

Office of the Independent Monitor
Study of Parent Participation at IEP Meetings
Arun Ramanathan
Jaime Hernandez
Outcome 14

Background

In the area of parent participation at individualized education program (IEP) meetings, the parties agreed to a two-part outcome. The first part of Outcome 14 focuses on the percentage of parents of students with disabilities attending IEP meetings. It states:

- By June 30, 2006, the District will increase the rate of parent participation in IEP meetings in the area of attendance to 75%

The parties reached consensus that parent attendance at IEP meetings would be defined as parents who physically attended the IEP or participated in a telephone or video conference. They expressed their preference for using Welligent data for the purposes of establishing a baseline attendance rate and developing an outcome.

In 2003-04, Welligent data placed the rate of parents attending their child's IEP in Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) at approximately 60%. The District proposed a parent attendance outcome of 70%. The plaintiffs, using data from the national Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study (SEELS) showing a 90% attendance rate among a nationally drawn sample of parents, proposed an outcome of 85%.

The decision to set an outcome of 75% was based on an assessment of the Welligent data. Because 20% of current IEPs in the Welligent system contained no data on parent participation, it is possible that available data may have underestimated the rate of parent attendance. This hypothesis was supported by the findings of a survey conducted for the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) in which 80% of parents contacted had attended their child's last IEP. If, as the plaintiffs postulated, this survey overstated the percentage of parents attending IEPs, it is possible that the actual rate of parent attendance at IEP meetings ranged between 60% and 70%. Based on these findings, an outcome of 75% was considered a viable target.

The second part of Outcome No. 14 focuses on the responsibility of District personnel under the IDEA regulations to make a series of attempts to convince parents to attend the IEP meeting. This part of the outcome was agreed upon by both parties and is presented below:

- By June 30, 2006, 95% of the records of IEP meetings in which the parent does not attend will provide evidence of recorded attempts to convince the parent to attend the IEP meeting in accordance with Section 300.345(d) of the IDEA regulations
- Evidence of compliance with this outcome will be based on criteria determined by the Independent Monitor defining "recorded attempts to convince" and be assessed through a scientific sample of those records of IEP meetings in which the parent did not attend

For the purposes of assessing compliance with this outcome, the Independent Monitor considers three “recorded attempts to convince the parent to attend the IEP meeting” to be a sufficient number to establish that LAUSD is “unable to convince parents that they should attend.”

A recorded attempt to convince is defined as “an effort to arrange a mutually agreed upon time and place, such as – (1) Detailed records of telephone calls made or attempted and the results of those calls; (2) Copies of correspondence sent to parents and any responses received; and (3) detailed records of visits made to the parents home or place of employment and the results of those visits.” The District is expected to collect evidence of recorded attempts to convince and record the results of those attempts in its data system.

If a parent provides written or verbal confirmation that they do not wish to attend the IEP meeting and the District can provide evidence of this confirmation in the form of a signed Parent Notification, a logged telephone call or personal conversation with date, a logged record of a visit to a home or place of employment with a date, or an email message or fax, the Independent Monitor considers that to be sufficient evidence that the District is unable to convince the parents that they should attend the IEP meeting. In this case, the District does not need to provide evidence of additional recorded attempts to convince the parents that they should attend the IEP meeting.

Methodology

Information on parent attendance is recorded in a student’s IEP. The records of students whose IEPs in the Welligent system can be retrieved at the central office level. For students who are not in the Welligent database, information on parent attendance is located in their school file. In addition, as noted, not all IEPs in the Welligent system have information on parent attendance.

In summary, there are four groups of students:

1. Students in Welligent whose parents attended the IEP
2. Students in Welligent whose parents did not attend the IEP
3. Students in Welligent with no data on IEP attendance
4. Students not in Welligent (but present in other District data systems such as SIS) with information on IEP attendance in their school file

As noted in the outcome, the study focused on groups 2, 3 and 4: students whose parents did not attend the IEP, those with no data on attendance and those not in the Welligent system. For those with no data on attendance, the goal was to determine their attendance status and to determine if their results differed from students in Welligent with attendance data. This would allow us to determine if students in Welligent are more likely to have parents who attend their IEPs, thereby lending credence to the theory that schools that are fully implementing the system are more likely to be in compliance in other areas.

It has also been theorized that some groups are more likely to have parents that attend an IEP. Prior to drawing a sample, the OIM asked the American Institutes of Research (AIR) to conduct an analysis of all IEPs from November 2004 to January 2005 to determine if there was any statistically significant differences between the three groups of IEPs in the Welligent system

(attend, did not attend, no data) by student ethnicity, school level, local district, high and low incidence disability¹, language, gender, and IEP meeting type (initial and three-year).

The November start date was chosen because the District introduced edits in the Welligent IEP system in late October that limited the ability of school personnel to enter no data or inappropriate data in the parent attendance fields and added information on the “method of contact” and number of contacts. This minimized the number of IEPs with “no data” in the file and maximized those with attend data. Overall, AIR found that students with low incidence disabilities, white students, and elementary school students in the sample were more likely to have parents that attended the IEP meeting. Parents were also more likely to attend initial IEPs than other types of IEPs. (See Attachment A)

Parent Participation Sampling Design

In order to determine whether there was evidence to convince a parent to attend an IEP meeting in 95% of the situations when a parent did not attend an IEP meeting, the OIM asked AIR to draw three consecutive samples of students with completed IEPs in the District data systems. The parent participation samples were drawn at three points in time from three databases containing IEP contact and attendance information from November 2004 to January 2005; January to April 2005; and April to May 2005. These samples were stratified by local district and grade level. The samples were drawn in conjunction with samples for a study of the accuracy of the District’s Least Restrictive Environment data and clustered to maximize efficiency without introducing bias. The decision to begin sampling IEPs from November was based on the District’s inclusion in its Welligent system of a method to track recorded attempts to convince parents to attend the IEP meeting and, as we have already noted, edits that limited the possibility of entering no data or invalid data into the area on parent attendance. This meant that after November, there were two basic groups of IEPs in which the parent did not attend:

1. IEPs with recorded attempts to convince
2. IEPs without recorded attempts to convince

One sample was drawn from those students who had information in the Welligent database on the number of recorded attempts to convince to attend. For these students, the goal would be to review their records to determine if their parents had given the school permission to proceed with the IEP in their absence or to find evidence of three recorded attempts to convince them to attend. Since these students had dates associated with any recorded attempts in their data file, the school would be credited with any additional recorded attempts found in their file.

In addition, since the District stated its expectation that all school staff would be expected to enter information on recorded attempts for all students in the Welligent system, we sought to compare the results for a sample of these student records to a sample of students with no recorded attempts. This would provide information on whether evidence of a recorded attempt to convince might increase the likelihood that a parent would attend the IEP meeting.

¹ Specific Learning Disability (SLD) and Speech and Language Impairment (SLI) are considered high incidence disabilities for this analysis. All others are low incidence.

First Parent Participation Sample: February 2005

There were 148 student records in the group with recorded attempts in the November 2004 – January 2005 database. This information was then merged with information in the SIS database. For six students, the local district information did not match in both databases and therefore the students were dropped, leaving 142 students (see Table 1). As a key need was to ensure representation by district, all students in this group were selected.

Table 1. Students with Welligent IEPs with Recorded Attempts

Local School		
District	Number of Students	Percent
1	42	29.6%
2	21	14.8%
3	19	13.4%
4	10	7.0%
5	7	4.9%
6	6	4.2%
7	17	12.0%
8	20	14.1%
Total	142	100.0%
Number of Schools		85

The second task was to select a sample from students whose IEPs *did not* have information on recorded attempts to convince parents to attend the IEP meeting. For these students, the goal would be to review the students' school records to determine if their parents had given schools permission to proceed with IEP in their absence or to find evidence of three recorded attempts to convince them to attend.

In order to maximize the efficiency of the data collection process, we used the schools of the first group (i.e., the 85 schools attended by the group of 142 students) to select students for this second group. Table 2 shows that 236 students attend the same schools as the students above (this figure excludes students if the local district information did not match in both the parent participation and SIS database).

Table 2. Students with IEPs without Info on Recorded Attempts in Same Schools as Students in Group 1

Local School		
District	Number of Students	Percent
1	66	28.0%
2	25	10.6%
3	48	20.3%
4	19	8.1%
5	11	4.7%
6	16	6.8%
7	27	11.4%
8	24	10.2%
Total	236	100.0%
Number of schools		85

Given the lower representation of students in districts 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8, additional schools were selected to balance out this disproportionate representation (see Table 3). It is important to note that these schools have no students with information on recorded attempts.

Table 3. Student without Info on Recorded Attempts Attending Different Schools than Students in Group 1

Local School District	Number of additional students	Number of additional schools
2	30	2
4	15	2
5	30	3
6	20	1
8	20	3
Total	115	11

Although these additional schools do not have students with information on recorded attempts, we were concerned about the potential bias that may be introduced by relying primarily upon schools in which at least one student has information in the database on recorded attempts (85 versus 11 schools). While we could not determine this conclusively at the time of the sampling, schools that have at least one student IEP with recorded attempts in the database may keep better files on their students (i.e., therefore there may be a record in the student’s file on site) or may have better contact practices than schools that do not.² Therefore, relying only on schools of the first group could underestimate any potential problems at hand.

To address this potential bias, we selected about 20 additional students in each district, from two to three schools that did not have any students with recorded attempts information. This resulted in an additional 156 students to provide data for the schools with no students with recorded attempts information.

Table 4 shows the first parent participation sample of students with (n=142) and without (n=507) recorded attempts information. The final distributions of students of both groups across local districts are close to the observed in their respective population in the November 2004 – January 2005 parent participation database. In case of the first group shown, it is obviously identical.

² After the data collection, we indeed observed that students attending schools with at least 1 sampled student with recorded attempt in parent participation databases showed statistically significantly higher rates of evidence to convince than students attending schools with no sampled students with recorded attempt in the databases when data are weighted to reflect the proportions of high and low incidence disabilities in the population (81.6% to 76.1%).

Table 4. Distribution of Students in First Parent Participation Sample by District

Local District	Students With Recorded Attempts Info		Students Without Recorded Attempts Info		Total	
1	42	29.6%	86	17.0%	128	19.7%
2	21	14.8%	75	14.8%	96	14.8%
3	19	13.4%	68	13.4%	87	13.4%
4	10	7.0%	54	10.7%	64	9.9%
5	7	4.9%	59	11.6%	66	10.2%
6	6	4.2%	54	10.7%	60	9.2%
7	17	12.0%	46	9.1%	63	9.7%
8	20	14.1%	65	12.8%	85	13.1%
Total	142	100.0%	507	100.0%	649	100.0%

Second Parent Participation Sample: April 2005

The objective of this sampling strategy was to 1) supplement the first sample (drawn in February 2005) with elementary schools to resolve the disproportionate number of middle and high schools in the first sample and 2) maximize efficiency in the data collection process for the parent participation and LRE studies, without introducing bias. None of the students selected in the first sample were eligible to be selected in the second sample.

As with the first parent participation sample, we sought geographical representation across the eight districts. The following groups were drawn only from students in elementary schools.

Again, one sample was drawn from students with Welligent IEPs with information in the database on recorded attempts to convince. There were 137 student records in this group across 77 elementary schools in the January – April 2005 database.

The second task was to select a sample of students with IEPs that did not have information on recorded attempts. In order to maximize the efficiency of the data collection process, we first looked at students in the schools of the first sample (i.e., the 77 schools attended by the sample of 137 students). There were 236 student records in this group across the 77 elementary schools, for a total of 373 students.

To draw students for these two groups and maximize efficiency in the data collection process, we limited the selection to schools that had five or more students (of the 373 students across 77 schools). We selected three of these schools from each district, equaling 24 schools. Five students were then randomly selected from each school, for a total of 120 students across 24 schools. Of these 120 students, 39 had information in the database on the recorded attempts to convince (first group) and 81 did not have info on recorded attempts (second group).

As with the first sample drawn in February 2005, we were concerned about the potential bias that may be introduced by relying entirely upon schools in which at least one student has information in the database on recorded attempts. As mentioned, schools that have at least one student with recorded attempts to contact information in the database may keep better files on their students (i.e., therefore there may be a record in the student’s file on site) or may have better contact

practices than schools that do not. Therefore, relying only on schools in the first group could potentially underestimate any potential problem at hand.

To address this potential bias, we selected 80 additional students from schools that did not have any student with recorded attempts information. Again, we maximized efficiency in the data collection process by limiting the pool to schools that had five or more students without information on recorded attempts. We then selected two schools of those schools from each district (16 schools), and randomly drew five students from each school for a total of 80 students.

The second parent participation sample had a total of 200 students across 40 elementary schools: 39 students with information on recorded attempts and 161 without information on recorded attempts.

Third Parent Participation Sample: May 2005

A third sample of 221 students was drawn from the April – May 2005 database. Given the low number of students with recorded attempts, we selected all students who had information in the database on recorded attempts to convince the parent to attend (80 students in 51 schools).

To maximize efficiency, we then selected all students who did not have information in the database on recorded attempts to convince the parent to attend (73 students).

To avoid introducing bias from relying upon schools with at least one student with information on contact information, we supplemented the sample by selecting 45 students who did not have information on recorded attempts to convince and were attending other schools. To continue to maximize data collection efficiency, this selection was limited to schools that had at least five students without recorded attempts to contact information. Furthermore, an additional 23 students without recorded attempts information were drawn to ensure district and school level representation.

Tables 5 and 6 show the final distributions of the overall parent participation sample (1,070 students across 241 schools) across local school districts and school type in comparison to the overall population of special education students in LAUSD. For the analysis, 26 students were dropped (students who exited or transferred to other schools), resulting in 1,044 observations.

Table 5: District Distribution for Special Education Population* and Total Parent Participation Sample

Local School District	Students in Population	%	Students in PP Sample	%
1	13,546	18.1%	204	19.2%
2	11,218	15.0%	153	14.4%
3	10,637	14.2%	141	13.2%
4	9,268	12.4%	114	10.7%
5	6,831	9.1%	112	10.5%
6	6,298	8.4%	100	9.4%
7	7,513	10.1%	107	10.0%
8	9,414	12.6%	134	12.6%
Total	74,725	100%	1,065**	100%

* Source: SIS Database, April 2005

** There were five observations from District “N”, for a total of 1,070 students in the parent participation sample.

Table 6. School Level Distribution for Special Education Population* and Total Parent Participation Sample

School Level	Students in Population	%	Students in PP Sample	%
Elementary	36,517	44.9%	484	45.2%
Middle	17,800	21.9%	277	25.9%
High	19,214	23.6%	244	22.8%
Special Centers	4,189	5.2%	65	6.1%
Others	3,605	4.4%	0	0.0%
Total	81,325	100%	1,070	100

* Source: SIS Database, April 2005

Data Collection and Entry

The OIM designed and piloted an instrument (Attachment B) to identify and collect data on whether parents attended the IEP and for those that did not attend, if schools had recorded attempts to convince to attend. For all students, existing attendance data such as the date the IEP was signed was present on the instrument. Any information on recorded attempts was also present on the instrument.

Data was collected to confirm or determine if and when consent was provided for the most recent IEP. IEP notification forms were reviewed to determine if parents had provided consent to proceed with the IEP in their absence, did not plan to attend, or requested to have the IEP rescheduled. For those parents that indicated that they would prefer to have the IEP rescheduled, data was collected on the evidence present in the student file on the number of subsequent attempts to convince the parent to attend.

Research assistants (RAs) were trained to review student files and record data on the instrument developed by the OIM. RAs were directed to first confirm data on attendance and IEP consent date for students with information on parent attendance. For those students without information on parent attendance (“No Data” Welligent and non-Welligent IEPs), RAs collected data on

attendance. If the RA found information that a parent attended the IEP, they did not need to collect additional information.

Once non-attendance status had been confirmed, RAs reviewed the full student IEP and cumulative folders to search for evidence to convince in the form of IEP notification forms, notes or records of telephone calls in student cumulative folders and IEPs. These documents were reviewed because methods of contact are confidential documents that are placed in these folders. RAs were not required to interpret any data but only to enter the information that they found within the student’s cumulative or IEP folders.

Data was collected and entered into a database. As mentioned in the sampling description, 26 students were dropped from the analysis, due to students exiting or transferring to another school. The distribution of students by local district and school level in the analyzed sample is closely aligned with that in the overall special education population in LAUSD (Tables 7 and 8) and the low and high incidence populations (Table 9).

Table 7. Distribution of Students in the Parent Participation Analysis by Local District

Local District	N	%
1	198	19.0%
2	146	14.0%
3	140	13.4%
4	113	10.8%
5	108	10.3%
6	103	9.9%
7	104	10.0%
8	132	12.6%
Total	1,044	100%

Table 8. Distribution of Students in the Parent Participation Analysis by School Level

School Level	N	%
Elementary	479	45.9%
Middle	270	25.9%
High	233	22.3%
Spec Centers	62	5.9%
Total	1,044	100.0%

Table 9. Distribution of Students in the Parent Participation Analysis by High and Low Incidence Disabilities*

High/Low Incidence Disabilities	N	%
High Incidence	845	80.9%
Low Incidence	199	19.1%
Total	1,044	100%

* Specific Learning Disabilities and Speech and Language Impairment are considered high incidence disabilities for this analysis. All others are low incidence.

Findings

If a parent provided consent to proceed with an IEP in their absence, this was considered sufficient evidence to convince the parent to attend. If the parent stated that they did not expect to attend the IEP and requested a copy, this was considered sufficient evidence to convince. If there was evidence of three attempts to convince the parent to attend the IEP and the school proceeded to convene the IEP without the parent, this was considered sufficient evidence to convince. If a parent requested that a school reschedule the IEP and there was evidence that the school held the IEP prior to making three attempts without any supporting documentation of parental consent to proceed in the IEP or cumulative folders, this was considered insufficient evidence to convince. Based on these guidelines, each student whose parent did not attend the IEP was coded as a “Yes” or “No” in the field of evidence to convince.

Below are the percentages of students for which there was no evidence to convince parents to attend the student’s IEP meeting. These estimates have been weighted to represent the proportions of high and low incidence disability categories in the special education population (using the April 2005 SIS database). Approximately 79% of student files contained evidence that the school made appropriate attempts to convince the parents to attend (see Table 10). The percentage of files without evidence to convince was approximately 21%.

Table 10. Percentages of students with and without evidence to convince³

Evidence To Convince	N	%	Confidence Interval Min	Confidence Interval Max
No Evidence	223	20.6%	15.3%	25.9%
Evidence To Convince	821	79.4%	76.7%	82.2%
Total	1,044	100%		

These percentages were further disaggregated by students with and without recorded attempts to convince in the parent participation databases. Not surprisingly, students who showed recorded attempts to contact parents in the database had higher rates of evidence to convince at the school site (84% versus 78% for students without recorded attempts in the database).

Table 11. Percentages of students with and without evidence to convince, by recorded attempts in database

Recorded Attempts	No Evidence To Convince	Evidence To Convince	Total
Students did not have recorded attempts	181 22.2%	608 77.7%	100%
Students had recorded attempts	42 15.6%	213 84.4%	100%
Total	223 20.6%	821 79.4%	100%

Pearson:

Uncorrected chi2(1) = 5.3483
Design-based F(1, 1043) = 5.0450 **P = 0.0249**

³ Confidence intervals for Tables 11, 12, 13 and 14 can be found in Attachment C

The overall percentages were also disaggregated by Welligent status, local district, and school level. While a slightly higher percentage of Welligent students had no evidence to convince parents in comparison to non-Welligent students, Table 12 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between these groups of students.

Table 12. Percentages of students with and without evidence to convince, by Welligent status

Welligent Status	No Evidence To Convince		Evidence To Convince		Total
Non-Welligent	42	17.9%	177	82.1%	100%
Welligent	181	21.3%	644	78.7%	100%
Total	223	20.6%	821	79.4%	100%

Pearson:

Uncorrected chi2(1) = 1.1879

Design-based F(1, 1043) = 1.1770 P = 0.2782

When examining the percentages by local district, the differences are statistically significant at the 5% significance level. As shown in Table 13, the percentages of students without evidence range from a low of 15% in District 1 to almost 30% in District 3.

Table 13. Percentages of students with and without evidence to convince, by local district

Local District	No Evidence To Convince		Evidence To Convince		Total
1	33	15.4%	165	84.6%	100%
2	29	21.2%	117	78.8%	100%
3	42	29.5%	98	70.5%	100%
4	20	16.8%	93	83.2%	100%
5	27	22.8%	81	77.2%	100%
6	27	26.7%	76	73.3%	100%
7	18	17.2%	86	82.8%	100%
8	27	18.5%	105	81.5%	100%
Total	223	20.6%	821	79.4%	100%

Pearson:

Uncorrected chi2(7) = 14.3879

Design-based F(6.96, 7256.67) = 1.9866 P = 0.0534

As with the district level, the differences in the percentages of students with and without evidence to convince by school level are statistically significant at the 1% significance level (Table 14). Students in elementary schools are less likely to have no evidence (16%), whereas students in high schools are more likely (29%) to lack evidence that the school made sufficient contact to convince parents to attend the IEP.

Table 14. Percentages of students with and without evidence to convince, by school level

School Level	No Evidence To Convince		Evidence To Convince		Total
Elementary	79	15.8%	400	84.2%	100%
Middle	62	23.1%	208	76.9%	100%
High	71	29.3%	162	70.7%	100%
Spec Centers	11	17.3%	51	82.7%	100%
Total	223	20.6%	821	79.4%	100%

Pearson:

Uncorrected $\chi^2(3) = 18.3048$

Design-based $F(2.88, 3004.23) = 5.2558$ **P = 0.0015**

Implications

Based on these findings, LAUSD did not meet the negotiated target of Outcome No. 14 to provide evidence of recorded attempts to convince the parent to attend the IEP meeting for 95% of the records in a sample of IEP meetings in which the parent did not attend during the 2004-05 school year. The current percentage for this part of the parent participation outcome is 79%.

The results provide several indications of how the District can improve its performance to achieve the 95% threshold. A large percentage of IEPs in the Welligent system did not contain any data on recorded evidence to convince. When visiting schools, it was clear that the majority of school staff did not realize that they would be expected to maintain records of recorded attempts to convince and enter them into the Welligent database. If the District directs school staff to record attempts to convince into the Welligent system and place paper notifications in student school files, the percentage of students with sufficient evidence to convince should increase.

While no local district achieved the outcome target, performance ranged from a low of 71% to a high of 85%. The District should seek to identify the practices in those local districts where the percentages of evidence to convince are the highest and use them to inform those districts where the percentages are lowest. Similarly, the District should focus attention at the high school level to ensure that school staffs are following the requirements of the law and District policy. All schools should be notifying parents about IEP meetings and maintaining information on contacts, such as notification forms in a student's confidential files.

Attachment A: Parent Participation Analysis: Comparison of Groups: Attended IEP meeting, Met with Staff and No Data

The tables compare the characteristics of students whose parents 1) attended the Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting, 2) met with staff, or 3) have no data. For these comparisons, OIM provided AIR with a database with information on 8,173 students, representing data from meetings held November 2004 to January 2005.

In the first table, the chi square test shows that the proportions of students with low and high incidence disabilities whose parents attended IEP meetings, met with staff, and show no data are statistically significantly different from the proportions that we would expect under a random assignment. Specifically, under a random assignment, around 70 percent (+/- a sampling error) of students with high incidence disabilities should fall into each of the three parental attendance status groups. The actual proportions obtained differ by more than the sampling error (as shown by the chi square test). Particularly different from the 70 percent are students in the high incidence group whose parents met with staff (80.3 percent). This group is generating the chi square result.

Chi square results show similar findings for the proportions of students by ethnicity, school level, local district, and IEP meeting type. Proportions that appear to be driving the chi square results are in boldface.

Two sets of tables are presented: Tables A compare the three parental attendance status groups (i.e., each attendance group adds up to 100 percent); Tables B compare each characteristic (e.g., disability, language, etc. add up to 100 percent).

Table 1A: Low and High Incidence Disabilities

	Low Incidence	High Incidence*	Total
ATTENDED IEP	2,102 32.3%	4,411 67.7%	6,513 100%
MET WITH STAFF	288 19.7%	1,177 80.3%	1,465 100%
NO DATA	52 31.0%	116 69.1%	168 100%
Total	2,442 30.0%	5,704 70.0%	8,146 100%

* High incidence disabilities are specific learning disabilities and speech-language impairment.
Pearson chi2(2) = 90.7505 Pr = 0.000

Table 1B: Low and High Incidence Disabilities

	Low Incidence	High Incidence*	Total
ATTENDED IEP	2,102 86.1%	4,411 77.3%	6,513 80.0%
MET WITH STAFF	288 11.8%	1,177 20.6%	1,465 18.0%
NO DATA	52 2.1%	116 2.0%	168 2.1%
Total	2,442 100%	5,704 100%	8,146 100%

* High incidence disabilities are specific learning disabilities and speech-language impairment.
Pearson chi2(2) = 90.7505 Pr = 0.000

Table 2A: Language

	English	Spanish	All Others	Total
ATTENDED IEP	2,598 39.8%	3,701 56.7%	233 3.6%	6,532 100%
MET WITH STAFF	559 38.1%	862 58.8%	45 3.1%	1,466 100%
NO DATA	78 44.6%	91 52.0%	6 3.4%	175 100%
Total	3,235 39.6%	4,654 57.0%	284 3.5%	8,173 100%

Pearson chi2(4) = 4.5251 Pr = 0.340

Table 2B: Language

	English	Spanish	All Others	Total
ATTENDED IEP	2,598 80.3%	3,701 79.5%	233 82.0%	6,532 79.9%
MET WITH STAFF	559 17.3%	862 18.5%	45 15.9%	1,466 17.9%
NO DATA	78 2.4%	91 2.0%	6 2.1%	175 2.1%
Total	3,235 100%	4,654 100%	284 100%	8,173 100%

Pearson chi2(4) = 4.5251 Pr = 0.340

Table 3A: Ethnicity

	White	Hispanic	African-American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Other	Total
ATTENDED IEP	793 12.2%	4,553 70.1%	917 14.1%	123 1.9%	105 1.6%	6,491 100%
MET WITH STAFF	85 5.8%	1,049 71.7%	278 19.0%	26 1.8%	26 1.8%	1,464 100%
NO DATA	13 7.4%	124 70.9%	28 16.0%	7 4.0%	3 1.7%	175 100%
Total	891 11.0%	5,726 70.4%	1,223 15.0%	156 1.9%	134 1.7%	8,130 100%

Pearson chi2(8) = 70.4153 Pr = 0.000

Table 3B: Ethnicity

	White	Hispanic	African-American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Other	Total
ATTENDED IEP	793 89.0%	4,553 79.5%	917 75.0%	123 78.9%	105 78.4%	6,491 79.8%
MET WITH STAFF	85 9.5%	1,049 18.3%	278 22.7%	26 16.7%	26 19.4%	1,464 18.0%
NO DATA	13 1.5%	124 2.2%	28 2.3%	7 4.5%	3 2.2%	175 2.2%
Total	891 100%	5,726 100%	1,223 100%	156 100%	134 100%	8,130 100%

Pearson chi2(8) = 70.4153 Pr = 0.000

Table 4A: Gender

	Female	Male	Total
ATTENDED IEP	2,181 33.4%	4,351 66.6%	6,532 100%
MET WITH STAFF	522 35.6%	944 64.4%	1,466 100%
NO DATA	70 40.0%	105 60.0%	175 100%
Total	2,773 33.9%	5,400 66.1%	8,173 100%

Pearson chi2(2) = 5.5670 Pr = 0.062

Table 4B: Gender

	Female	Male	Total
ATTENDED IEP	2,181 78.7%	4,351 80.6%	6,532 79.9%
MET WITH STAFF	522 18.8%	944 17.5%	1,466 17.9%
NO DATA	70 2.5%	105 1.9%	175 2.1%
Total	2,773 100%	5,400 100%	8,173 100%

Pearson chi2(2) = 5.5670 Pr = 0.062

Table 5A: School Level

	Elementary Pre-K - Grade 5	Middle Grade 6 - 8	High Grade 9 - PG	Total
ATTENDED IEP	3,969 60.8%	1,328 20.3%	1,233 18.9%	6,530 100%
MET WITH STAFF	669 45.6%	452 30.8%	345 23.5%	1,466 100%
NO DATA	87 49.7%	47 26.9%	41 23.4%	175 100%
Total	4,725 57.8%	1,827 22.4%	1,619 19.8%	8,171 100%

Pearson chi2(4) = 124.3825 Pr = 0.000

Table 5B: School Level

	Elementary Pre-K - Grade 5	Middle Grade 6 - 8	High Grade 9 - PG	Total
ATTENDED IEP	3,969 84.0%	1,328 72.7%	1,233 76.2%	6,530 79.9%
MET WITH STAFF	669 14.2%	452 24.7%	345 21.3%	1,466 17.9%
NO DATA	87 1.8%	47 2.6%	41 2.5%	175 2.1%
Total	4,725 100%	1,827 100%	1,619 100%	8,171 100%

Pearson chi2(4) = 124.3825 Pr = **0.000**

Table 6A: IEP Meeting Type

	Annual	Initial	Total
ATTENDED IEP	5,420 83.0%	1,112 17.0%	6,532 100%
MET WITH STAFF	1,354 92.4%	112 7.6%	1,466 100%
NO DATA	153 87.4%	22 12.6%	175 100%
Total	6,927 84.8%	1,246 15.3%	8,173 100%

Pearson chi2(2) = 82.5874 Pr = **0.000**

Table 6B: IEP Meeting Type

	Annual	Initial	Total
ATTENDED IEP	5,420 78.2%	1,112 89.3%	6,532 79.9%
MET WITH STAFF	1,354 19.6%	112 9.0%	1,466 17.9%
NO DATA	153 2.2%	22 1.8%	175 2.1%
Total	6,927 100%	1,246 100%	8,173 100%

Pearson chi2(2) = 82.5874 Pr = **0.000**

Table 7A: Local District

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Y	Total
ATTENDED	1,217	856	858	836	774	524	443	662	3	6,173
IEP	19.7%	13.9%	13.9%	13.5%	12.5%	8.5%	7.2%	10.7%	0.1%	100%
MET WITH	289	234	188	135	168	134	115	181	0	1,444
STAFF	20.0%	16.2%	13.0%	9.4%	11.6%	9.3%	8.0%	12.5%	0.0%	100%
NO DATA	25	19	23	21	20	17	17	22	0	164
	15.2%	11.6%	14.0%	12.8%	12.2%	10.4%	10.4%	13.4%	0.0%	100%
Total	1,531	1,109	1,069	992	962	675	575	865	3	7,781
	19.7%	14.3%	13.7%	12.8%	12.4%	8.7%	7.4%	11.1%	0.0%	100%

Pearson chi2(16) = 34.0572 Pr = **0.005**

Table 7B: Local District

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Y	Total
ATTENDED	1,217	856	858	836	774	524	443	662	3	6,173
IEP	79.5%	77.2%	80.3%	84.3%	80.5%	77.6%	77.0%	76.5%	100%	79.3%
MET WITH	289	234	188	135	168	134	115	181	0	1,444
STAFF	18.9%	21.1%	17.5%	13.6%	17.5%	19.9%	20.0%	20.9%	0.0%	18.6%
NO DATA	25	19	23	21	20	17	17	22	0	164
	1.6%	1.7%	2.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.5%	3.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.1%
Total	1,531	1,109	1,069	992	962	675	575	865	3	7,781
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Pearson chi2(16) = 34.0572 Pr = **0.005**

(Dropping the “Y” district from the analysis still produces a chi2(14) = 33.2652, Pr = 0.003)

Attachment B: Parent Participation Instrument

Office of the Independent Monitor

LRE

Page 1

District ID#	Last Name	First Name	Birthday	Grade	Current IEP Date	IEP Date if different:
				12	4/28/2005	

Attend School: _____ Loc Code: _____ Local District: 1

IEP Meeting Location: _____

Page 4

Eligibility: MDV _____ Eligibility if different: _____

Page 5

Performance area	Wk	Freq	Total	Month	Freq	Total	Minutes outside Gen Ed
1	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			
2	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			
3	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			
4	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			
5	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			
6	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			
7	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			

Page 3

Gen Ed RSP SDC (Minutes per week): _____ DIS Gen Ed/Inclusion % of time: _____

Page 12

1. # of District Policy Total Instructional Minutes: _____ 2. # of Total Instructional Minutes School Report: _____

3. # of SPED Minutes from IEP: _____ 4. # of SPED Minutes from Schedule: _____

5. Percent of Time in SPED IEP Analysis: _____ 6. Percent of Time in SPED Schedule Analysis: _____

SIS Percent of Time: _____ Wollongt Percent of Time: _____

Parent Participation

Student in PP	Attended IEP	Attended IEP Different	Recorded Contacts	Date
1	NO DATA		Method 1: Notification Form	
Page 10	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent participated (if checked Stop) <input type="checkbox"/> Parent unable to attend, reviewed with staff <input type="checkbox"/> Parent consents to IEP Date of consent: _____		Method 2: _____ Who: _____	
Page 11	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent present		Method 3: _____ Who: _____	
Notification Form Present <input type="checkbox"/>			Evidence to convince: Yes/No _____	
1. <input type="checkbox"/> I intend, however, proceed (if checked indicate Yes) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> I cannot attend, send copy 3. <input type="checkbox"/> I intend, if unable, reschedule/phone conf. (if checked look for Contacts) 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Not convenient, reschedule			Notes: _____	

Attachment C: Confidence Intervals

Confidence Intervals for Parent Participation Results

Table 11

	N	p	Min	Max
Without Recorded Attempts	181	0.2227	16.2%	28.3%
With Recorded Attempts	42	0.1562	4.6%	26.6%

Table 12 (No Evidence to Convince %)

	N	p	Min	Max
Non-Welligent	42	0.1793	6.3%	29.5%
Welligent	181	0.2129	15.3%	27.3%

Table 13: District Level (No Evidence to Convince %)

	N	p	Min	Max
1	33	0.1543	3.1%	27.8%
2	29	0.2119	6.3%	36.1%
3	42	0.2948	15.7%	43.3%
4	20	0.1684	0.4%	33.2%
5	27	0.2277	7.0%	38.6%
6	27	0.2669	10.0%	43.4%
7	18	0.1719	0.0%	34.6%
8	27	0.1853	3.9%	33.2%

Table 14: School Level (No Evidence to Convince %)

	N	p	Min	Max
Elementary	79	0.1584	7.8%	23.9%
Middle	62	0.2306	12.6%	33.5%
High	71	0.2926	18.7%	39.8%
Spec Centers	11	0.1727	0.0%	39.6%