7.1%	7.6%	7,246	14,950	\$42,825	\$51,334	25.8%	37.1	3.12	4,682	\$10,932,866	\$5,638,412	\$27,299,989	\$247,116,006
HARRISON TOWN	0.0%	6.2%	8,050	13,620	\$51,193	\$53,006	20.8%	34.0	3.23	11,322	\$18,592,896	\$5,862,194	\$33,685,003	\$297,325,673
GLOUCESTER CITY	20.8%	9.0%	5,485	11,456	\$52,222	\$58,825	24.5%	36.7	3.31	4,938	\$10,106,000	\$4,460,888	\$18,776,888	\$189,386,123
MILVILLE CITY	2.0%	9.5%	13,341	28,400	\$44,925	\$55,000	25.8%	36.6	3.19	676	\$18,614,053	\$17,742,135	\$47,675,797	\$547,813,364
PLAINFIELD CITY	0.0%	8.5%	27,441	49,808	\$52,056	\$58,942	25.8%	33.3	3.60	8,270	\$53,216,937	\$13,611,993	\$89,559,930	\$844,026,891
GARFIELD CITY	3.0%	9.0%	16,017	30,487	\$51,407	\$56,701	23.3%	35.5	3.29	14,525	\$23,779,544	\$4,955,764	\$54,724,753	\$548,700,434
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	0.0%	6.7%	28,177	49,708	\$44,657	\$42,534	21.0%	34.8	2.23	49,363	\$33,729,028	\$11,818,705	\$60,408,331	\$927,168,552
VINELAND CITY	2.0%	9.7%	28,184	60,724	\$54,024	\$64,185	24.5%	37.7	3.23	888	\$32,175,166	\$39,829,154	\$94,170,388	\$1,268,919,718
BURLINGTON CITY	3.9%	8.7%	5,238	9,920	\$48,317	\$62,049	23.9%	38.9	3.18	3,239	\$7,735,586	\$2,399,153	\$21,034,617	\$182,205,599
PEMBERTON TWP	9.9%	8.8%	12,190	27,912	\$63,309	\$73,757	24.6%	36.5	3.22		\$14,066,917	\$5,652,362	\$32,662,225	\$465,955,777
LONG BRANCH CITY	4.9%	6.8%	16,000	30,719	\$52,792	\$56,778	21.7%	33.8	3.23	5,825	\$37,092,828	\$12,548,383	\$87,542,263	\$693,759,307
JERSEY CITY	2.0%	6.6%	138,335	247,597	\$54,280	\$58,533	21.1%	33.3	3.20	16,736	\$223,604,355	\$102,512,654	\$438,278,148	\$7,131,468,288
NEPTUNE TWP	2.0%	8.1%	15,159	27,935	\$58,630	\$74,422	20.6%	42.7	3.13		\$26,674,459	\$10,121,607	\$72,831,715	\$725,053,867
HOBOKEN CITY	4.0%	3.3%	35,786	50,005	\$101,782	\$121,614	12.2%	31.2	2.68	39,220	\$57,690,375	\$60,912,565	\$159,607,606	\$3,567,442,637
Average Low Income Urban Dist.	3.0%	9.1%	28,624.3	59,163.4	\$45,351	\$52,254	24.6%	33.9	3.33	13,790.5	\$52,783,481	\$18,989,239	\$96,642,850	\$1,039,121,206
Median Low Income Urban Dist.	2.0%	9.0%	24,981.0	49,708.0	\$43,770	\$50,995	25.0%	34.0	3.33	10,681.9	\$32,175,166	\$12,548,383	\$69,234,845	\$693,759,307
Standard Deviation Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	4.7%	2.3%	\$30,811	\$63,318	\$13,903	\$16,835	3.6%	3.5	0.34	\$13,359	\$55,806,867	\$22,638,195	\$101,301,526	\$1,384,875,944
Sum Low Inc. Urb. Dist.	-7.5%										\$1,636,287,898	\$588,666,413	\$2,995,928,349	\$32,212,757,379
SUM OF ALL NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI					\$113,162	\$114,265	23.5%			1,196			\$27,114,753,398	\$317,747,736,669
MEAN OF NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.														\$558,431,875
MEDIAN NJ DISTRICTS AND MUNI.														\$283,730,566
STAND. DEV.														\$739,813,759
LAKEWOOD TWP	6.7%	6.3%	28,809	92,843	\$41,527	\$45,420	41.8%	23.9	4.49		\$53,095,472	\$28,709,453	\$172,155,093	\$1,518,509,794
BRICK TWP	0.0%	6.9%	39,538	75,072	\$65,129	\$81,868	20.7%	43.6	3.05		\$68,937,798	42,778,067.98	\$209,338,456	\$2,167,586,561
HOWELL TWP	2.0%	6.2%	27,783	51,075	\$89,287	\$102,015	26.3%	39.6	3.37		26,113,351	19,289,911.38	\$114,267,859	\$1,184,869,360
JACKSON TWP	2.0%	6.7%	29,158	54,856	\$86,327	\$96,171	24.7%	41.6	3.21		\$31,114,857	\$26,271,390	\$135,088,171	\$1,740,028,351
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	4.1%	6.7%	48,055	91,239	\$71,934	\$83,924	22.3%	43.0	3.10		\$72,736,498	53,563,404.29	\$263,868,928	\$3,262,389,179
TOMS RIVER CDP				88,791	72,434	83,745	21.7%	42.5	3.12	2,280				

Appendix 2

Appendix 2--2014 performance report Urban and Neighboring Districts Data compiled from individual school reports found on DOE website.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P		
1	COUNTY_CODE	HIGH SCHOOL	Average Composite SAT Score	Average Mathematics Score on SAT	Average Critical Reading Score on SAT	Average Writing Score on SAT	Percent of Students Scoring Above 1550 on SAT	DROP OUT RATE	POST-SECONDARY ENROLLMENT 16 MONTHS AFTER GRADUATION	ENROLLED IN YR INSTT.	ENROLLED 4YR INSTT.	PERCENT STUDENTS TAKING DANCE CLASS	PERCENT STUDENTS TAKING DRAMA CLASS	PERCENT STUDENTS TAKING MUSIC CLASS	PERCENT STUDENTS TAKING VISUAL ARTS	PERCENT TAKING ANY ARTS CLASS	
2	BRIDGETON	BRIDGETON HIGH SCHOOL	1190	413	392	385	5.4	3.0%	44.7%	83.1%	16.9%	13.0	6.8	18.2	30.9	54.9	
3	CAMDEN	DR. CHARLES E. BRIMM MEDICAL ARTS HIGH SCHOOL	1144	389	381	374	0	0.5%	84.0%	45.2%	54.8%	N/R	N/R	17.7	43.1	58.4	
4	CAMDEN	CAMDEN HIGH SCHOOL	1014	352	325	337	0	7.1%	37.7%	84.6%	9.6%	N/R	19.8	23.3	55	81.9	
5	CAMDEN	WOODROW WILSON HIGH SCHOOL	1018	353	336	329	0	7.5%	47.9%	72.9%	21.4%	8.7	7.9	51.7	69.2	99.1	
6	CAMDEN	CREATIVE ARTS VILLAGE ACADEMY	1069	358	361	350	0	0.6%				17.6	18.1	38.5	16.5	90.1	
7	CAMDEN	MET EAST HIGH SCHOOL	1104	365	385	354	0	0.0%				N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	
8	PASSAIC	PASSAIC HIGH SCHOOL # 12	1222	427	401	394	8.7	1.0%	59.8%	66.7%	33.3%	N/R	2.7	6.4	16.3	24	
9	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY						2.3%	51.6%	62.1%	37.9%	N/R	2.1	10.8	1.3	36.1	
10	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF CULINARY ARTS HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM	990	332	319	339	0	3.0%	49.5%	75.0%	25.0%	N/R	29.2	11.3	N/R	40.3	
11	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT & PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	1031	358	343	330	4.8	1.4%	59.2%	66.2%	33.8%	N/R	21.9	2.7	1.7	25.9	
12	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCE						0.0%	84.6%	40.0%	60.0%	N/R	N/R	N/R	36.2	36.2	
13	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE						0.9%	72.9%	32.6%	67.0%	N/R	N/R	41.6	43.5	65.9	
14	PATERSON	ROSA L. PARRIS SCHOOL OF FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS	1149	388	375	386	0	0.0%	79.7%	51.0%	49.0%	5.4	33	38.3	26.8	88.5	
15	PATERSON	ACADEMY HIGH SCHOOL	1080	330	410	340	0	1.0%	34.4%	63.6%	36.4%	N/R	N/R	N/R	51.9	81.8	
16	PATERSON	INTERNATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL	1192	423	387	382	4	0.4%	72.3%	49.4%	50.6%	N/R	N/R	N/R	25.3	25.3	
17	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY ENGG & MATHEMATICS	1140	410	369	361	2.2	3.2%	64.1%	53.0%	47.0%	N/R	1.4	22.2	12.8	34.6	
18	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING	1070	363	363	344	1.3	3.3%	57.5%	72.1%	27.9%	N/R	5.5	6	17	25.7	
19	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY	980	348	318	314	0	4.4%	47.6%	84.6%	15.4%	N/R	0.4	2.5	25.2	28	
20	PATERSON	SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES	985	345	323	317	0	2.9%	41.2%	74.3%	25.7%	N/R	2.2	3.3	29.8	34.8	
21	NEW	NEW BRUNSWICK HIGH SCHOOL	1295	453	416	426	19.6	2.4%	63.7%	64.9%	35.1%	4.1	15.3	17.8	54	69.2	
22	NEWARK	ARTS HIGH SCHOOL	1243	417	410	416	8.1	0.3%	81.3%	35.4%	64.6%	11.9	18.3	44.1	30.9	96.4	
23	NEWARK	BARRINGER HIGH SCHOOL	1010	350	329	331	0.8	10.2%	46.3%	75.0%	25.0%	9.4	0.1	8.6	27	42.6	
24	NEWARK	CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	1078	372	351	355	0	1.5%	59.5%	46.7%	53.3%	N/R	N/R	25.6	43.3	57.5	
25	NEWARK	EAST SIDE HIGH SCHOOL	1229	431	396	402	2.6	1.7%	48.9%	69.6%	30.4%	N/R	9.9	8.1	41.9	55.1	
26	NEWARK	NEWARK VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL	1049	358	336	355	0	1.6%	55.7%	67.6%	32.4%	N/R	N/R	20.1	36.8	52.4	
27	NEWARK	MALCOLM X SHABAZZ HIGH SCHOOL	977	336	325	316	0	2.7%	41.6%	50.7%	49.3%	N/R	15	39	47.7	85	
28	NEWARK	SCIENCE PARK HIGH SCHOOL	1612	564	519	529	66	0.1%	88.8%	21.7%	78.4%	N/R	N/R	21.4	33.6	54.2	
29	NEWARK	TECHNOLOGY HIGH SCHOOL	1320	465	427	428	6	0.3%	76.1%	32.6%	67.3%	N/R	4.1	22.1	24.9	50.2	
30	NEWARK	UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL	1340	466	439	435	10.6	0.7%	85.0%	17.6%	82.4%	N/R	N/R	39	35	61.6	
31	NEWARK	WEEQUAHIC HIGH SCHOOL	1014	340	330	339	0	6.1%	37.2%	69.0%	31.0%	N/R	2.8	30.2	38.6	61.4	
32	NEWARK	AMERICAN HISTORY HIGH SCHOOL	1220	403	409	408	5.8	0.0%	72.1%	20.5%	79.5%	N/R	N/R	24.3	44.7	64.4	
33	NEWARK	NEWARK LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	1154	380	368	406	0	19.4%				N/R	N/R	N/R	86.4	86.4	
34	NEWARK	BARDEARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	1281	426	429	426	7.1	0.0%				36.1	N/R	N/R	81.3	86.3	
35	TRENTON	DAYLIGHT/TWILIGHT HIGH SCHOOL	1100	352	384	364	0	32.6%	23.1%	83.3%	16.7%	N/R	N/R	31.4	20.3	50.5	
36	TRENTON	TRENTON CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL - MAIN CAMPUS	1128	378	375	375	5.6	3.0%	52.3%	66.9%	33.1%	16.2	N/R	9.4	25.5	46.9	
37	TRENTON	TRENTON CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL - WEST CAMPUS	1227	411	408	408	11.1	3.6%	64.2%	52.3%	47.7%	N/R	N/R	12.9	33.4	41.8	
38	SALEM CITY	SALEM HIGH SCHOOL	1267	436	412	419	11.8	3.1%	41.3%	66.7%	33.3%	13.1	N/R	22	39	65.3	
39	UNION CITY	UNION CITY HIGH SCHOOL	1245	436	403	406	10.9	0.8%	77.2%	48.5%	51.3%	4.3	6	12.6	27.3	42.9	
40	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	PLEASANTVILLE HIGH SCHOOL	1076	380	340	356	2.6	1.8%	50.2%	73.3%	26.7%	N/R	10	10	27	43.2	
41	EAST ORANGE	EAST ORANGE STEM ACADEMY HIGH SCHOOL	1259	436	416	407	11.8	0.4%				N/R	N/R	69.8	38.7	100	
42	EAST ORANGE	EAST ORANGE CAMPUS HIGH SCHOOL	1066	362	361	343	0.7	9.7%	55.6%	60.1%	39.9%	N/R	N/R	14.2	19	32	
43	EAST ORANGE	CICELY L. TYSON COMMUNITY MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	1273	438	420	415	10.8	1.4%	75.0%	23.2%	76.8%	9.7	28.4	38.1	28.9	99.9	
44	ELIZABETH	ELIZABETH HIGH SCHOOL	1505	529	477	499	41.3	0.4%	92.0%	15.4%	84.6%	18.1	8.5	39.7	42.4	83.2	
45	ELIZABETH	JOHN E. DWYER TECHNOLOGY ACADEMY	973	349	318	306	1.2	9.7%	54.2%	72.8%	27.2%	N/R	N/R	14.8	38.7	46.7	
46	ELIZABETH	ADMIRAL WILLIAM F. HALSEY JR. LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	996	354	319	323	1.2	1.4%	58.6%	66.9%	33.1%	6.2	N/R	N/R	37.2	42.2	
47	ELIZABETH	THOMAS JEFFERSON ARTS ACADEMY	1062	361	347	354	1.7	0.4%	68.5%	57.4%	42.4%	15.3	14	32.5	31.3	80.4	
48	ELIZABETH	THOMAS A. EDISON CAREER AND TECHNICAL ACADEMY	1044	375	330	339	0.6	9.7%	67.7%	74.6%	25.6%	N/R	N/R	10.3	0.3	36	36.2
49	ELIZABETH	ALEXANDER HAMILTON PREPARATORY ACADEMY	1241	439	392	410	9	1.4%	81.8%	50.3%	49.7%	17.7	10.3	17.8	21.9	51.9	
50	ORANGE TWP	ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL	1145	400	374	371	3.2	1.0%	62.0%	51.7%	48.3%	13.1	10.3	18.1	13.6	76.5	
51	PERTH AMBOY	PERTH AMBOY HIGH SCHOOL	1245	445	398	402	10.4	1.0%	73.2%	61.4%	38.6%	5.5	5.8	15.3	32	47.2	
52	ASBURY PARK	ASBURY PARK HIGH SCHOOL	1021	363	342	316	4.3	8.5%	45.2%	90.9%	9.1%	N/R	6.4	12.5	30.6	41.6	
53	IRVINGTON	IRVINGTON HIGH SCHOOL	1130	379	374	377	5.7	4.9%	54.4%	64.7%	35.3%	20.5	N/R	23.5	36.9	66.8	
54	KEANSBURG	KEANSBURG HIGH SCHOOL	1337	466	443	428	20.4	2.8%	67.4%	65.5%	34.5%	N/R	N/R	21	43.6	60	
55	PHILLIPSBURG	PHILLIPSBURG HIGH SCHOOL	1551	534	514	503	52	0.7%	67.2%	49.1%	50.9%	N/R	N/R	2.3	11.7	39.3	49.2
56	HARRISON	HARRISON HIGH SCHOOL	1291	441	420	430	11	0.0%	67.8%	41.4%	56.9%	N/R	N/R	16.9	25.8	41.3	
57	GLOUCESTER	GLOUCESTER CITY JR. SR. HIGH SCHOOL	1386	471	459	456	27.1	1.5%	57.2%	66.3%	33.7%	N/R	4.6	8.2	49.2	55.7	
58	MILLVILLE	MILLVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	1397	471	468	458	29.1	1.8%	54.9%	76.0%	24.0%	N/R	N/R	17.5	26.4	42	
59	PLAINFIELD CITY	PLAINFIELD HIGH SCHOOL	1129	381	380	368	2.6	3.2%	52.9%	69.2%	30.8%	5.0	2.9	7.9	8.5	23.1	
60	PLAINFIELD CITY	BARACK OBAMA ACADEMY FOR ACADEMIC & CIVIC DEVELOPMENT	1022	330	352	340	0	27.1%				N/R	N/R	N/R	46.2	46.2	
61	PLAINFIELD CITY	PLAINFIELD ACADEMY FOR THE ARTS & ADVANCED STUDIES	1339	426	459	454	20.0%					11.8	10.5	35.7	27.7	84.5	
62	GARFIELD	GARFIELD HIGH SCHOOL	1296	456	423	417	10.3		70.7%	44.2%	55.8%	N/R	N/R	17.9	35.7	47.1	
63	WEST NEW YORK	MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL	1263	447	414	402	9.2	0.2%	71.5%	58.3%	41.3%	1.9	5.5	10.5	34.7	48.8	
64	VINELAND	VINELAND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	1460	502	485	473	34.3	0.1%	59.1%	74.7%	25.3%	N/R	7.2	16.2	32.8	49.8	
65	BURLINGTON CITY	BURLINGTON CITY HIGH SCHOOL	1319	456	441	422	16.4	1.9%	58.7%	59.0%	41.0%	N/R	N/R	12.6	30.9	41.5	
66	LONG BRANCH	LONG BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL	1222	423	399	400	15.3	0.8%	69.4%	63.3%	36.7%	10.3	11.4	15.5	24.6	52.7	
67	JERSEY CITY	INFINITY INSTITUTE	1549	534	506	509	60	0.0%				N/R	1.1	19.5	12.1	32.6	
68	JERSEY CITY	HENRY SNYDER HIGH SCHOOL	1045	354	345	346	0	7.0%	65.5%	47.3%	49.5%	4.3	2.2	3.8	4.8	15.1	
69	JERSEY CITY	JAMES J FERRIS HIGH SCHOOL	1048	368	334	346	3.2	5.1%	78.9%	57.2%	41.6%	N/R	N/R	5	20.8	23.8	
70	JERSEY CITY	LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL	1019	355	333	331	2.6	1.6%	69.4%	56.0%	41.3%	N/R	N/R	5.2	0.6	5.8	
71	JERSEY CITY	DR RONALD MCNAIR HIGH SCHOOL	1774	624	577	573	87.3	0.0%	89.0%	3.2%	96.8%	N/R	N/R	13.4	4.2	17.5	
72	JERSEY CITY	WILLIAM L DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL	1201	423	383	395	8.4	3.6%	73.3%	43.2%	55.2%	N/R	N/R	7.3	11.4	17.8	
73	JERSEY CITY	LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL	1195	406	397	392	3.8	0.0%	88.4%	39.5%	57.9%	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	
74	NEPTUNE TWP	NEPTUNE HIGH SCHOOL	1310	434	436	440	15.4	0.9%	70.1%	64.6%	35.4%	N/R	7.4	11.5	54.9	65.6	
75	HOBOKEN	HOBOKEN JUNIOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	1204	415	398	391	10.8	0.8%	67.4%	35.6%	62.1%	3.6	3.8	9.5	36.2	50.1	
76	ABBOTT AVERAGE	ABBOTT AVERAGE	1191	409	392	390	10.4	3.3%	62.7%	56.7%	42.9%	11.3	7.5	19.3	32.7	52.6	
77	ABBOTT MEDIAN	ABBOTT MEDIAN	1190	406	387	386	4.8	1.5%	63.9%	60.8%	39.3%	10.3	6.0	16.9	32.0	50.0	
78	STATE AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE	1514	502	481	480	38.5	1.1%				2.1%	3.9%	17.5%	31.1%	49.3%	
79	STATE MEDIAN	STATE MEDIAN	1477	509	486	481	38.6	0.4%									
80	LAKEWOOD	LAKEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	1101	388	355	358	1.4	3.2%	45.6%	65.2%	34.8%	N/R	N/R	1.6	1.2	2.7	
81	BRICK	BRICK TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL	1460	501	483	476	35.0	0.8%	73.1%	56.2%	43.8%	N/R	1.5	8	27	34.6	
82	BRICK	BRICK TOWNSHIP MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL	1466	502	480	484	34.5	1.1%	73.0%	55.0%	45.0%	N/R	2.1	7.5	40	48.2	
83	HOWELL HIGH SCHOOL	HOWELL HIGH SCHOOL	1523	526	502	495	43	0.3%	82.5%	48.2%	51.8%	3.2	5	10.9	29.5	46.2	
84	JACKSON	JACKSON MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL	1517	527	496	494	44.2	0.2%	75.2%	43.4%	56.6%	N/R	1.4	16.8	33.3		

Appendix 3

	BIRTHS			
Year	Lakewood	Paterson	Jersey City	Newark
1990	1,275	3,396	4,652	6,398
1991	1,260	3,385	4,584	6,383
1992	1,298	3,247	4,431	5,885
1993	1,286	3,295	4,177	5,622
1994	1,411	3,226	4,237	5,549
1995	1,391	3,012	4,017	5,301
1996	1,477	3,003	4,002	5,086
1997	1,539	2,977	3,871	5,102
1998	1,702	3,008	3,885	4,748
1999	1,784	2,925	3,841	4,806
2000	1,944	3,010	3,926	4,847
2001	2,201	2,954	3,854	4,890
2002	2,365	2,843	3,743	4,606
2003	2,646	2,952	3,712	4,780
2004	2,806	2,778	3,733	4,655
2005	3,049	2,732	3,733	4,580
2006	3,129	2,827	3,852	4,895
2007	3,461	2,841	4,092	4,832
2008	3,448	2,797	4,094	4,811
2009	3,746	2,744	4,094	4,648
2010	3,849	2,614	4,294	4,202
2011	3,966	2,663	4,440	4,353

LAKEWOOD TRANSPORTATION AND TUITION COSTS

	TRANSPORTATION	TUITION	OPERATING BUDGET	RATIO OF TRANS. AND TUITION TO OP. BUDGET
2003	\$7,387,726	\$5,388,323		
2004	\$8,615,512	\$5,471,075		
2005	\$9,855,586	\$7,806,215		
2006	\$11,631,701	\$8,995,160	\$80,557,895	25.6%
2007	\$13,061,860	\$10,663,218	\$87,912,032	27.0%
2008	\$14,849,926	\$15,271,616	\$94,917,251	31.7%
2009	\$15,356,692	\$15,497,723	\$96,232,713	32.1%
2010	\$16,560,794	\$14,978,022	\$95,192,866	33.1%
2011	\$16,035,448	\$15,798,337	\$97,487,122	32.7%
2012	\$18,284,218	\$18,814,571	\$104,362,574	35.5%
2013	\$21,130,243	\$19,053,992	\$107,701,339	37.3%
2014	\$18,325,244	\$25,275,951	\$114,661,752	38.0%
2015	\$17,972,788	\$28,093,613	\$120,830,423	38.1%

Appendix 4

2014 NJ HSPA State Summary
07/16/2014

District Name	County	2004 % PASS HSPA LA	2005 % PASS HSPA LA	2006 % PASS HSPA LA	2007 % PASS HSPA LA	2008 % PASS HSPA LA	2009 % PASS HSPA LA	2010 % PASS HSPA LA	2011 % PASS HSPA LA	2012 % PASS HSPA LA	2013 % PASS HSPA LA	2014 % PASS HSPA LA	2004 % PASS HSPA MATH	2005 % PASS HSPA MATH
ASBURY PARK	MONMOUTH	43.8	33.3	40	45.6	25.2	26.5	47.6	46.6	41.1	41.1	63.4	25.8	23.1
BRIDGETON	CUMBERLAND	64.4	58.9	62.5	66.2	54.3	58.5	65.9	71.8	75.9	75.9	85.2	33.3	37.1
CAMDEN CITY	CAMDEN	44	44.7	36.6	48	42.1	34.3	41.4	50.6	41.2	41.2	57.1	23.8	30.1
EAST ORANGE	ESSEX	58.4	54.5	51.1	62.3	49.1	51.4	59.1	67	71.1	71.1	78.3	30.6	36.8
ELIZABETH	UNION	57.4	58	57.6	61.2	56.1	63.2	68.4	73.8	77.2	77.2	86.8	37.9	46.9
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	ESSEX	51.5	55	57.9	61.6	60.2	52.4	52.1	68.7	59.9	59.9	69	16.7	24.7
KEANSBURG BOROUGH	MONMOUTH	68.2	69.5	70.3	85.1	79.1	70.1	76.9	77.3	79.8	79.8	85.5	55.8	58.4
MILLVILLE	CUMBERLAND	70.2	67.8	63.3	77.1	67.5	68.3	77.8	79.5	81.2	81.2	83.6	54.6	60.3
NEW BRUNSWICK	MIDDLESEX	61.6	60.8	54	64.3	68.3	65.9	65.3	68.7	75.6	75.6	82.4	46.7	63.9
NEWARK	ESSEX	48.7	52.4	53.5	58.3	51.1	54.7	57.4	67.7	77.8	77.8	79.6	28.3	37.4
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF	ESSEX	53.3	52.2	43.3	53.1	53.2	46	58.9	64	69.2	69.2	73.4	21.6	33.2
PASSAIC CITY	PASSAIC	60.3	56	61.9	57.7	58.6	60	59.8	64.1	68.5	68.5	78.1	43	46.7
PATERSON	PASSAIC	54.7	53.8	52.6	56.3	49.3	49.7	51.7	59.5	71.8	71.8	74.6	40.4	47.2
PERTH AMBOY	MIDDLESEX	65	61.5	65.2	65	59.9	62.8	67.4	74.4	65.5	65.5	72.7	44.6	52.1
PLEASANTVILLE	ATLANTIC	51	61.5	46.8	53.2	52.6	45.5	49.5	67.5	65.9	65.9	72.5	29.8	31.3
SALEM CITY	SALEM		70.8	71.2	76.2	72.8	61.4	72.5	70.2	70.1	70.1	75.8		52.0
TRENTON	MERCER	49.4	51.5	40.8	51.2	43	42.2	52	61.8	67.9	67.9	71.7	21.6	30.5
UNION CITY	HUDSON	69.4	64.1	68.1	69.1	69.7	70.7	73.8	76	80.5	80.5	87.6	50.1	56.3
VINELAND CITY	CUMBERLAND	71.5	69.2	67.3	67.5	60.8	63.3	68.6	76.7	83.1	83.1	84.7	52.7	57.7
WEST NEW YORK	HUDSON	69.8	67.6	77.2	80.2	71.6	70.4	79.1	83.4	85.5	85.5	91.2	53.8	64.8
BURLINGTON CITY	BURLINGTON	77.7	76.8	72	69.1	71	62.2	73.2	79.7	81.8	81.8	80.8	51.8	66.1
GARFIELD	BERGEN	69	67.5	70.6	71.1	69.6	63.2	81	82.2	84.4	84.4	90.3	55.5	63.4
GLOUCESTER CITY	CAMDEN	80.4	78.1	80.6	77.9	86.2	76.4	85	77.2	91.9	91.9	87.8	55.7	62.9
HARRISON	HUDSON	77.1	65.9	77.4	83.6	62.6	76.6	78.6	84.4	84.5	84.5	88.7	65.9	60.8
JERSEY CITY	HUDSON	64	63.1	63.6	65.4	63.9	63.8	69.3	80.8	80.5	80.5	86.8	42.7	49.6
LONG BRANCH	MONMOUTH	65.5	63.8	64.1	72.7	68	68.3	71.9	80.4	83.3	83.3	88	55.4	59.4
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	BURLINGTON	69.1	79.7	74	76.7	80.1	76.3	75.9	83.1	85.6	85.6	85.1	46.3	61.8
PHILLIPSBURG	WARREN	79	85.1	85.6	83.5	87	84.1	91.1	89.7	92.8	92.8	92.2	60.3	75.4
PLAINFIELD	UNION	69.1	60	54	62.1	58.1	59.8	53.7	63.9	77.6	77.6	80.2	32.3	34.6
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP	MONMOUTH	76.8	72.3	54	74.4	71.3	64.2	77.3	86.1	85.6	85.6	85.9	55.9	65.9
HOBOKEN	HUDSON	64.5	76.7	74.9	88.5	78.8	66.2	75.4	72	84.3	84.3	91.6	60.6	73.3
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN		63.5	63.0	61.7	67.2	62.6	60.6	67.0	72.5	75.5	75.5	81.0	43.1	50.4
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN		64.8	63.1	63.3	66.2	62.6	63.2	68.6	73.8	77.8	77.8	83.6	45.5	52.1
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN		60.6	60.3	59.5	63.9	59.4	59.5	64.9	71.9	76	76	81.1	40.2	47.7
STATE		82.2	83.2	83.5	85.4	82.8	83.6	87.1	89.6	91.6	91.6	93.2	70.1	75.5
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP	OCEAN	69.2	65.3	66.4	67.3	60.9	57.6	57.8	65.8	70.7	70.7	80.1	54.8	58.6
BRICK TOWNSHIP	OCEAN	86.4	89.6	87.2	88.8	85.8	86.7	90.6	90.9	91.9	91.9	93.5	71	79.3
HOWELL	MONMOUTH	90.9	87.2	90.2	95.4	94.7	95.7	98.7	98.7	98.8	98.8	98.8	79.4	83.5
JACKSON TWSP.	OCEAN	86	90.8	89.2	87	84.5	85.8	93.5	93.7	93.8	93.8	95.8	73.2	81.3
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	OCEAN	85.5	89.1	87.5	87	83.4	87.2	88.5	92.4	93.8	93.8	94.6	71.4	77.7

2014 NJ HSPA State Summary
07/16/2014

District Name	2006 % PASS HSPA MATH	2007 % PASS HSPA MATH	2008 % PASS HSPA MATH	2009 % PASS HSPA MATH	2010 % PASS HSPA MATH	2011 % PASS HSPA MATH	2012 % PASS HSPA MATH	2013 % PASS HSPA MATH	2014 % PASS HSPA MATH		2004 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2004 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2005 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2005 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2006 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA
ASBURY PARK	25	30.3	14.4	13.2	19	16.7	29.5	29.5	33.3			0.0			19.4
BRIDGETON	43.2	32.8	40.5	40.1	42.4	45.2	51.7	51.7	53.5						11.9
CAMDEN CITY	22.5	22.1	25.6	13.2	16.1	18	19.7	19.7	25.1			33.3			5.9
EAST ORANGE	31.3	37.3	22.9	36.3	38.4	50.9	46.8	46.8	42.7		0.0	0.0			11.1
ELIZABETH	44.7	37	43.8	42.9	49.3	50.3	63.2	63.2	62.2						16.7
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	25.6	20.3	29.8	20.5	17.3	23.5	32.2	32.2	31.6		0.0	0.0			3.6
KEANSBURG BOROUGH	67.2	71.1	65.9	58.8	58.7	50.5	62.6	62.6	62.5			41.7			21.2
MILLVILLE	50.8	60.4	60.7	51	62.4	62.1	64	64	64.2		0.0	0.0			19
NEW BRUNSWICK	51.9	50.2	51.9	55.9	54.6	47.4	52.2	52.2	53.6						15.6
NEWARK	40.3	39.7	40.3	42.6	46.4	50.6	60.8	60.8	53		15.2	2.3	11.4	6.7	10.3
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF	22.5	24.6	27.1	23.5	26.2	30.9	46.6	46.6	39.4		4.8				3.2
PASSAIC CITY	44.4	34.8	41.8	38.2	41.9	39.7	53.2	53.2	46.1						21.9
PATERSON	45.5	39.7	34.2	31.9	33	30.9	49.7	49.7	43.2		6.1	9.1			7.3
PERTH AMBOY	49.9	47.1	48.3	43.2	54.4	55.6	61.4	61.4	57.7						22.6
PLEASANTVILLE	36.7	28.4	29.1	29.3	27.9	29.6	32	32	38.3				33.3	9.1	7.7
SALEM CITY	53.8	48.8	58.6	37.3	49.2	45.3	42.7	42.7	47.6						
TRENTON	28	19.5	21	17.7	24.9	26.5	36.4	36.4	39.2						8
UNION CITY	61.1	58.3	59.1	59.2	58.8	59.8	67.3	67.3	68.2		50.0	25.8	45.5	11.2	23.3
VINELAND CITY	62.2	55.2	58.4	53.4	51.6	54.8	67	67	63.5						23
WEST NEW YORK	69.9	70.8	59.5	64.8	62	65.7	74.6	74.6	69.4						37.5
BURLINGTON CITY	64	50.7	52.8	53.7	42.6	52.8	58.8	58.8	66.4		0.0	0.0			17.2
GARFIELD	71.3	60.3	62.1	56.7	61.3	56.9	69.2	69.2	63.9				20.7	10.7	13.3
GLOUCESTER CITY	77.3	67.8	78.4	61.5	67.8	64.7	76.3	76.3	65.6						37.9
HARRISON	68.3	71.4	50.4	66.2	62.9	68.1	71.1	71.1	71.3						50
JERSEY CITY	49.5	48.4	48.6	47.3	50.9	60.3	63.2	63.2	65.9		11.9	6.3	20.8	12.8	14
LONG BRANCH	59.8	44.4	50	47.6	46.6	50	60.9	60.9	60.1						27.6
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	60.2	58	62.4	52.9	54.9	57.7	63.8	63.8	61.5		33.3	14.3	60	34.8	20
PHILLIPSBURG	78.2	70.2	79.5	74.2	75.7	77.4	74.3	74.3	73.7		39.4	25.0	42.1	24.3	24.5
PLAINFIELD	36.6	45	39.8	29.8	32.3	27.5	48.6	48.6	48.2		15.4	7.9	23.3	10.3	17.6
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP	36.6	60	61.6	48.5	54.9	57.9	62.6	62.6	54.3						17.6
HOBOKEN	63.7	75.3	64.1	52.5	36.2	33.1	60.7	60.7	60.2						25.5
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	49.7	47.7	47.8	44.0	45.8	47.1	55.6	55.6	54.4		14.7	10.2	32.3	15.0	18.5
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	49.9	48.4	50.0	47.3	49.2	50.5	60.8	60.8	57.7		9.0	6.3	33.3	11.0	17.6
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN	47.6	44.5	45.5	43.1	46.2	48.7	57.1	57.1	54.6		26.1	15.6	30	17	15.8
STATE	75.9	73.4	74.8	72.7	74.1	75.2	79.7	79.7	78.9		62.1	46.3	64.8	49.9	44.9
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP	56.5	49.6	48.4	42.9	32.7	36.7	43.8	43.8	42.6				40.9	21.7	27.7
BRICK TOWNSHIP	78.7	75.5	79.3	68.4	70.9	78.6	77	77	79.5		49.3	23.8	65.5	47.4	54.7
HOWELL	86.7	88	86.9	86.2	91.4	88	90.6	90.6	91.8		0.0	0.0			54.7
JACKSON TWSP.	81.6	75.8	76.7	75.8	80.8	78.2	84.6	84.6	82.7		41.1	22.8	61.3	39.3	52.9
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	77.1	70.9	71.8	75.2	73	74.3	81.8	81.8	80.9		57.1	30.3	75	41.4	44.9

2014 NJ HSPA State Summary
07/16/2014

District Name	2006 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2007 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2007 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2008 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2008 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2009 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2009 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2010 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2010 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2011 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2011 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2012 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2012 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2013 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2013 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH
ASBURY PARK	14.3	7.1	3.6		14.4								12.5		12.5
BRIDGETON	4.7	19.6	3.5		40.5	10.5		13.2		22.9		15.8		15.8	
CAMDEN CITY	0.9	8	2		25.6										
EAST ORANGE	7.6	6.4	4.4		22.9			16.1		23.1		33.7		33.7	
ELIZABETH	7	11.2	2.6		43.8	16.7		20.2		26		36.9	16.8	36.9	16.8
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	3.8	4.4			29.8			10.2		24.3		15		15	
KEANSBURG BOROUGH	21.9	27.3	13.6		65.9	11.1						46.9	18.7	46.9	18.7
MILLVILLE	9.8	31.3	13.4		60.7	28.1	14.5	39.5	17.8			47.5		47.5	
NEW BRUNSWICK	11.9	17.7	6.6	34.1	86.0	35.3	21.6	37.2	26.8	28.9		46.5	19.7	46.5	19.7
NEWARK	4.9	12.1	4.6		40.3	14.5		16.5		25.7	11.1	37.6	13.2	37.6	13.2
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF		3.1	3.2		27.1							26.8		26.8	
PASSAIC CITY	5.3	12.6	4	18	59.8	16		20		27.9		28.4		28.4	
PATERSON	4.5	9.3	1.5		34.2			15.6		23.8		32.6	12.1	32.6	12.1
PERTH AMBOY	11.5	15.4	13.5	11.8	60.1	14.6		24.5	15.4	38.3		31.7	22	31.7	22
PLEASANTVILLE	15	20.8	12.5		29.1					32.4					
SALEM CITY	4.8	27.3	18.2		58.6					14.3		11.8		11.8	
TRENTON	2.6	10.9	0.7		21.0	10.3		12.5				35.6		35.6	
UNION CITY	19.8	30.7	10.7	26.2	85.3	37.1	22.6	47.7	30.6	55.3	27.1	64.5	40.7	64.5	40.7
VINELAND CITY	16.6	22.5	12.4	13.3	71.7		10.5	22.3		23.1	11.4	40.9	17.9	40.9	17.9
WEST NEW YORK	17.5	44.4	20	36.4	95.9	42.2	21.9	54.9	25.5	61.4	36.2	69.2	23	69.2	23
BURLINGTON CITY	13.8	19.4	8.6		52.8		23.3	26.3							
GARFIELD	16.3	18.6	2.3		62.1	11.1		31.3	15.6	41.5	12.5	59.6	21.1	59.6	21.1
GLOUCESTER CITY	35.7	32.1	35.7	51.7	130.1	36.7	36.6								
HARRISON	14.3	47.4	10.5		50.4			36.4		15.4		50	15	50	15
JERSEY CITY	2.9	16.3	5.1	19.2	67.8	15.5		19.6		36.2	11.1	25.6	11.7	25.6	11.7
LONG BRANCH	12.5	17	4.3	31.7	81.7	26.4	12.7			51.3		54.5		54.5	
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	8.1	25.4	15.6		62.4					30	10.2	45.8	17	45.8	17
PHILLIPSBURG	16.3	36.1	23.6		79.5		24					68.3	20.6	68.3	20.6
PLAINFIELD	16.4	18.9	20		39.8	16.4		16.2		32.8		41.3	16.1	41.3	16.1
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP	16.4	29.6	11.3		61.6			35	12.9	48		49.2	12.7	49.2	12.7
HOBOKEN	11.8				64.1					43.3	10.3	41.7	16.7	41.7	16.7
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	11.6	20.1	9.9	26.9	55.6	21.4	20.9	25.8	20.7	33.0	16.2	40.7	18.2	40.7	18.2
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	11.9	18.8	8.6	26.2	59.8	16.2	21.9	21.3	17.8	29.5	11.3	41.1	16.9	41.1	16.9
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN	8.7	17.3	7.4	15.6	61.1	17.6		23.2		30.4	10.9	38.7	14.9	38.7	14.9
STATE	31.6	48.3	29.7	43.2	118.0	46.5	29.4	56.3	32.7	61.7	34.5	67.8	38.2	67.8	38.2
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP	14.9	30.6	9.4	11.6	60.0			16.7		34.1	11.4	47.5	21.6	47.5	21.6
BRICK TOWNSHIP	40.2	57	36.5		79.3					41.8		72.2	37.6	72.2	37.6
HOWELL	38.9	75	51.4		86.9	79.8	58	93.2	65.5	93.6	54.4	94.1	64.7	94.1	64.7
JACKSON TWSP.	38.3	56.1	28.4		76.7	45.2	26.9			65.4	24.1	72.7	39.6	72.7	39.6
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	29.7	39.9	19.2		71.8	52.8	27.8	59.9	31.2	62.4	32.6	67.8		67.8	

2014 NJ HSPA State Summary
07/16/2014

District Name	2014 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2014 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2004 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2004 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2005 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2005 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2006 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2006 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2007 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2007 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2008 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2008 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2009 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2009 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH
ASBURY PARK	25				9.1		6.7	7.1						
BRIDGETON	23.5			9.1						6.3			16.7	
CAMDEN CITY				2.9	5.7	2.2								
EAST ORANGE	45.5		10.5	15.8	21.9	12.5	29.6	25.9	23.8	14.3				
ELIZABETH	46.7	16.9	24.2	30.1	19.8	29.8	25.1	30.2	26.7	25.9			21.9	
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	30.2		3.8		18.9	17.1	22.7		31.5	13.2				
KEANSBURG BOROUGH	72	56												
MILLVILLE														
NEW BRUNSWICK	46.2	18.2	22.6	26.9	21.3	53.2	20.9	35.3	30.4	32.9	38.7			
NEWARK	42	13.8	14.7	15.2	10.4	21.1	29.9	43	27.8	36.3			22.1	
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF	54.5		20.0	13.3	18.2			4.5	27.8	11.1				
PASSAIC CITY	42.7	10.7	24.8	19.4	22	28	22.6	16.7	32.2	22.6	29.8	23.1	32.1	
PATERSON	39.9		11.0	20.3	8.1	26.7	13	27.5	11.6	16.1		13.9		
PERTH AMBOY	38.9	13	22.9	13.2	11.1	19.3	16.3	11.1	28.4	17.1	15.2	18.4	19.2	
PLEASANTVILLE			13.3	13.3					6.3	6.3				
SALEM CITY	21.4													
TRENTON	39		10.5	10.5	19.2	16	26.7	26.7	12.1	3	17.9	10.7	12.5	
UNION CITY	76.3	31.2	29.2	27.0	22.4	35.7	30.4	37.1	17.5	25.4	37.8	38.1	36.5	44.4
VINELAND CITY	49.1	17.2	16.7	22.3	22.2	16	23.5	35.3	18.9	24.3	16	24		15
WEST NEW YORK	80	30.9	29.4	17.9	12.5	33.3	6.7	26.7	51.2	46.3	31		25	34.8
BURLINGTON CITY														
GARFIELD	55.8	18.6	21.9	37.5	13.6	45.5	40.4	70.2	36.5	51.9			25	
GLOUCESTER CITY	51.8	25.9	0.0	0.0										
HARRISON	52.4		15.0	30.0	12.5	25	14.3	21.4	35.3	47.1				
JERSEY CITY	51.2	18.2	10.3	16.1	12.2	17.9	28.4	27.8	24.6	23.5	18.1		14.4	
LONG BRANCH	54.8	16.7	35.3	17.6			21.1	31.6	55	45	46.2	34.6	40.9	54.5
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP														
PHILLIPSBURG														
PLAINFIELD	40.6	11.3	40.0	10.6	20.5	18.2	17.5	18.4	17.6	24.2			35.7	
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP			0.0	0.0										
HOBOKEN														
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	46.9	21.3	17.9	17.4	15.7	24.8	20.8	27.1	27.1	24.6	27.9	23.3	25.2	37.2
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	46.2	17.7	16.7	16.1	18.2	21.1	21.9	26.7	27.8	23.9	29.8	23.1	23.6	39.6
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN	45.8	14.3	19.5	20.1	16.1	24.5	23.1	28.9	25.3	25.8	21.7	26.7	22.2	21.9
STATE	72	39.3	24.1	29.3	22.5	34.6	29.2	36.5	31.5	33.1	28.8	35.7	31.4	31.5
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP	38.5	2.6	22.2	30.8		31.6	9.1	9.1	27.8	22.3	20.8			
BRICK TOWNSHIP	75.4	40.9												
HOWELL	94.4	66.3												
JACKSON TWSP.	80	42.1	0.0	0.0										
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	69.7	36.1					17.6	31.3	21.4	21.4		46.7	29.4	29.4
											0			

2014 NJ HSPA State Summary
07/16/2014

District Name	2010 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2010 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2011 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2011 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2012 % PASS HSPA LA	2012 % PASS HSPA MATH	2012 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA LA	2012 % SPEC ED PASS HSPA MATH	2012 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2012 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2013 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2013 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH	2014 % LEP PASS HSPA LA	2014 % LEP PASS HSPA MATH
ASBURY PARK					41.1	29.5		12.5					28.6	
BRIDGETON	21.1		32.4		75.9	51.7	15.8		35		35		57.1	
CAMDEN CITY					41.2	19.7								
EAST ORANGE	18.9		36.4		71.1	46.8	33.7						28.6	
ELIZABETH	29.2		31.5		77.2	63.2	36.9	16.8	31	27.6	31	27.6	55.5	35.8
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP			24		59.9	32.2	15							
KEANSBURG BOROUGH					79.8	62.6	46.9	18.7						
MILLVILLE					81.2	64	47.5							
NEW BRUNSWICK	25.5	27.5	29.5		75.6	52.2	46.5	19.7	30.7	15.4	30.7	15.4	44.4	13.9
NEWARK	23.5		39.3	46.4	77.8	60.8	37.6	13.2	36.5	43.2	36.5	43.2	31.8	36.7
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF					69.2	46.6	26.8							
PASSAIC CITY	27		30		68.5	53.2	28.4		39.7		39.7		53.7	20.8
PATERSON	22.1		22.7		71.8	49.7	32.6	12.1	23.9	30.4	23.9	30.4	40.2	
PERTH AMBOY	29.7	28.3	32.2		65.5	61.4	31.7	22	32.2	34.9	32.2	34.9	14.3	14.3
PLEASANTVILLE			16.7		65.9	32								
SALEM CITY					70.1	42.7	11.8							
TRENTON					67.9	36.4	35.6		26.1		26.1		30.8	
UNION CITY	43.1	39.8	38.7	42.2	80.5	67.3	64.5	40.7	38.4	41.1	38.4	41.1	55.1	53.7
VINELAND CITY	24.1		23.8	14.3	83.1	67	40.9	17.9	29.4	11.8	29.4	11.8		
WEST NEW YORK	46.6	24.1			85.5	74.6	69.2	23	40.8	53.7	40.8	53.7	58.3	41.7
BURLINGTON CITY					81.8	58.8								
GARFIELD	45.5	40.9	45.5	36.4	84.4	69.2	59.6	21.1	56	42.3	56	42.3	88.9	33.4
GLOUCESTER CITY					91.9	76.3								
HARRISON	18.8				84.5	71.1	50	15					33.3	
JERSEY CITY	23.9		38.6	27	80.5	63.2	25.6	11.7	51.1	39.3	51.1	39.3	51	42.4
LONG BRANCH			36.4		83.3	60.9	54.5		46.2		46.2			
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP					85.6	63.8	45.8	17						
PHILLIPSBURG					92.8	74.3	68.3	20.6						
PLAINFIELD	38.1		32.4		77.6	48.6	41.3	16.1	57.1	41.4	57.1	41.4	40.9	13.6
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP					85.6	62.6	49.2	12.7						
HOBOKEN					84.3	60.7	41.7	16.7						
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	29.1	32.1	31.9	33.3	75.5	55.6	40.7	18.2	38.3	34.6	38.3	34.6	44.5	30.6
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	25.5	28.3	32.3	36.4	77.8	60.8	41.1	16.9	36.5	39.3	36.5	39.3	42.7	34.6
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN	27.2	25.2	31.6	27.8	76	57.1	38.7	14.9	34.6	31.1	34.6	31.1	44.3	31.6
STATE	34.8	33.3	42.4	35.7	91.6	79.7	67.8	38.2	46.7	39.9	46.7	39.9	54.3	38.8
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP			24.1	17.9	70.7	43.8	47.5	21.6					47.1	23.5
BRICK TOWNSHIP					91.9	77	72.2	37.6	21.4	21.4	21.4	21.4		
HOWELL					98.8	90.6	94.1	64.7						
JACKSON TWSP.					93.8	84.6	72.7	39.6						
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL			63.6	45.5	93.8	81.8	67.8						68.8	31.3

Appendix 5

2014 NJ ASK Grade 8 State Summary
08/29/2014

District Name	County	2014 % PASS LA	2013 % PASS LA	2012 % PASS LA	2011 % PASS LA	2010 % PASS LA	2009 % PASS LA	2008 % PASS LA	2007 % PASS LA	2006 % PASS LA	2005 % PASS LA	2004 % PASS LA	2014 % PASS MATH	2013 % PASS MATH
ASBURY PARK	MONMOUTH	34	38	40.2	34.3	38.4	37.8	29.5	28.5	22.3	20.3	27.9	17	17
BRIDGETON	CUMBERLAND	44	54	58.2	59.4	56	61.9	57.3	43	45.4	32.3	33.8	42	39
CAMDEN CITY	CAMDEN	32	32	33	31.4	33.7	38.4	36.2	23.8	28.7	28.5	28	19	18
EAST ORANGE	ESSEX	56	58	57.1	52.4	51.7	59.1	54.8	44.8	42.4	38	33.9	39	35
ELIZABETH	UNION	68	72	72.2	71	65.9	63.1	57.1	45.3	42	42.9	43.8	62	58
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	ESSEX	49	52	48.4	48.1	51.3	46.4	50.7	35	33.5	37.3	35.1	30	33
KEANSBURG BOROUGH	MONMOUTH	57	65	67	61.4	72.6	76.4	74.2	47.9	55.9	50.6	57.4	37	36
MILLVILLE	CUMBERLAND	62	66	59.2	63.9	62.5	56.7	60.7	52.7	49.1	46.5	47.6	44	56
NEW BRUNSWICK	MIDDLESEX	48	58	53.8	50.4	53.1	54.1	57.8	42.8	46.3	46.1	42.6	45	44
NEWARK	ESSEX	51	56	57.7	57.1	57.7	55.9	56.4	49.9	44.9	47.1	44.5	42	42
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF	ESSEX	55	55	54.7	51.8	59.1	52.9	50.5	36.3	33.3	31.4	31.7	34	29
PASSAIC CITY	PASSAIC	53	59	56	55.6	57.2	58.3	51.9	42.6	45.3	39.2	30.1	48	45
PATERSON	PASSAIC	54	62	58.7	53.7	57.5	52	56.3	46.1	48.1	46.1	45.7	46	46
PERTH AMBOY	MIDDLESEX	54	58	57.2	55.8	55.3	54.7	59.1	48.9	50.3	44.6	38.1	36	35
PLEASANTVILLE	ATLANTIC	48	54	61.3	63.4	54.1	55.7	52	33.6	36.6	42.2	39.7	38	40
SALEM CITY	SALEM	46	55	56.1	37.7	60.8	44.9	55.1	38.4	30.6	44.8	2004 SALEM CITY NOT	36	30
TRENTON	MERCER	42	43	43.9	46.8	44	41	42.3	37.3	31.2	23.6	22	25	23
UNION CITY	HUDSON	76	77	78.6	80	79.8	74.5	75.6	72.4	76.6	63	68.3	70	68
VINELAND CITY	CUMBERLAND	70	66	73.2	70.9	74.4	66.7	65.5	57.3	54.3	50.1	51.3	67	56
WEST NEW YORK	HUDSON	71	77	77.2	76.3	75.7	75.5	79.1	70.9	66.8	68.8	70.8	67	69
BURLINGTON CITY	BURLINGTON	56	58	57.6	62.3	69.8	66.6	66.9	51.7	56.9	64.3	59.5	47	36
GARFIELD	BERGEN	81	74	73.6	78.3	78.4	78.6	71.5	67.8	60.4	63.7	63.4	82	68
GLOUCESTER CITY	CAMDEN	73	79	73.4	77.8	78.2	77.8	62	43.7	59.8	55.1	56.6	73	69
HARRISON	HUDSON	73	78	83	82.6	77.7	77.6	83.1	72.2	64.4	59.2	57.3	70	66
JERSEY CITY	HUDSON	63	64	66.7	65.2	61.5	61.7	59.8	51.6	53	56	49.9	53	55
LONG BRANCH	MONMOUTH	61	68	65.1	62.3	67.4	70.9	73.6	57.9	56.4	51.8	46.6	51	53
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	BURLINGTON	71	77	71.5	69.7	73.9	68.7	70.7	54.4	60	63.3	62.2	49	49
PHILLIPSBURG	WARREN	72	63	67.2	69.4	69.2	70.7	69.9	59	59.1	72.3	71.8	47	50
PLAINFIELD	UNION	52	60	55.4	64.1	55.3	52.2	48.5	31.1	43.3	62.6	46.8	34	31
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP	MONMOUTH	65	58	64.9	66.7	71.9	63.8	60.8	60.7	52.3	52.1	50.6	47	45
HOBOKEN	HUDSON	61	56	62.8	65.2	74.5	75	73.6	73.5	85.9	84.7	80.3	33	30
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN		58	61	61	61	63	61	60	49	50	49	48	46	44
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN		56	59	59	62	62	62	59	48	49	47	47	45	44
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN		57	61	60.8	59.6	59.9	58.1	57.4	47.8	47.3	46.6	44.6	47	46
STATE		80	82	82.2	82.1	82.5	82	81.1	73.7	74.2	61.8	60.9	72	69
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP	OCEAN	50	48	49	53.9	48.7	51.2	49.7	38.3	38.8	39.8	45.5	43	36
BRICK TOWNSHIP	OCEAN	85	89	89.2	87.3	90.4	87.9	87.2	82.9	82.8	80.6	78.8	80	73
HOWELL TWP	MONMOUTH	88	89	87.8	90	88.8	90.3	90.4	85.7	88.3	83.4	82.6	84	79
JACKSON TWSP.	OCEAN	83	85	85.3	88.6	89	89.4	91.3	85	86	82	80.4	78	76
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	OCEAN	84	88	88.6	87.7	87.8	87.3	87.3	81	80.7	78.5	76.1	76	67

2014 NJ ASK Grade 8 State Summary
08/29/2014

District Name	2012 % PASS MATH	2011 % PASS MATH	2010 % PASS MATH	2009 % PASS MATH	2008 % PASS MATH	2007 % PASS MATH	2006 % PASS MATH	2005 % PASS MATH	2004 % PASS MATH		2014 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2014 % SPEC ED MATH	2013 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2013 % SPEC ED MATH	2012 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2012 % SPEC ED MATH
ASBURY PARK	22.8	29.3	20.7	19.5	14.6	22.3	14.4	14.7	16.7						13.6	
BRIDGETON	45.8	51.4	41.2	50	40.2	42.6	33.5	22.5	19.1			11	11	11		
CAMDEN CITY	17.8	17.2	17.3	24.5	18.2	14.5	12.8	13.7	14.5							
EAST ORANGE	44.5	38.5	33.7	43.1	31.5	31	26.9	22	25.8		20		19		17.9	15.4
ELIZABETH	61.6	55.3	50.4	47.8	36.7	33.5	30.4	32.7	30.7		22	22	29	18	27.8	18
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	34.6	37.6	37.5	36.9	27.6	22.9	17.9	18.2	17.7		17					
KEANSBURG BOROUGH	54.4	40.5	52.9	65.5	43.3	57.7	53.8	50.3	53.7				19			
MILLVILLE	51.2	51	41.9	43.8	47.1	48.8	39	36.8	31.7		24	16			16.5	
NEW BRUNSWICK	38.3	34.9	34.6	34.5	40.2	40.2	41.1	43.2	40				18			
NEWARK	45.2	45.4	40.6	41.9	37.2	35.3	31.2	30.3	35.5		13	11	19	12	18.7	13.4
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF	39.3	30.1	41	35.5	24.5	25.5	22.7	20	20.3						12.3	
PASSAIC CITY	38.8	41	38.4	40.7	34.9	36.4	30.1	25.5	19		14	20	30		29	16
PATERSON	40	40.8	42.3	46.4	40.6	39.7	34.9	36.3	38.4		18	13	29	14	24.6	11.4
PERTH AMBOY	42.8	42.7	43.2	47.7	41.1	42.1	35.5	31.2	33.4		19	16	23	10	21.9	13.9
PLEASANTVILLE	41.7	42.4	41.6	44.1	37.5	26.3	32.3	27.8	18.7		16				26.9	
SALEM CITY	31.3	30	29.4	25	30.3	39.2	24.4	29.4			22	21			14.3	
TRENTON	26.4	33.2	24.7	27.1	21.9	24.7	19	12.7	14.3							
UNION CITY	70.4	83.9	74.5	71.8	70.1	67.5	70.9	62.2	62.3		48	41	44	40	36.9	32.1
VINELAND CITY	63.5	57.8	57.2	54.2	48.5	49.5	43.4	44.1	39.1		30	26	20	15	24.5	
WEST NEW YORK	73.6	77.9	75.5	76.5	69.9	74.2	64.1	62.5	69.3		31	22	44	30	41.7	19.4
BURLINGTON CITY	42	56.6	50.8	52.8	45.9	48.8	46.9	52.2	41.3		14	15			20.7	16.7
GARFIELD	63	77	71.8	74.4	63.2	67.6	55.8	53.6	58.5		55	53	41	26	30.6	30.6
GLOUCESTER CITY	68	70.9	58	47.6	50	45.6	53.2	43.9	48.4				52	43		
HARRISON	65.3	62.3	51.2	65.1	55.1	47.7	35.3	41.1	44.2		40	36	40	28	37.9	24.1
JERSEY CITY	55.5	52.7	41.1	46.8	43	47.1	42.6	42.9	42.7		22	17	24	17	25.7	15
LONG BRANCH	54.9	50.5	54.5	54.6	45.6	48.8	41.1	40.4	27.3		23	24	27		31.7	24.4
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	60.6	56.4	59.5	59.5	46.1	45.9	39.4	42.9	43.7		14	15				
PHILLIPSBURG	44.4	47.6	41.4	54.3	50	62.5	49.7	62.4	61.7		39	14	23	18	29.4	17.6
PLAINFIELD	31.7	37.4	27.2	37.6	28.8	28.2	22.2	53	32.7		14		11		17.1	
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP	47.1	46.3	45.9	46.8	49.7	56	40	36.8	41.8				11			14.3
HOBOKEN	47.5	56.3	51.8	55.1	52.8	57.2	75.9	71.2	68.2				18	13		
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	47	48	45	47	41	43	38	38	37		24	22	26	21	25	19
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	45	46	42	47	41	43	36	37	37		22	18	23	17	25	17
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN	47.2	47.2	43.3	45.6	39.5	39.7	34.9	34	34.5		19	15	22	14	21.6	13.1
STATE	71.6	71.5	68.5	71.2	67.4	68.4	64.5	50	50.3		43	33	46	30	47.2	30.6
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP	35.2	44.6	37.4	42.8	33	32.9	34.2	42	40				13	19	13.2	18.4
BRICK TOWNSHIP	78.2	71.9	75.6	73.6	65.8	70.9	70.3	64.7	66.5		59	42	67	44	59.7	41.9
HOWELL TWP	78.7	76.8	75.5	80.3	79.1	86.6	81.2	77.7	76.7		52	42	55	33		25.2
JACKSON TWSP.	77.7	83.1	83.7	83.2	80.3	83.8	80.7	72.6	66.4							
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	74.1	76	69.4	77.4	76.3	73.6	74	69.8	66		46	33			59.1	24

2014 NJ ASK Grade 8 State Summary
08/29/2014

District Name	2011 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2011 % SPEC ED MATH	2010 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2010 % SPEC ED MATH	2009 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2009 % SPEC ED MATH	2008 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2008 % SPEC ED MATH	2007 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2007 % SPEC ED MATH	2006 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2006 % SPEC ED PASS MATH	2005 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2005 % SPEC ED PASS MATH	2004 % SPEC ED PASS LA	2004 % SPEC ED PASS MATH
ASBURY PARK									11.1	14.3		5.8	2.3	4.8	7.1	1.7
BRIDGETON	13.5				22.4	12	16.2	18.2	9.2	14.1	6.9	12.2	7.5	7.1	1.3	
CAMDEN CITY									3.8	1.4	2.8	2.4	5	1.8	0.8	1.1
EAST ORANGE	15					14.9	15.2		16	10.8	7.8	4.9	8.3	4.3	4.1	4.8
ELIZABETH	23.5	13.3	20.7	16.7	15.5		13		10.3	6.3	7	5.7	7.5	7.2	8.5	8.3
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP		11.8							4.9	2.4	0.9		1.9	1.8	1.3	
KEANSBURG BOROUGH	25.9								8.1	13.5	12.9	16.1		4.3	20.9	11.1
MILLVILLE					16.3		11.8		10.1	11.3	5.5	7.3	7.8		2.2	5.4
NEW BRUNSWICK			14.3		17.7	10.3	24.2	16.5	20.4	16.7	13.9	17	15.7	18.9	19.2	17.9
NEWARK	24.7	17.3	22.7	11.8	19		19		13	7.7	12.3	9.6	12.2	6.7	9.4	9.4
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF	10.4		14.8	10.2					8.5	5	2	1.9	5.3			2.4
PASSAIC CITY	23.6	13.8	18.8		25.6	12.3	11.3		10.1	9.5	6.7	2.9	6.7	4.2	2.5	4.2
PATERSON	13.6	10.1	20.4		18.9	20.5	18		12.6	13.7	10.2	8.9	10.4	10.2	8.8	10.6
PERTH AMBOY	19.1	12.4	26.1	12.5	23.1	15.9	20.8		16.1	14.1	15.3	18	8.2	11.8	6.1	6.4
PLEASANTVILLE	14.7	11.8	21.2	18.2	23.9	13.3	19.1	12.8	15.9	10.4	13	15.7	3.4	3.3	13	2.8
SALEM CITY			18.8				16.1		8.7	8.7	4.2		9.4	7.9		
TRENTON	16.8		16.2						10.8	4.7	3.6	7.2	2	4.9	1.8	
UNION CITY	60.4	73.6	56.8	65.2	35.4	38.1	42.3	42.3	41.3	33	47.7	44.2	19.4	23.3	27.1	29.5
VINELAND CITY	21.8	13.9	29.7	11.3		10.4			20.8	8.9	8.1	7.3	8.5	7.7	7.7	11
WEST NEW YORK	53.6	39.1	48.5	29.4	42.9	25.4	54.4	26	39.7	37.5	41.3	25.8	23.4	15.6	17.9	17.6
BURLINGTON CITY	28.6	23.8	22.6	20					14.3	6.9	21.2	24.2	33.3	25	31.3	9.4
GARFIELD	55.7	49.2	42.9	23.7	36.5	29	30.6	12.9	21.3	18.8	15.4	19.7	15.4	10.7	7.5	17.4
GLOUCESTER CITY		32.1							16.2	13.5	17.2	20	13.3	13.3	14.3	17.9
HARRISON	55.6	16.7	50	15.8	40	40	41.7		22.7	9.1	6.3	6.3	6.7			
JERSEY CITY	24.1	17	27.4	14	21.2	16.5	22.3	11.5	15	12.7	15.2	9.7	15.7	11.3	11.5	8.2
LONG BRANCH	18.4		44.1	21.3	35.8	25	31.4		13.2	17	15.8	26.3	8.3	21	7.2	9
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP	32.7	24.5	35.4	23	16.9	21.7			11.8	7.3	8.2	4.9	23	17.9	18.5	5.6
PHILLIPSBURG					37.5		21.2	13.2	15.2	18.8	2.4	4.5	28.5	22.6	27.6	20.8
PLAINFIELD	26.3		20.3		13.6		17.1		4.3	3.2	6.3	3.3	11.9	9.1	4.2	4.2
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP	29				31	17.6		11.8	14	12.1	8.1	4	13.2	5.1	8.5	1.4
HOBOKEN					21.1				14.3	23.8	45.8	29.4	48.6	44.4	21.9	23.5
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	28	24	29	21	26	20	23	18	15	12	13	13	13	12	11	10
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	24	17	23	17	23	17	19	13	13	11	8	9	9	9	9	9
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN STATE	22.2	14.9	22.9	12.5	20.1	13.1	19.1	10.6	13.8	10.8	11.6	10	11.3	8.8	9.1	8.2
STATE	47.6	31.3	47.7	28.7	47.2	30.4	44.2	27	32.9	28.8	32.7	25	17.4	14.7	16.8	14.1
LAKEWOOD TOWNSHIP	28.6		13.6		19		21.4		9.4	10.9	3	6.3	7.9	10.4	11.4	7.1
BRICK TOWNSHIP	62.7	38.7	71.5				61.1	31.1	54	39.4	47.8	35.4	47.4	31.6	42	32.8
HOWELL TWP	62.4	33.4	55.2	32.1	55.9	32.8	55.9	33.9	50.4	53.2	54.5	37.4	40.7	37.6	35.6	29
JACKSON TWSP.			56.6	51.6	57.2	47.5			53.8	53.7	46.2	42.2	34.3	24.3	38.8	19.6
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL				31.9	53.3	36.4	49.1	29	37.4	33.1	41.7	28.2	36.4	34.7	28.3	18

2014 NJ ASK Grade 8 State Summary
08/29/2014

District Name	2014 % LEP PASS LA	2014 % LEP PASS MATH	2013 % LEP PASS LA	2013 % LEP PASS MATH	2012 % LEP PASS LA	2012 % LEP PASS MATH	2011 % LEP PASS LA	2011 % LEP PASS MATH	2010 % LEP PASS LA	2010 % LEP PASS MATH	2009 % LEP PASS LA	2009 % LEP PASS MATH	2008 % LEP PASS LA	2008 % LEP PASS MATH	2007 % LEP PASS LA
ASBURY PARK			#REF!		28.6										
BRIDGETON		17	22				31.6						28.6	10.3	4.3
CAMDEN CITY			0												4.2
EAST ORANGE	29		19		30	32.3	17.6					42.9	28.6		23.5
ELIZABETH	43	39	47	32	49.1	38.3	45.9	32.9	42.9	30.7	37.4		30.1		13.3
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	33		0					12.8							8
KEANSBURG BOROUGH			19												
MILLVILLE			0												
NEW BRUNSWICK			18						36.3		27.9	23.5	23.8	26.6	12.8
NEWARK	28	29	31	23	35.5	25.2	32.9	19.9	44.6	41.2	46.6		47.7		38.4
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF			0		17.4		14.8		15.4	21.4					7.1
PASSAIC CITY	39	30	30		47.1	19.3	32.9	14.3	45.5		35.3	24.6	42.1		30.1
PATERSON	30	28	43	24	33	22.8	33.2	23.9	27.5		21.5	22.1	28.2		18
PERTH AMBOY	16	15	33	14	23.7	17.9			30.4	38.6	33.9	30.5	44.8		19
PLEASANTVILLE	21		0		11.8				36	32	38.9	27.8	21.4		
SALEM CITY			0												
TRENTON			0				20		20.3						14.8
UNION CITY	44	51	84	42	64.5	56.6	54	65.8	56.9	59.3	60.3	57.8	55.8	52.6	48.1
VINELAND CITY			35	29	16.7		35.3	26.5	11.5	22.2		14.3			
WEST NEW YORK	27	36	74	26	29.8	40.3	39.3	50.8	30.9	47.1	32.2	55.9	25.5	23.4	18.3
BURLINGTON CITY			0												
GARFIELD	25	58	68	73			38.1	57.2	40.9	45.5			44.8	44.8	45.9
GLOUCESTER CITY			95												
HARRISON	47	56	68	50	72.7	63.6	40	50							
JERSEY CITY	37	35	40	39	35.8	26.3	36.5	30.8	31.1	24.3	32.7	22.6	27.2	23.6	17.5
LONG BRANCH	15	25	27		33.3	43.5			40	54.6	50	36.8	48		12.5
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP			0												
PHILLIPSBURG			41	27											
PLAINFIELD	27		11		32.9		38.5		34.9		25.8		22.2		9.3
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP			11												
HOBOKEN			30												
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	31	35	27	34	35	35	34	35	34	38	37	33	35	30	19
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	29	32	22	29	33	32	35	31	35	39	35	28	29	25	16
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN	30	29	36	25	34.6	25.8	34	27.9	34.3	30.1	35.6	30.9	35.9	26.4	23.3
STATE	36	38	76	35	40.6	35.4	38.3	35.2	38.9	35.9	40.3	37.7	37.7	30.9	27.4
LAKEWOOD TOWNSHIP			32	44	32.1	36.7			31		23.7		11.4		8.8
BRICK TOWNSHIP	39	62	110	56											
HOWELL TWP			89				46.2	53.9	46.2	18.2		62.5			
JACKSON TWSP.			0												
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL			0								45	45			21.4

2014 NJ ASK Grade 8 State Summary
08/29/2014

District Name	2007 % LEP PASS MATH	2006 % LEP PASS LA	2006 % LEP PASS MATH	2005 % LEP PASS LA	2005 % LEP PASS MATH	2004 % LEP PASS LA	2004 % LEP PASS MATH
ASBURY PARK			0		10.5		
BRIDGETON	23.1		0		5.6		
CAMDEN CITY	1.6		0			2.1	6.1
EAST ORANGE	4.3	29.2	0	6.3	5	7.1	7.1
ELIZABETH	15.7	2.7	0	4	11.9	15.7	17
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	7.1		0				
KEANSBURG BOROUGH			0				
MILLVILLE	16.7		0				
NEW BRUNSWICK	20.4	11.9	0	1.7	11.5	8.1	14.1
NEWARK	27.8	22.8	0	30.9	25.7	22.4	32.1
ORANGE TOWNSHIP, CITY OF	9.5	5	0	4	4	3.4	6.8
PASSAIC CITY	36.5	2.9	0	3.1	8.6	7.6	8.5
PATERSON	19.8	9.3	0	9.6	12.5	11.6	17.6
PERTH AMBOY	20.4	12.1	0	8.6	4.6	14.1	11.1
PLEASANTVILLE	26.7	20	0		8.3	16.7	25
SALEM CITY			0	8.4	12.3		
TRENTON	6.2	19.5	0	2.6	4.3	1.6	
UNION CITY	47.6	32.9	0	22.3	30	30.2	35.8
VINELAND CITY	12.5	4	0	6.9	16.2	8.3	2.7
WEST NEW YORK	31.7	2.1	0		2.5	32.7	32.7
BURLINGTON CITY			0				
GARFIELD	62.1	4	0	15.4	11.5	16.2	27
GLOUCESTER CITY			0				
HARRISON	7.1		0				
JERSEY CITY	21.6	14.4	0	8.3	15.2	11.6	26.9
LONG BRANCH	18.5	15.4	0		14.3	12.5	6.3
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP			0				
PHILLIPSBURG			0	19.7	24.2	17.5	23.6
PLAINFIELD	14.8	5.8	0			11.9	21.4
NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP			0				
HOBOKEN			0				
AVERAGE LOW INCOME URBAN	21	13	0	10	12	13	18
MEDIAN LOW INCOME URBAN	19	12	0	8	12	12	17
SUM LOW INCOME URBAN	24.4	13.6	0	11.2	14.2	14.6	19.4
STATE	31	15.8	0	12.2	18.7	10.9	18.4
LAKESWOOD TOWNSHIP	11.6		0	5.6	41.2	7.9	23.7
BRICK TOWNSHIP	33.3		0			45.5	27.3
HOWELL TWP	75		0		36.4	16.7	25
JACKSON TWSP.			0				
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	12.5		0		8.3	18.8	25.1

Appendix 6

DISTRICT NAME	COUNTY NAME	SCHOOL NAME	2014 Adjusted Cohort Grad Rate	2013 Adjusted Cohort Grad Rate	2012 Adjusted Cohort Grad Rate	2011 Adjusted Cohort Grad Rate
ASBURY PARK CITY	MONMOUTH	Districtwide Total	49.26%	50.69%	49.02%	59.46%
BRIDGETON CITY	CUMBERLAND	Districtwide Total	71.01%	68.38%	67.25%	67.96%
CAMDEN CITY	CAMDEN	Districtwide Total	61.70%	53.42%	49.27%	56.89%
EAST ORANGE	ESSEX	Districtwide Total	71.87%	69.90%	70.79%	64.08%
ELIZABETH CITY	UNION	Districtwide Total	72.60%	71.05%	65.70%	67.00%
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	ESSEX	Districtwide Total	62.31%	60.30%	62.47%	50.47%
KEANSBURG BORO	MONMOUTH	Districtwide Total	80.41%	76.11%	78.07%	82.84%
MILLVILLE CITY	CUMBERLAND	Districtwide Total	86.17%	82.33%	81.57%	82.93%
NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	MIDDLESEX	Districtwide Total	62.98%	60.73%	58.57%	58.76%
NEWARK CITY	ESSEX	Districtwide Total	68.63%	67.70%	68.72%	61.26%
CITY OF ORANGE TWP	ESSEX	Districtwide Total	86.17%	79.59%	66.67%	58.28%
PASSAIC CITY	PASSAIC	Districtwide Total	76.32%	71.32%	60.80%	62.70%
PATERSON CITY	PASSAIC	Districtwide Total	74.51%	72.11%	66.39%	64.03%
PERTH AMBOY CITY	MIDDLESEX	Districtwide Total	59.73%	58.97%	72.87%	83.02%
PLEASANTVILLE CITY	ATLANTIC	Districtwide Total	75.98%	70.03%	66.92%	64.29%
SALEM CITY	SALEM	Districtwide Total	69.44%	75.47%	75.69%	67.88%
TRENTON CITY	MERCER	Districtwide Total	52.95%	48.55%	48.44%	47.71%
VINELAND CITY	CUMBERLAND	Districtwide Total	76.57%	71.77%	68.73%	80.36%
UNION CITY	HUDSON	Districtwide Total	80.63%	79.17%	82.87%	89.46%
WEST NEW YORK TOWN	HUDSON	Districtwide Total	84.58%	78.35%	76.14%	72.77%
BURLINGTON CITY	BURLINGTON	Districtwide Total	82.22%	78.20%	76.36%	85.94%
GARFIELD CITY	BERGEN	Districtwide Total	87.32%	78.05%	79.36%	78.62%

GLOUCESTER CITY	CAMDEN	Districtwide Total	86.21%	82.86%	86.62%	83.02%
HARRISON TOWN	HUDSON	Districtwide Total	90.48%	91.44%	92.70%	92.44%
JERSEY CITY	HUDSON	Districtwide Total	67.15%	67.46%	67.34%	69.92%
LONG BRANCH CITY	MONMOUTH	Districtwide Total	94.42%	91.55%	85.48%	83.12%
PEMBERTON TWP	BURLINGTON	Districtwide Total	84.27%	83.87%	83.67%	85.37%
PHILLIPSBURG TOWN	WARREN	Districtwide Total	86.46%	83.33%	87.78%	88.65%
PLAINFIELD CITY	UNION	Districtwide Total	89.42%	77.32%	71.98%	65.62%
NEPTUNE TWP	MONMOUTH	Districtwide Total	78.33%	76.80%	76.44%	83.76%
HOBOKEN CITY	HUDSON	Districtwide Total	86.78%	85.43%	74.53%	81.99%
ABBOTT AVERAGE			76.03%	72.98%	71.59%	72.28%
ABBOTT MEDIAN			76.57%	75.47%	71.98%	69.92%
STATE AVERAGE			89.61%	89.12%	88.41%	88.31%
STATE MEDIAN			92.35%	92.52%	91.79%	91.94%
LAKWOOD TWP	OCEAN	Districtwide Total	74.34%	71.17%	73.24%	70.11%
BRICK TWP	OCEAN	Districtwide Total	88.64%	86.97%	88.74%	87.39%
FREEHOLD REGIONAL	MONMOUTH	HOWELL HIGH SCHOOL	97.09%	95.57%	96.39%	96.18%
JACKSON TWP	OCEAN	Districtwide Total	92.16%	95.58%	93.87%	93.42%
TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	OCEAN	Districtwide Total	91.27%	90.01%	91.19%	89.96%

Appendix 7

SCHOOL PEER GROUP**LAKWOOD HIGH SCHOOL****29-2520-050**

This table presents the list of peer schools in alphabetical order by county name that was created specifically for this school (highlighted in yellow). Peer schools are drawn from across the state and represent schools that have similar grade configurations and that are educating students of similar demographic characteristics, as measured by enrollment in Free/Reduced Lunch Programs, Limited English Proficiency or Special Education Programs.

<u>COUNTY NAME</u>	<u>DISTRICT NAME</u>	<u>SCHOOL NAME</u>	<u>CDS CODE</u>	<u>GRAD ESPAN</u>	<u>FRPL</u>	<u>LEP</u>	<u>SpED</u>
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	WOODROW WILSON HIGH SCHOOL	07-0680-040	09-12	88.6%	18.8%	28.4%
CAPE MAY	WILDWOOD CITY	WILDWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	09-5790-050	09-12	74.2%	3.6%	32.1%
CHARTERS	ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	80-6010-910	09-12	79.9%	0.0%	19.3%
CHARTERS	CAMDEN ACADEMY CHARTER HS	CAMDEN ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	80-6212-903	09-12	83.0%	2.9%	12.0%
CHARTERS	NORTH STAR ACAD. CS OF NEWARK	NORTH STAR ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOLS OF NEWARK	80-7320-960	KG-12	83.7%	0.0%	7.6%
CHARTERS	PATERSON CS FOR SCI/TECH	PATERSON CHARTER SCHOOL FOR SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY	80-7503-970	KG-12	79.1%	0.0%	7.9%
CHARTERS	UNIVERSITY ACADEMY CS	UNIVERSITY ACADEMY CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	80-8060-990	09-12	79.2%	0.0%	18.2%
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL	13-3880-050	09-12	83.5%	10.7%	22.0%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	AMERICAN HISTORY HIGH SCHOOL	13-3570-087	06-12	85.4%	0.0%	7.0%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	ARTS HIGH SCHOOL	13-3570-010	07-12	78.6%	0.3%	6.4%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	SCIENCE PARK HIGH SCHOOL	13-3570-055	07-12	79.8%	0.1%	2.1%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL	13-3570-057	07-12	80.9%	0.0%	7.1%
HUDSON	HARRISON TOWN	HARRISON HIGH SCHOOL	17-2060-050	09-12	86.4%	6.6%	15.1%
HUDSON	JERSEY CITY	HENRY SNYDER HIGH SCHOOL	17-2390-050	09-12	70.3%	0.5%	32.1%
HUDSON	WEST NEW YORK TOWN	MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL	17-5670-050	09-12	82.4%	11.1%	15.5%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	TRENTON CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL - MAIN CAMPUS	21-5210-050	09-12	84.6%	10.1%	18.0%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	TRENTON CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL - WEST CAMPUS	21-5210-051	09-12	81.7%	0.5%	16.8%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	NEW BRUNSWICK HIGH SCHOOL	23-3530-050	PK-12	86.2%	10.6%	16.9%
MONMOUTH	ASBURY PARK CITY	ASBURY PARK HIGH SCHOOL	25-0100-010	09-12	87.0%	17.0%	18.3%
MONMOUTH	KEANSBURG BORO	KEANSBURG HIGH SCHOOL	25-2400-010	09-12	73.2%	1.1%	20.7%
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP	LAKWOOD HIGH SCHOOL	29-2520-050	09-12	81.6%	4.6%	15.3%
PASSAIC	PASSAIC CO MANCHESTER REG	PASSAIC COUNTY-MANCHESTER REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL	31-3980-010	09-12	77.0%	3.4%	16.1%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES	31-4010-307	09-12	87.2%	22.9%	22.3%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL OF CULINARY ARTS HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM	31-4010-002	09-12	87.1%	18.5%	17.9%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL OF SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY ENGG & MATHEMATICS	31-4010-304	09-12	90.6%	18.4%	15.4%
SALEM	SALEM CITY	SALEM HIGH SCHOOL	33-4630-050	09-12	75.7%	0.6%	18.1%
UNION	ELIZABETH CITY	ADMIRAL WILLIAM F. HALSEY JR. LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	39-1320-402	09-12	89.9%	11.6%	12.7%
UNION	ELIZABETH CITY	ALEXANDER HAMILTON PREPARATORY ACADEMY	39-1320-405	09-12	88.5%	3.6%	5.7%
UNION	ELIZABETH CITY	THOMAS JEFFERSON ARTS ACADEMY	39-1320-403	09-12	82.3%	7.9%	14.4%
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	BARACK OBAMA ACADEMY FOR ACADEMIC & CIVIC DEVELOPMENT	39-4160-051	09-12	82.1%	1.7%	3.4%
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	PLAINFIELD HIGH SCHOOL	39-4160-050	09-12	86.9%	19.8%	15.8%

SCHOOL PEER GROUP**LAKWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL****29-2520-083**

This table presents the list of peer schools in alphabetical order by county name that was created specifically for this school (highlighted in yellow). Peer schools are drawn from across the state and represent schools that have similar grade configurations and that are educating students of similar demographic characteristics, as measured by enrollment in Free/Reduced Lunch Programs, Limited English Proficiency or Special Education Programs.

<u>COUNTY NAME</u>	<u>DISTRICT NAME</u>	<u>SCHOOL NAME</u>	<u>CDS CODE</u>	<u>GRAD ESPAN</u>	<u>FRPL</u>	<u>LEP</u>	<u>SpED</u>
ATLANTIC	ATLANTIC CITY	UPTOWN SCHOOL COMPLEX	01-0110-080	PK-08	91.0%	4.1%	11.1%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	CHARLES SUMNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	07-0680-310	PK-08	98.4%	27.4%	16.1%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	OCTAVIO V. CATTO FAMILY SCHOOL	07-0680-145	PK-08	96.2%	22.1%	14.4%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	THOMAS H. DUDLEY FAMILY SCHOOL	07-0680-190	PK-08	98.3%	22.3%	15.2%
CHARTERS	CAMDEN'S PROMISE CS	CAMDEN'S PROMISE CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6215-910	05-08	92.0%	5.3%	12.2%
CHARTERS	LADY LIBERTY ACADEMY CS	LADY LIBERTY ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-7100-936	KG-08	90.2%	0.4%	10.3%
CHARTERS	MARION P. THOMAS CS	MARION P. THOMAS CHARTER SCHOOL	80-7210-940	PK-08	88.3%	0.0%	10.0%
CHARTERS	PAUL ROBESON HUMANITIES CS	PAUL ROBESON CHARTER SCHOOL FOR THE HUMANITIES	80-6025-907	04-08	90.7%	0.0%	15.9%
CUMBERLANI	BRIDGETON CITY	BROAD STREET SCHOOL	11-0540-030	KG-08	97.1%	27.5%	10.7%
CUMBERLANI	BRIDGETON CITY	QUARTER MILE LAND SCHOOL	11-0540-100	KG-08	91.7%	3.0%	7.1%
CUMBERLANI	BRIDGETON CITY	WEST AVENUE SCHOOL	11-0540-130	KG-08	92.2%	1.3%	6.4%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	CHANCELLOR AVENUE SCHOOL	13-3570-330	03-08	86.6%	0.3%	30.7%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	CLEVELAND EIGHTEENTH AVENUE SCHOOL	13-3570-350	PK-08	89.9%	1.4%	18.4%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	DR. E. ALMA FLAGG SCHOOL	13-3570-415	KG-08	92.9%	10.9%	9.5%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	RAFAEL HERNANDEZ SCHOOL	13-3570-575	PK-08	90.0%	4.8%	16.1%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	THIRTEENTH AVENUE SCHOOL	13-3570-715	PK-08	88.8%	2.5%	20.5%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	MARTIN LUTHER KING DUNN MIDDLE SCHOOL	21-5210-100	06-08	92.1%	7.3%	18.3%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	JOYCE KILMER MIDDLE SCHOOL	21-5210-235	06-08	90.9%	1.2%	19.1%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	LUIS MUNOZ-RIVERA MS	21-5210-240	06-08	88.6%	2.4%	23.7%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	NEW BRUNSWICK MIDDLE SCHOOL	23-3530-055	06-08	92.7%	12.6%	13.2%
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP	LAKWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL	29-2520-083	06-08	90.7%	3.5%	13.7%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	ALEXANDER HAMILTON ACADEMY	31-4010-043	KG-08	92.2%	8.2%	9.9%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	DON BOSCO ACADEMY	31-4010-301	06-08	93.3%	12.1%	13.5%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	NEW ROBERTO CLEMENTE	31-4010-316	06-08	96.0%	21.3%	17.5%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	REV DR FRANK NAPIER JR SCHOOL	31-4010-080	KG-08	94.4%	11.6%	16.9%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 21	31-4010-250	PK-08	94.1%	18.9%	10.8%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 26	31-4010-290	KG-08	91.5%	9.5%	8.5%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 6/ACADEMY OF PERFORMING ARTS	31-4010-100	PK-08	93.3%	7.2%	8.5%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 7	31-4010-110	05-08	91.1%	6.1%	24.7%
UNION	ELIZABETH CITY	BENJAMIN FRANKLIN SCHOOL NO. 13	39-1320-160	KG-08	93.0%	16.5%	19.8%
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	HUBBARD MIDDLE SCHOOL	39-4160-060	06-08	94.3%	15.7%	18.6%

This table presents the list of peer schools in alphabetical order by county name that was created specifically for this school (highlighted in yellow). Peer schools are drawn from across the state and represent schools that have similar grade configurations and that are educating students of similar demographic characteristics, as measured by enrollment in Free/Reduced Lunch Programs, Limited English Proficiency or Special Education Programs.

<u>COUNTY NAME</u>	<u>DISTRICT NAME</u>	<u>SCHOOL NAME</u>	<u>CDS CODE</u>	<u>GRAD ESPAN</u>	<u>FRPL</u>	<u>LEP</u>	<u>SpED</u>
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	ALFRED CRAMER COLLEGE PREPARATORY LAB SCHOOL	07-0680-170 PK-06		98.1%	24.7%	13.3%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	RAFAEL CORDERO MOLINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	07-0680-250 PK-06		98.2%	12.1%	14.2%
CAPE MAY	WILDWOOD CITY	GLENWOOD AVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	09-5790-060 PK-05		90.2%	35.0%	13.2%
CHARTERS	CAMDEN COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	CAMDEN COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6063-945 KG-05		99.3%	10.1%	10.1%
CHARTERS	NEW HORIZONS COMM. CS	NEW HORIZONS COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-7290-957 KG-05		95.9%	0.0%	7.9%
CHARTERS	ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY CS	ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6058-939 KG-03		92.3%	3.1%	3.9%
CUMBERLANI	VINELAND CITY	GLORIA M SABATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	11-5390-075 KG-05		91.2%	31.1%	13.7%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	ELLIOTT STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	13-3570-390 PK-04		91.2%	21.1%	4.5%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	ROBERTO CLEMENTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	13-3570-615 PK-04		92.4%	25.7%	9.0%
HUDSON	UNION CITY	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	17-5240-100 PK-04		97.1%	30.6%	14.3%
HUDSON	WEST NEW YORK TOWN	PUBLIC SCHOOL NUMBER FIVE	17-5670-090 PK-06		94.7%	17.7%	8.8%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-230 KG-05		89.8%	0.6%	0.0%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	MOTT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-260 KG-05		93.8%	18.1%	12.1%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	PARKER ELEMENTARY	21-5210-270 KG-05		95.9%	17.7%	9.9%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	PAUL S. ROBESON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-080 KG-05		89.8%	21.9%	1.1%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	WILSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-310 KG-05		94.5%	28.5%	9.9%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	A CHESTER REDSHAW SCHOOL	23-3530-060 KG-05		92.8%	30.0%	10.4%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	LORD STLRING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-3530-100 PK-05		92.6%	20.9%	9.1%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-3530-125 PK-05		88.4%	30.4%	9.5%
MIDDLESEX	PERTH AMBOY CITY	HERBERT N. RICHARDSON 21ST CENTURY SCHOOL	23-4090-130 KG-04		91.7%	31.5%	6.8%
MONMOUTH	LONG BRANCH CITY	AUDREY W. CLARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	25-2770-090 PK-05		91.5%	27.1%	8.2%
OCEAN	LAKESWOOD TWP	ELLA G CLARKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	29-2520-080 01-05		93.4%	30.9%	11.9%
PASSAIC	PASSAIC CITY	ETTA GERO SCHOOL # 9	31-3970-125 04-06		96.4%	26.8%	16.1%
PASSAIC	PASSAIC CITY	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. SCHOOL # 6	31-3970-100 PK-06		94.5%	43.3%	14.8%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 14	31-4010-180 KG-04		94.4%	7.1%	6.6%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 19	31-4010-230 PK-04		92.8%	16.9%	5.8%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 29	31-4010-311 KG-04		88.7%	28.6%	9.5%
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	39-4160-150 KG-05		92.3%	42.9%	13.3%
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	WASHINGTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL	39-4160-180 PK-05		95.4%	44.5%	16.2%
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	WOODLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	39-4160-190 KG-05		86.8%	27.9%	5.8%
UNION	ROSELLE BORO	HARRISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	39-4540-020 01-04		82.7%	44.5%	7.0%

This table presents the list of peer schools in alphabetical order by county name that was created specifically for this school (highlighted in yellow). Peer schools are drawn from across the state and represent schools that have similar grade configurations and that are educating students of similar demographic characteristics, as measured by enrollment in Free/Reduced Lunch Programs, Limited English Proficiency or Special Education Programs.

<u>COUNTY NAME</u>	<u>DISTRICT NAME</u>	<u>SCHOOL NAME</u>	<u>CDS CODE</u>	<u>GRAD ESPAN</u>	<u>FRPL</u>	<u>LEP</u>	<u>SpED</u>
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	LEEDS AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	01-4180-080 PK-05		89.2%	10.5%	9.5%
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	SOUTH MAIN STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	01-4180-095 KG-05		91.2%	6.4%	8.6%
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	WASHINGTON AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	01-4180-060 KG-05		86.8%	39.5%	16.8%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	FRANCIS X. MCGRAW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	07-0680-230 PK-05		96.8%	3.5%	11.7%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	HARRY C. SHARP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	07-0680-300 PK-06		95.7%	6.8%	16.2%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	YORKSHIP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	07-0680-360 PK-07		95.6%	3.0%	14.5%
CHARTERS	BELOVED COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	BELOVED COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6082-963 KG-03		82.9%	17.5%	2.9%
CHARTERS	BURCH CHARTER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	BURCH CHARTER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	80-6022-990 KG-05		86.0%	0.0%	1.2%
CHARTERS	CAMDEN'S PRIDE CHARTER SCHHOL	CAMDEN'S PRIDE CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6024-906 KG-04		90.9%	2.1%	7.1%
CHARTERS	INTERNATIONAL CS OF TRENTON	INTERNATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOL OF TRENTON	80-6810-940 KG-04		92.2%	0.0%	6.7%
CHARTERS	KNOWLEDGE A TO Z CHARTER SCHOOL	KNOWLEDGE A TO Z CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6083-968 KG-04		90.0%	0.0%	4.2%
CHARTERS	PATERSON ARTS AND SCIENCE CHARTER SCHOOL	PATERSON ARTS AND SCIENCE CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6096-982 KG-05		83.6%	3.0%	0.0%
CHARTERS	UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CS	UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CHARTER SCHOOL	80-8065-980 PK-07		95.6%	0.9%	8.8%
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	FOREST STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	13-3880-080 PK-07		86.8%	14.3%	8.3%
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	ROSA PARKS/CENTRAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL	13-3880-105 PK-07		89.3%	21.4%	10.3%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	SOUTH STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	13-3570-640 PK-05		85.8%	20.8%	3.8%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-190 KG-05		90.4%	10.7%	12.3%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	GRANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-200 KG-05		94.3%	24.6%	16.0%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	GREGORY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-210 KG-05		91.5%	0.3%	9.5%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-401 KG-05		92.1%	10.9%	13.1%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-3530-080 PK-05		90.5%	19.4%	11.3%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	LIVINGSTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-3530-090 KG-05		87.3%	23.5%	9.4%
MIDDLESEX	PERTH AMBOY CITY	ROBERT N. WILENTZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-4090-200 KG-04		88.6%	20.8%	7.6%
MONMOUTH	ASBURY PARK CITY	THURGOOD MARSHALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	25-0100-100 PK-04		95.9%	13.4%	13.8%
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP	CLIFTON AVE GRADE SCHOOL	29-2520-070 01-05		91.9%	23.4%	15.7%
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP	OAK STREET ELEM SCHOOL	29-2520-084 01-05		92.4%	19.3%	11.8%
PASSAIC	PASSAIC CITY	THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL # 1	31-3970-080 PK-06		88.1%	28.3%	15.2%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 15	31-4010-190 PK-05		87.7%	27.4%	12.6%
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 27	31-4010-300 PK-07		92.1%	8.2%	10.6%
SOMERSET	FRANKLIN TWP	PINE GROVE MANOR SCHOOL	35-1610-140 PK-04		80.7%	33.6%	4.7%
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	EMERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	39-4160-130 KG-05		89.0%	21.6%	12.2%

This table presents the list of peer schools in alphabetical order by county name that was created specifically for this school (highlighted in yellow). Peer schools are drawn from across the state and represent schools that have similar grade configurations and that are educating students of similar demographic characteristics, as measured by enrollment in Free/Reduced Lunch Programs, Limited English Proficiency or Special Education Programs.

<u>COUNTY NAME</u>	<u>DISTRICT NAME</u>	<u>SCHOOL NAME</u>	<u>CDS CODE</u>	<u>GRAD ESPAN</u>	<u>FRPL</u>	<u>LEP</u>	<u>SpED</u>
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	SOUTH MAIN STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	01-4180-095 KG-05	91.2%	6.4%	8.6%	
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	FRANCIS X. MCGRAW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	07-0680-230 PK-05	96.8%	3.5%	11.7%	
CAPE MAY	WILDWOOD CITY	GLENWOOD AVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	09-5790-060 PK-05	90.2%	35.0%	13.2%	
CHARTERS	BELOVED COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	BELOVED COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6082-963 KG-03	82.9%	17.5%	2.9%	
CHARTERS	CAMDEN'S PRIDE CHARTER SCHHOL	CAMDEN'S PRIDE CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6024-906 KG-04	90.9%	2.1%	7.1%	
CHARTERS	INTERNATIONAL CS OF TRENTON	INTERNATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOL OF TRENTON	80-6810-940 KG-04	92.2%	0.0%	6.7%	
CHARTERS	KNOWLEDGE A TO Z CHARTER SCHOOL	KNOWLEDGE A TO Z CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6083-968 KG-04	90.0%	0.0%	4.2%	
CHARTERS	NEW HORIZONS COMM. CS	NEW HORIZONS COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-7290-957 KG-05	95.9%	0.0%	7.9%	
CHARTERS	ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY CS	ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	80-6058-939 KG-03	92.3%	3.1%	3.9%	
CHARTERS	UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CS	UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CHARTER SCHOOL	80-8065-980 PK-07	95.6%	0.9%	8.8%	
CUMBERLANI	VINELAND CITY	GLORIA M SABATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	11-5390-075 KG-05	91.2%	31.1%	13.7%	
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	ROSA PARKS/CENTRAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL	13-3880-105 PK-07	89.3%	21.4%	10.3%	
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	SOUTH STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	13-3570-640 PK-05	85.8%	20.8%	3.8%	
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	GRANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-200 KG-05	94.3%	24.6%	16.0%	
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-230 KG-05	89.8%	0.6%	0.0%	
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	MOTT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21-5210-260 KG-05	93.8%	18.1%	12.1%	
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-3530-080 PK-05	90.5%	19.4%	11.3%	
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	LIVINGSTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-3530-090 KG-05	87.3%	23.5%	9.4%	
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-3530-125 PK-05	88.4%	30.4%	9.5%	
MIDDLESEX	PERTH AMBOY CITY	ROBERT N. WILENTZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	23-4090-200 KG-04	88.6%	20.8%	7.6%	
MONMOUTH	ASBURY PARK CITY	THURGOOD MARSHALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	25-0100-100 PK-04	95.9%	13.4%	13.8%	
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP	CLIFTON AVE GRADE SCHOOL	29-2520-070 01-05	91.9%	23.4%	15.7%	
OCEAN	LAKWOOD TWP	OAK STREET ELEM SCHOOL	29-2520-084 01-05	92.4%	19.3%	11.8%	
PASSAIC	PASSAIC CITY	DANIEL F. RYAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL # 19	31-3970-200 PK-05	92.7%	31.6%	15.7%	
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	EDWARD W KILPATRICK	31-4010-047 PK-05	90.8%	24.9%	11.1%	
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 15	31-4010-190 PK-05	87.7%	27.4%	12.6%	
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 27	31-4010-300 PK-07	92.1%	8.2%	10.6%	
PASSAIC	PATERSON CITY	SCHOOL 29	31-4010-311 KG-04	88.7%	28.6%	9.5%	
SOMERSET	FRANKLIN TWP	PINE GROVE MANOR SCHOOL	35-1610-140 PK-04	80.7%	33.6%	4.7%	
UNION	PLAINFIELD CITY	EMERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	39-4160-130 KG-05	89.0%	21.6%	12.2%	
UNION	ROSELLE BORO	HARRISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	39-4540-020 01-04	82.7%	44.5%	7.0%	

Exhibit B

Applicant: 29 2520 LAKEWOOD TOWNSHIP

Application Sections Basic

Application: IDEA Consolidated - 00-

Project Period: 7/1/2015 - 6/30/2016

Cycle: Original Application

[Printer-Friendly](#)
[Click to Return to District Select](#)
[Click to Return to GMS Access/Select Page](#)
[Click to Return to Menu List / Sign Out](#)

Allocation	Consortium	Budget Detail	Budget Summary
------------	------------	---------------	----------------

The application has been approved. No more updates will be saved for the application.

Basic Entitlement Allocation (Ages 3-21)

[Instructions](#)

IDEA Part B Sec. 611 - It is estimated that the project/program is funded 100% with federal funds. These funds are coded under CFDA Number 84.027A

Allocation Calculation				
				Base Amount
				844432
Population				
Public Enrollment	Nonpublic Enrollment	Total Population	Population Rate Per Pupil	Increase for Population Amount
5822	24996	30818	136.8168515127690085	4216422
Poverty				
Public Free/Reduced Lunches	Nonpublic Free/Reduced Lunches	Total Free/Reduced Lunch Count	Poverty Rate Per Pupil	Increase for Poverty Amount
5232	17377	22609	68.49680983504512916	1548644
Total				
Current Year Funds				
Basic Allocation (Ages 3-21)				6609498
ReAllocated Curr Year (+)				0
Release (-)				0
Total Current Year Funds				6609498
Prior Year(s) Funds				
Carryover (+)				0
Overpayment (+)				0
ReAllocated Prior Year (+)				0
Total Prior Year(s) Funds				
Cooperative/Consortia				
Transfer In/Out				0
Adjusted Total				6609498

Nonpublic Proportionate Share Calculation			
Total Students with Disabilities	Total Nonpublic Students with Disabilities	Basic Allocation (Ages 3-	Nonpublic Proportionate

(Ages 3-21)	(Ages 3-21)	21)	Share
4730	3577	6609498	4998346
Prior Year(s) Funds			
	Carryover (+)		0
Cooperative/Consortia			
	Transfer In/Out		0
Adjusted Total			4998346

PRD 2.0 user ID: PUBLIC



New Jersey Department of Education
Send Questions to: eweghelp@doe.state.nj.us

Exhibit C

Estimated Deficit June 30, 2016

Item	Adjusted Budget	Current Expenditures and Encumbrances	Additional Projected Expenditures	Projected Deficit
Tuition Accounts	\$ 28,093,613	\$ 29,448,564	\$ 300,000	\$ (1,654,951)
Tuition Accounts	\$ 364,383	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 364,383
Transportation Regular	\$ 12,175,187	\$ 19,169,999	\$ -	\$ (6,994,812)
Transportation Special	\$ 3,979,997	\$ 5,098,552	\$ 100,000	\$ (1,218,555)
Transportation Aid In Lieu	\$ 600,000	\$ 600,029	\$ 770,747	\$ (770,776)
Repayment Loans	\$ 1,187,819	\$ 450,000	\$ -	\$ 737,819
TOTAL	\$ 46,400,999	\$ 54,767,144	\$ 1,170,747	\$ (9,536,892)

	Original Estimated	New Estimated	
Extraordinary Aid	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 3,600,000	\$ (900,000)
Township Grant	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
TOTAL	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 4,600,000	\$ 100,000

Total Estimated Deficit Current Year	\$ (9,436,892)
Deficit as of June 30, 2015 Budgetary Basis	\$ (2,952,396)
Total Estimated Deficit June 30, 2016	\$ (12,389,288)

REGULAR TRANSPORT DEFICIT

	12/21/2015	1/12/2016
Current deficit for regular transportation 511 account	\$ (6,911,381)	\$ (6,994,812)
Additional aid in lieu	\$ (973,284)	\$ (770,776)
Total	\$ (7,884,665)	\$ (7,765,588)
Grant from Lakewood Township	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
Advance aid from DOE shifted from 2014-15	\$ -	\$ -
Deferral of repayments to DOE	\$ 737,819	\$ 737,819
TOTAL	\$ 1,737,819	\$ 1,737,819
Balance	\$ (6,146,846)	\$ (6,027,769)

Five Year Lookback State Aid

New Jersey State Aid	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012
Equilization Aid	15,263,034	15,263,034	15,263,034	14,972,074	14,793,805
Transportation Aid	3,934,658	3,934,658	3,934,658	3,865,747	3,043,050
Special Education Aid	2,975,869	2,975,869	2,975,869	2,904,408	2,748,847
Security Aid	2,161,835	2,161,835	2,161,835	2,136,065	218,913
PARCC Readiness Aid	58,370	58,370	0	0	0
Per Pupil Growth Aid	58,370	58,370	0	0	0
Total General Fund State Aid	24,452,136	24,452,136	24,335,396	23,878,294	20,804,615
Extraordinary Aid	3,600,000	3,147,306	3,610,389	2,972,875	3,668,596
Total	28,052,136	27,599,442	27,945,785	26,851,169	24,473,211

TRANSPORTATION

	Transportation Aid	% Increase	Mandated Students	% Increase
2015-2016	3,934,658	0.00%	19904	5.22%
2014-2015	3,934,658	0.00%	18917	11.43%
2013-2014	3,934,658	1.78%	16977	14.28%
2012-2013	3,865,747	27.04%	14855	4.12%
2011-2012	3,043,050		14267	
Ending Increase		29.30%		39.51%
Three Years State Aid Frozen		0.00%		17.24%

TRANSPORTATION

Year Ending	Mandated Regular Ed Public	Mandated Regular Ed NP	Special Transp Needs Public	Special Transp Needs Private	Courtesy Students Mixed
6/30/2012	2,310	11,690	175	92	9,368
6/30/2013	2,239	12,388	190	38	9,744
6/30/2014	2,306	14,301	225	145	10,718
6/30/2015	2,206	16,334	219	158	9,935
6/30/2016	2,191	16,997	446	271	9,969
Total Change	-119	5,307	271	179	601
% Change 2012-2016	-5.15%	45.40%	154.86%	194.57%	6.42%
Three Years State Aid Frozen	-115	2,696	221	126	-749
Three Years State Aid Frozen	-4.99%	18.85%	98.22%	86.90%	-6.99%

Special Education

	Special Education Aid	Percent Increase	In District Students	Percent Increase	Out of District Students	Percent Increase
2011-2012	\$ 2,748,847.00	N/A	811	N/A	206	N/A
2012-2013	\$ 2,904,408.00	5.66%	819	0.99%	245	18.93%
2013-2014	\$ 2,975,569.00	2.45%	838	2.32%	275	12.24%
2014-2015	\$ 2,975,569.00	0.00%	849	1.31%	295	7.27%
2015-2016	\$ 2,975,569.00	0.00%	876	3.18%	369	25.08%
Five Year Increase	\$ 226,722.00	8.25%	65	8.01%	163	79.13%
Three Year Increase	\$ -	0.00%	38	4.53%	94	34.18%

SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPARISON

	Special Education Sent to Private Schools for the Handicapped in Lakewood	Special Education Sent to Out of District Schools	%White	%Black	%Hispanic
2011-12	125	81	80%	9%	11%
2012-13	144	101	74%	13%	12%
2013-14	172	118	72%	12%	17%
2014-15	211	129	76%	9%	15%
2015-16	261	108	81%	6%	13%
% Inc	108.80%	33.33%			
Student Population 2015-16			8%	10%	80%

	Special Ed In District Classrooms	%White	%Black	%Hispanic
2011-12	811	14%	19%	66%
2012-13	819	13%	15%	71%
2013-14	838	11%	12%	76%
2014-15	849	14%	10%	76%
2015-16	876	11%	10%	78%
% Inc	8.01%			
Student Population 2015-16		8%	10%	80%

WE MUST DETERMINE WHY THIS IS HAPPENING.

FUND 20 COMPARISON

Year	Source	Total Award	Non Public	Public
2015-16	FEDERAL	24,772,743	13,072,368	11,700,375
2014-15	FEDERAL	21,977,003	13,033,941	8,943,062
2013-14	FEDERAL	22,397,286	12,686,154	9,711,132
2012-13	FEDERAL	24,003,036	13,530,624	10,472,412
2011-12	FEDERAL	16,143,071	9,075,851	7,067,220
TOTAL CHANGE		8,629,672	3,996,517	4,633,155
% CHANGE		53.46%	44.03%	65.56%
2015-16	STATE	26,698,224	24,716,239	1,981,985
2014-15	STATE	26,249,150	24,216,017	2,033,133
2013-14	STATE	23,065,301	20,750,854	2,314,447
2012-13	STATE	21,676,100	19,358,726	2,317,374
2011-12	STATE	19,213,129	16,844,363	2,368,766
TOTAL CHANGE		7,485,095	7,871,876	-386,781
% CHANGE		38.96%	46.73%	-16.33%
2015-16	COMBINED	51,470,967	37,788,607	13,682,360
2014-15	COMBINED	48,226,153	37,249,958	10,976,195
2013-14	COMBINED	45,462,587	33,437,008	12,025,579
2012-13	COMBINED	45,679,136	32,889,350	12,789,786
2011-12	COMBINED	35,356,200	25,920,214	9,435,986
TOTAL CHANGE		16,114,767.00	11,868,393.00	4,246,374.00
% CHANGE		45.58%	45.79%	45.00%

8

Budget Breakdown by Public and Non Public

Type			
General Fund			\$ 120,830,423
Non Public Programs			
Stars Program Rent	\$	187,000	
Related Services	\$	450,000	
Transportation Routes	\$	15,263,282	
Transportation AIL	\$	1,573,284	
Subtotal	\$	17,473,566	
Public Balance	\$		103,356,857
Fund 20 Federal Programs			\$ 24,772,743
Non Public Programs	\$	13,072,368	
Public Balance	\$		11,700,375
Fund 20 State Programs			\$ 26,698,224
Non Public Programs	\$	24,716,239	
Public Balance	\$		1,981,985
Debt Service Public			\$ 1,306,446
Total Public			\$ 118,345,663
Total Non Public			\$ 55,262,173
Total Budget			\$ 173,607,836

Transportation Expense Public and Non Public

Type of Contracted Service		NON PUBLIC	PUBLIC	TOTAL
Regular To and From School	511	\$ 15,263,282.29	\$ 3,011,682.56	\$ 18,274,964.85
Aid In Lieu ESTIMATED	503	\$ 1,370,776.00	\$ -	\$ 1,370,776.00
Jointures Regular Education	513		\$ 14,000.00	\$ 14,000.00
TOTAL REGULAR EDUCATION		\$ 16,634,058.29	\$ 3,025,682.56	\$ 19,659,740.85
Special To and From School	514		\$ 3,962,459.69	\$ 3,962,459.69
Special ESC	518		\$ 900,000.00	\$ 900,000.00
TOTAL SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION NEEDS		\$ -	\$ 4,862,459.69	\$ 4,862,459.69
TOTAL		\$ 16,634,058.29	\$ 7,888,142.25	\$ 24,522,200.54