

***Office of the Independent Monitor***  
Report on the Monitoring of the District's Rate of Due Process Filings and  
Comprehensive Plan to Reduce Due Process Filings

The Modified Consent Decree requires the Independent Monitor (IM) to “analyze the number of due process filings and, if necessary, take appropriate actions in this area.” During the 2004-2005 school year, the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) conducted an analysis of the District's due process filings and obtained input from the District and the plaintiffs. As a result, the IM decided to take action in this area by requiring the District to develop a plan to reduce due process filings and stated that over the course of the next two years, the OIM would monitor the “implementation of the plan, the District's rate of due process filings and conduct research on the causes and resolutions of the findings.”

In 2005, the LAUSD acknowledged that its rate of due process filings was disproportionately high. Data collected by the Independent Monitor revealed that while the District had 12% of the California's student enrollment, it had one-third of the state's due process filings. The rate of filings per student was higher in LAUSD than all other large urban school districts in California and higher than a comparative sample nationally, with the exception of New York Public Schools. In order to address the high rate of filings, LAUSD developed the Comprehensive Plan to Reduce Due Process Filings.

The high number of filings in LAUSD is a recent phenomenon. Filings roughly doubled in number from the 1999-2000 to the 2000-2001 school years. The Office of Independent Monitor reviewed the sources of due process filings from the 1999-2000 and the 2003-2004 school years but could not identify any major differences between the characteristics of filings in the two years that might explain the dramatic increase. The review did reveal that several of the explanations provided by the District for the increase of filings, such as an “increase” in the number of filings by attorneys, had limited validity. The review also revealed that the majority of filings derived from disputes over service provision or placements that were amenable to resolution at the school level. In addition, the study found that in a vast majority of cases, parents prevailed on the issues that had provoked the dispute prior to reaching the formal hearing stage. This finding raised questions about the rationale behind the denial of a parent's request at the school level, particularly since a due process request was typically filed after the IEP team meeting had concluded.

A primary goal of the due process plan was to reduce the number of formal due process filings by providing school-level IEP teams with a re-affirmation of their authority to make decisions about service provision, placement, etc. A second goal was to ensure that they receive additional expertise when they required assistance to make such decisions. A third goal was to reduce the number of disputes by providing for a more collaborative IEP team process. Activities to promote all three goals were integrated into the four stages of the Plan.

This report contains the following:

1. Comparative filing rates from 1999-2000 to 2004-2005

2. The findings from a study of the sources and results of due process filings and informal dispute resolutions in 2004-2005 school year
3. The results of a review of the District's evidence of completion of activities in the Comprehensive Due Process Plan.
4. Results of a school level survey of administrator awareness of specific elements of the Comprehensive Due Process Plan

## **Comparative Filing Rates**

### California and LAUSD

From December 2005 to January 2006, my office collected data on due process filing rates for comparison districts in California (See Attachment A). The districts selected were Long Beach, Oakland, Sacramento, San Diego and San Francisco. We collected data from the California Department of Education, Education Demographics Unit and the Special Education Hearing Office.

Chart A.1 displays the overall enrollment and special education enrollment for selected districts. Currently, LAUSD's enrollment makes up 11.7% of the overall California enrollment and 12.2% of the state's special education enrollment.

Chart A.2 displays the number of due process filings by year in each California school district and the percentage change in the number of due process filings by year. In 2000-2001, LAUSD experienced a 90% increase in the number of filings, from 492 to 934. Over the past four years, the District has continued to experience increases in the number of due process filings to the current figure of approximately 1200 filings. However, the rate of increase has stabilized. Other districts have experienced larger percentage increases and decreases over the past five years due to the smaller number of filings they experience on an annual basis.

Chart A.3 displays the number of special education students per due process filing. In 2004-2005, LAUSD had the highest rate of students per filing, with 1 filing for every 71 students. San Francisco had the second highest rate of students per filing, with 1 filing for every 126 students. Sacramento had the lowest rate of filings, with 1 filing for every 447 students. Overall, in the state of California there was 1 filing for every 181 students. With LAUSD removed from state totals, there was 1 filing for every 232 students. Based on this data, it appears that the rate of filings continues to be disproportionately high in comparison to state figures and other large school districts' figures in California.

In addition, we continue to find considerable variation in the number of due process filings within local districts. In 2003-2004, the local districts with the highest rates of filings were A, C and D. After the 2003-2004 school year, the Districts shifted from 11 to 8 local districts. In 2004-2005, filings were concentrated in local districts 1, 3 and 4 (Chart A.4). The geographic areas of these districts roughly correspond to the three local districts with the highest rates of due process filings in 2003-04. Local District 3 ranked first with one filing for every 30 students. Local District 1 had a one filing for every 51 students. Local District 4 had one filing for every 69 students. The combined figure including requests for informal dispute resolution reveals that

Local District 3 had one request for dispute resolution for every 18 students. Local District 1 had one request for every 27 students.

On the other end of the spectrum, Local District 5 had one filing for every 209 students and Local District 6 had one filing for every 179 students. Their rates of dispute resolution request were similarly low with Local District 6 having one request for every 110 students and Local District 5 having one request for every 90 students.

Using partial year data from March 2005-2006, local districts 1, 3, and 4 are maintaining their status as the highest filing local districts and 5 and 6 the lowest. Because this data is incomplete, increases in the number of filings over the remainder of the school year may change these rankings. Clearly, there are factors driving the high rates of dispute resolution requests in local districts 1, 3, and 4 and the comparatively low rates in 5 and 6. The District would be well advised to explore this variation and determine its causes.

As was the case with our initial analysis, the primary eligibilities associated with filings in both 2004-2005 and through March 2005-2006 were autism and specific learning disability (SLD). Children with autism were associated with one third of all filings in LAUSD. Students with SLD were associated with nearly one quarter of all filings. Another 20% derived from the categories of other health impaired (OHI), mental retardation (MR) and speech and language impairment (SLI) (Chart A.5).

### National Comparison Districts

From December 2005 to January 2006, the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) collected data on due process filing rates for comparison districts and states nationwide for the school years 2002-2003, 2003-2004, and 2004-2005. Previously, the OIM had collected data for the same states and districts for the 1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2002-2002 school years (See Attachment B). Districts were selected on the basis of size, percentage of Latino students and percentage of second language learners. For each district selected, the OIM also selected its corresponding state for making comparisons, with the exception of the statewide school district of Hawaii. Data was collected from the Los Angeles Unified School District and California; Baltimore and Maryland; Chicago and Illinois; Clark County and Nevada; Dallas, Houston and Texas; New York City and New York State; Miami-Dade County and Florida; and Hawaii.

Three data elements were collected: number of due process filings, special education enrollment and general education enrollment. Chart B.1 presents data on filings by year and the percentage of the state's total filings constituted by the filings in a school district. Chart B.2 presents the total enrollment for each school district and state and the percentage that the enrollment represents of the state's total enrollment. Chart B.3 presents the special education enrollment for each district and state.

Chart B.4 presents data on the number of special education students per due process filing. As was the case in the initial analysis, LAUSD has the second-highest rate of filings among the comparison districts and states. The rate of filings has increased each year. In 1999-2000,

LAUSD had one filing for every 166 students. In our initial analysis of data from 2002-2003, the rate of students per filing was 1 for every 80 students. It is now one filing for every 71 students.

### Due Process Study

In the initial review of the due process filings in LAUSD, the OIM drew representative samples of 100 due process filings from 1999-2000 and 100 filings from 2003-2004. The goal was to identify any trends in the causes and resolutions of filings that could be driving the high rate of filings in LAUSD. Since the OIM was unable to locate files for some students and not all files contained information on resolutions, the final samples consisted of 73 files from 2000-2001 and 56 files from 2003-2004. This review revealed that both the increase in filings in 2000-2001 and the maintenance of this high rate were associated with disagreements over services and placements. In most cases, at the mediation level, the District provided parents who had filed for due process with the services or placements they had requested. This finding, in combination with information that the District was requiring IEP teams to inform parents that they would need to file for due process in order to acquire some NPS placements or NPA services, indicated that one source of the high rate of filings was the lack of discretion of school-level IEP teams over the provision of placement and services. Since the district conceded most of the requests made by parents prior to a hearing, the existing system appeared to be counter-productive.

In light of the high number and the continuing increase in filings in LAUSD, the OIM reviewed a random sample of 100 due process filings from 2004-2005 and a random sample of 100 informal dispute resolutions from the 2004-2005 school year in the fall of 2005. This review had four goals. The first was once again to identify any trends in the causes and resolutions of filings that could be driving the high rate of filings. Second, we sought to determine if there were any changes in factors associated with the causes and resolutions of filings between 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. Third was to determine if there was any difference between the causes and resolutions of due process filings and informal dispute resolutions. Fourth was to determine whether the implementation of the District's plan to reduce due process filings and the large-scale implementation in the 2003-2004 school year of the informal dispute resolution process had any effect on the types of disagreements addressed.

Using an instrument developed by the OIM (See attachment C), each file was closely reviewed to collect data associated with sources of filings and their results. The instrument was initially piloted by the OIM with twenty-five files. Following the pilot, OIM staff collected and reviewed the remaining files. To ensure inter-rater reliability, each file was reviewed by two different analysts and then reviewed a third time by OIM staff to determine consistency. Completed instruments were also reviewed by OIM staff to determine the validity of the data. For example, files from school years outside of the scope of the study were removed from the sample. Data was reviewed three times to ensure accuracy in the area of "Categories" and to ensure inter-rater reliability in the assessment of the results of resolutions. Guidelines for assessment of requests and resolutions were defined as follows: "Plaintiffs Prevailed" when there was evidence of an equal or nearly equal correspondence between a request and resolution or when the resolution exceeded the amount of service provided for in the student's previous IEP. Parents also prevailed in those cases where the District sought to reduce a service and the parent received either the identical amount of service or an additional amount. "District Prevailed" when there

was evidence that the parent request was denied. “Neither Prevailed” when there was evidence of a compromise resolution. For example, a common compromise was when a request for a service by a parent resulted in an assessment plan. These definitions were maintained to promote consistency in analysis and minimize judgment.

Chart A presents the sample of filings by type of resolution. Because not all files could be located, 90 formal filings and 92 informal filings were reviewed. 88% of formal filings were resolved or resulted in an interim agreement. For filings that were still in process, 4 indicated that no resolution was achieved. For an additional 7, there was no information on resolution. For informal dispute resolution, 65% of the files contained evidence of a resolution. 45% contained evidence of no resolution or had no information on a resolution. It is possible that some of these filings went on to a formal filing.

**Chart A: Number and Percentages of Informal and Formal Filings by Resolution Status**

		<b>Interim Agreement</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>No Resolution</b>	<b>No Info</b>	<b>Total</b>
Formal	N	5	74	4	7	90
	%	5.56	82.22	4.44	7.78	100
Informal	N	0	60	11	21	92
	%	0	65.22	11.96	22.83	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>182</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>73.63</b>	<b>8.24</b>	<b>15.38</b>	<b>100</b>

Pearson chi2(3) = 16.7094 Pr = **0.001**

Chart B presents the percentage of informal/formal filings by eligibility. Of the 182 files reviewed, 172 contained information on eligibility. The data indicates that the eligibility categories resulting in filings and informal dispute resolutions (IDR) were similar. Autism produced approximately 33% of due process filings and IDRs. Specific learning disability was ranked second with 28% of due process filings and IDRs.

**Chart B: Number and Percentages of Informal/Formal Filings by Eligibility**

<b>Eligibility</b>		<b>Formal</b>	<b>Informal</b>	<b>Total</b>
AUT	N	23	33	56
	%	30.7	34.0	32.6
DD	N	1	3	4
	%	1.3	3.1	2.3
DEA	N	1	0	1
	%	1.3	0.0	0.6
ED	N	4	2	6
	%	5.3	2.1	3.5
HOH	N	0	1	1
	%	0.0	1.0	0.6
MDH	N	1	0	1
	%	1.3	0.0	0.6
MDO	N	1	0	1
	%	1.3	0.0	0.6
MR	N	7	7	14
	%	9.3	7.2	8.1
OHI	N	8	13	21
	%	10.7	13.4	12.2
OI	N	0	2	2
	%	0.0	2.1	1.2
SLD	N	22	26	48
	%	29.3	26.8	27.9
SLI	N	7	9	16
	%	9.3	9.3	9.3
VI	N	0	1	1
	%	0.0	1.0	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>172</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Pearson  
chi2(12) =  
9.5688 Pr =  
0.654

Chart C focuses on the petitioner. In the 186 files that contained evidence of a petitioner, the District was the petitioner in one formal due process filing.

**Chart C: Number and Percentages of Informal/Formal Filings by Petitioner**

		<b>District</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>Total</b>
Formal	N	1	91	92
	%	1.1	98.9	100.0
Informal	N	0	94	94
	%	0.0	100.0	100.0
Total	N	1	185	186
	%	0.5	99.5	100.0

Pearson  $\chi^2(2) = 1.0273$  Pr = 0.311

Chart D provides data on filings by cause. Files were reviewed to determine the cause based on the issue identified by the school or the parent. In most cases, the cause was identified on the IEP document, on the District’s form requesting for due process filing or IDR, or in a letter sent by the parent or their representative to school or district officials. The causes of filings appear to be consistent between formal and informal filings, with the exceptions of reimbursement and compensatory education services. A higher percentage of these categories appeared as causes of due process than informal filings. The five most common categories for causes of filings and IDRs were school placement (NPA or another public school), related service provider (NPA or school provider or preference for individual provider), NPA frequency (number of service times), assessment (for eligibility for special education or specific services) and program placement (type of program either public or private).

**Chart D: Number and Percentages of Informal/Formal Filings by Cause (n=449)**

*Note: A single filing may have multiple causes*

		<b>Formal</b>	<b>Informal</b>	<b>Total</b>
Procedural Error	N	9	0	9
	%	3.4	0.0	2.0
Assessment	N	24	21	45
	%	8.9	11.7	10.0
Identification	N	15	13	28
	%	5.6	7.2	6.2
Reimbursement	N	21	5	26
	%	7.8	2.8	5.8
School Placement	N	35	24	59
	%	13.0	13.3	13.1
Program Placement	N	23	18	41
	%	8.6	10.0	9.1
Retention / expulsion	N	1	0	1
	%	0.4	0.0	0.2
Behavior support asst	N	15	18	33
	%	5.6	10.0	7.4
Related service provider	N	31	24	55
	%	11.5	13.3	12.3
NPA Frequency	N	27	19	46
	%	10.0	10.6	10.2
ESY	N	8	4	12
	%	3.0	2.2	2.7
Resource	N	6	4	10
	%	2.2	2.2	2.2
Compensatory services	N	20	6	26
	%	7.4	3.3	5.8
TSA / other asst	N	8	10	18
	%	3.0	5.6	4.0
Transportation	N	2	0	2
	%	0.7	0.0	0.5
ED Therapy	N	11	6	17
	%	4.1	3.3	3.8
Unilateral revocation	N	4	3	7
	%	1.5	1.7	1.6
No Info	N	9	5	14
	%	3.4	2.8	3.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>449</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Pearson chi2(17) = 22.9137 Pr = 0.152



As noted above, reviewers analyzed files to determine the number and nature of requests per filing. Some filings contained one request. Other filings contained multiple requests. Each file was analyzed to determine whether the request resulted in a resolution favorable to the District, the parent, or neither. Chart E displays the results of the analysis of the resolutions. 68% of the requests in formal filings resulted in a resolution that favored the parent. 67% of the requests in IDRs resulted in a resolution that favored the parent. 20% of the requests in formal filings resulted in a resolution that favored neither. 22% of the requests in IDRs resulted in a resolution that favored neither. 13% of the requests in formal filings resulted in a resolution that favored the District. 10% of the requests in informal filings resulted in a resolution that favored the parents. These findings indicate that two thirds of parent requests in both informal and formal disputes resulted in resolutions that favor the parents. Just over 20% resulted in a compromise resolution. Only 12% of resolutions results were favorable to the position by the District after the conclusion of the IEP meeting that provoked the dispute. Given this data, there are legitimate questions as to why the District failed to pursue a compromise at the IEP meeting level or accede to the parent request in the vast majority of cases.

**Chart E: Number and Percentage of Requests Resulting in a Resolution of the District, Parent, or Neither**

*Note: A single filing may have multiple requests.*

		District	Parent	Neither	Total
Formal	N	28	150	43	221
	%	12.7	67.9	19.5	100.0
Informal	N	10	66	27	103
	%	9.7	64.1	26.2	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>324</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Pearson chi2(2) = 2.1615 Pr = 0.339

### Comprehensive Due Process Plan Evidence of Completion Review

Over the past year, the OIM has monitored the implementation of the Due Process Plan by requesting evidence of completion of plan activities. The first request was made in August 2005 and covered all activities scheduled for completion through June 2005. The second request was made in January 2006 and covered activities scheduled for completion through December 2005. Overall, the District provided evidence of activities completed.

### Results from the Survey of School Administrators on the Implementation of the Comprehensive Plan to Reduce Due Process Filings

During May 2005, we conducted a District wide telephone survey of all school administrators with special education responsibilities to monitor the implementation of the District's Comprehensive Plan to Reduce Due Process Filings. The survey consisted of seven questions to gauge the implementation of a few critical elements within the Plan, including whether school

administrators received a copy of the Plan to whether they had attended trainings and walk-in clinics on handling IEP disputes. The last two questions were designed to gauge if the District’s efforts to re-affirm the administrators of their authority to resolve IEP disputes and to identify the issues administrators did not feel they could resolve without referring to other District personnel.

Schools were asked the following questions:

1. Have you participated in an IEP that led to a due process filing?
2. Have you participated in an IEP that led to an informal dispute resolution?
3. Have you attended any District sponsored trainings on dispute resolution?
4. Have you attended any District sponsored walk-in clinics for handling potential disputes?
5. Did you receive a copy of the District’s Comprehensive Plan to Reduce Due Process Filings?
6. Do you feel you have the authority to resolve all IEP disputes?
7. Under what circumstances would you refer an IEP dispute to local district, support unit, or central office personnel? (This question was only asked if the response to question 6 was “no”)

A total 658 schools participated in the survey. The results were disaggregated by local district and school level (See Attachment D). Tables 1-6 show the overall results of the survey by item. During the 2005-2006 school year, 42% of schools reported having participated in an IEP that led to a due process filing and 47% reported participating in an IEP that led to an informal dispute resolution. 68% of administrators reported having participated in a District sponsored training and 29% have attended a walk-in clinic on handling IEP disputes. When asked if they received a copy of the Plan, two-thirds reported having received a copy. When asked whether they have the authority to resolve IEP disputes, 42% of school administrators responded they did. The reported reasons for deferring IEP disputes to local district, support units, and/or central office personnel included when disputes arose over non-public school placement and non-public service providers, compensatory services, provision of services such as speech and language services, and additional adult assistants (Table 7).

**Table 1. Participation in IEP Meeting that Led to Due Process, by All Schools**

Q12. Have you participated in an IEP meeting that led to a due process filing?	N	%
No	377	57.3
Yes	276	42.0
Don't Know	5	0.8
Total	658	100.0

**Table 2. Participation in IEP Meeting that Led to an Informal Dispute Resolution, by All Schools**

Q13. Have you participated in an IEP meeting that led to informal dispute resolution?	N	%
No	339	51.5
Yes	311	47.3
Don't Know	8	1.2
Total	658	100.0

**Table 3. Participation in Trainings to Resolve IEP Disputes, by All Schools**

Q14. Have you participated in any training seminars in IEP dispute resolution?	N	%
No	196	29.8
Yes	453	68.8
Don't Know	9	1.4
Total	658	100.0

**Table 4. Participation in Walk-in Clinic on Handling IEP Disputes, by All Schools**

Q15. Have you attended a district-sponsored walk-in clinic on handling potential IEP disputes?	N	%
No	463	70.4
Yes	190	28.9
Don't Know	5	0.8
Total	658	100.0

**Table 5. Percent of Schools that Received a Copy of the Plan, by All Schools**

Q16. Have you received a copy of the LAUSD Comprehensive Plan for due process?	N	%
No	99	15.1
Yes	437	66.4
Don't Know	122	18.5
Total	658	100.0

**Table 6. Percent of Schools that Report they have Authority to Resolve All IEP Disputes, By All Schools**

Q17. Does your school have the authority to resolve all IEP disputes with parents at your school site?	N	%
No	346	52.6
Yes	273	41.5
Don't Know	39	5.9
Total	658	100.0

**Table 7 Circumstances for Referring Disputes by Category**

Due Process comments	N	%
<b>Services (speech, language, physical therapy)</b>	62	32.3
<b>NPA services</b>	17	8.9
<b>Placement issues (NPS)</b>	91	47.4
<b>AAA services</b>	22	11.5
Total	192	100

When the findings are disaggregated by local districts, the results support other District data that shows due process filings are influenced by local district variables. Administrators in Local District 3 reported having participated in IEPs that led to due process filings with the highest frequency (59%), while Local District 6 administrators reported the lowest rate (27.9%) (Table 8). Local Districts 1 and 3 reported participating in IEPs that led to IDR with the highest frequency (63.2% and 60.2%, respectively), with Local District 6 (25.6%) and Local District 7 (26.8%) participating with the least frequency (Table 9). When asked if they have the authority to resolve disputes, administrators in Local District 8 reported having this authority with the most frequency (53.3%) while Local District 1 and 3 reported having this authority with the lowest frequency (37.7% and 37.6%, respectively) (Table 10).

**Table 8. Participation in IEP Meeting that Led to Due Process, by Local District**

Q12. IEP Meeting that led to a Due Process Filing					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	2.6%	48.3%	49.1%	100.0%	114
2	0.0%	62.4%	37.6%	100.0%	93
3	1.1%	39.8%	59.1%	100.0%	93
4	0.0%	53.4%	46.6%	100.0%	103
5	0.0%	64.2%	35.8%	100.0%	81
6	2.3%	69.8%	27.9%	100.0%	43
7	0.0%	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%	56
8	0.0%	69.3%	30.7%	100.0%	75
Total	0.8%	57.3%	42.0%	100.0%	658

**Table 9. Participation in IEP Meeting that Led to an Informal Dispute Resolution, by Local District**

Q13. IEP Meeting that led to a Dispute Resolution					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	0.9%	36.0%	63.2%	100.0%	114
2	2.2%	47.3%	50.5%	100.0%	93
3	2.2%	37.6%	60.2%	100.0%	93
4	1.9%	49.5%	48.5%	100.0%	103
5	0.0%	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%	81
6	2.3%	72.1%	25.6%	100.0%	43
7	0.0%	73.2%	26.8%	100.0%	56
8	0.0%	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%	75
Total	1.2%	51.5%	47.3%	100.0%	658

Table 10. Percent of Schools that Report they have Authority to Resolve All IEP Disputes, by Local District

Q17. Authority to Resolve all IEP Disputes					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	5.3%	57.0%	37.7%	100.0%	114
2	4.3%	54.8%	40.9%	100.0%	93
3	8.6%	53.8%	37.6%	100.0%	93
4	2.9%	57.3%	39.8%	100.0%	103
5	7.4%	53.1%	39.5%	100.0%	81
6	7.0%	53.5%	39.5%	100.0%	43
7	5.4%	46.4%	48.2%	100.0%	56
8	8.0%	38.7%	53.3%	100.0%	75
Total	5.9%	52.6%	41.5%	100.0%	658

### Implications

The District continues to demonstrate a disproportionately high number of due process filings when compared to school districts within California and nationally. It is evident that these filings are driven by multiple variables that must be addressed through a comprehensive approach. For example, the District needs to address the number of qualified speech providers to reduce filings related to compensatory services for speech and language services. In addition, the district must review its policies and procedures for a number of issues to clarify misunderstandings and practices in the field. This is particularly relevant to decisions of placements, including non-public school placement and additional adult assistants. It is also evident that many administrators do not feel they have the authority to resolve all IEP disputes. The District needs to continue to clearly re-affirm school administrators of their authority to resolve all IEP disputes consistent with District policies and procedure.

Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

## Due Process Comparison

Chart A.1

## Enrollment in California Public Schools

	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total
State of California	5,951,612		6,050,895		6,147,375		6,244,403		6,298,774		6,322,167	
Long Beach	91,465	1.54%	93,694	1.55%	96,488	1.57%	97,212	1.56%	97,560	1.55%	96,319	1.52%
LAUSD	710,007	11.93%	721,346	11.92%	735,058	11.96%	746,852	11.96%	747,009	11.86%	741,367	11.73%
Oakland	55,051	0.92%	54,863	0.91%	53,545	0.87%	52,501	0.84%	50,437	0.80%	49,214	0.78%
Sacramento	51,898	0.87%	52,734	0.87%	53,418	0.87%	52,850	0.85%	52,103	0.83%	51,420	0.81%
San Diego	140,743	2.36%	141,804	2.34%	141,599	2.30%	140,753	2.25%	137,960	2.19%	134,709	2.13%
San Francisco	60,896	1.02%	59,979	0.99%	58,566	0.95%	58,216	0.93%	57,805	0.92%	57,144	0.90%

## Special Education Enrollment

	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total
State of California	641,191		650,719		663,220		675,322		681,980		681,969	
Long Beach	6,663	1.04%	7,022	1.08%	7,381	1.11%	7,660	1.13%	7,808	1.14%	7,720	1.13%
LAUSD	81,739	12.75%	83,033	12.76%	85,768	12.93%	85,529	12.66%	85,441	12.53%	83,207	12.20%
Oakland	5,674	0.88%	5,777	0.89%	5,569	0.84%	5,690	0.84%	5,511	0.81%	5,279	0.77%
Sacramento	5,881	0.92%	6,086	0.94%	6,322	0.95%	6,460	0.96%	6,387	0.94%	6,262	0.92%
San Diego	14,912	2.33%	15,658	2.41%	16,637	2.51%	17,011	2.52%	17,313	2.54%	16,249	2.38%
San Francisco	6,860	1.07%	6,550	1.01%	6,936	1.05%	6,755	1.00%	7,108	1.04%	7,041	1.03%

Source: California Department of  
Education  
Educational Demographics Unit  
Special Education Hearing Office

Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Due Process Comparison

Chart A.2

Due Process Filings

	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total
State of California	2,105		2,556		3,099		3,209		3,367		3,763	
Long Beach	34	1.62%	51	2.00%	38	1.23%	56	1.75%	49	1.46%	50	1.33%
LAUSD	492	23.37%	934	36.54%	1,048	33.82%	1,067	33.25%	1,153	34.24%	1,177	31.28%
Oakland	15	0.71%	13	0.51%	20	0.65%	17	0.53%	21	0.62%	31	0.82%
Sacramento	13	0.62%	13	0.51%	21	0.68%	21	0.65%	14	0.42%	14	0.37%
San Diego	77	3.66%	64	2.50%	89	2.87%	103	3.21%	98	2.91%	122	3.24%
San Francisco	46	2.19%	43	1.68%	61	1.97%	52	1.62%	75	2.23%	56	1.49%

% Increase in Due Process Filings

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
State of California	15.98%	21.43%	21.24%	3.55%	4.92%	11.76%
Long Beach	126.67%	50.00%	-25.49%	47.37%	-12.50%	2.04%
LAUSD	25.83%	89.84%	12.21%	1.81%	8.06%	2.08%
Oakland	0.00%	-13.33%	53.85%	-15.00%	23.53%	47.62%
Sacramento	225.00%	0.00%	61.54%	0.00%	-33.33%	0.00%
San Diego	4.05%	-16.88%	39.06%	15.73%	-4.85%	24.49%
San Francisco	-17.86%	-6.52%	41.86%	-14.75%	44.23%	-25.33%

Source: California Department of Education  
Educational Demographics Unit  
Special Education Hearing Office



Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Due Process Comparison

Chart A.3

LAUSD Removed from State Totals

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Number of Filings	1,613	1,622	2,051	2,142	2,214	2,586
Percent Increase	13.27%	0.56%	26.45%	4.44%	3.36%	16.80%

Number of Special Education Students per Due Process Filing

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
State of California	304.6	254.6	214.0	210.4	202.5	181.2
Long Beach	196.0	137.7	194.2	136.8	159.3	154.4
LAUSD	166.1	88.9	81.8	80.2	74.1	70.7
Oakland	378.3	444.4	278.5	334.7	262.4	170.3
Sacramento	452.4	468.2	301.0	307.6	456.2	447.3
San Diego	193.7	244.7	186.9	165.2	176.7	133.2
San Francisco	149.1	152.3	113.7	129.9	94.8	125.7

LAUSD Removed from State Totals

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Number of Students per Filing	346.8	350.0	281.5	275.3	269.4	231.5

Source: California Department of  
Education  
Educational Demographics Unit  
Special Education Hearing Office

Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Dispute Resolution Request

Chart A.4

2004-05

Local District	# of Special Education Students	# of Requests for Dispute Resolution Meeting	% of Requests for Dispute Resolution Meeting	Ratio of Requests for Dispute Resolution Meeting	# of State Due Process Filings	% of State Due Process Filings	Ratio of State Due Process Filings	# of Requests for State Hearing	# of Requests for Informal Dispute	# of Requests for Informal	# of Requests for State Mediation
Blank		3						3			
1	13,857	507	3.66%	27.3	272	1.96%	50.9	224	228	7	48
2	11,224	272	2.42%	41.3	143	1.27%	78.5	115	127	2	28
3	10,780	584	5.42%	18.5	356	3.30%	30.3	286	224	4	70
4	9,518	268	2.82%	35.5	138	1.45%	69.0	116	130	0	22
5	9,824	109	1.11%	90.1	47	0.48%	209.0	33	62	0	14
6	6,295	57	0.91%	110.4	35	0.56%	179.9	27	22	0	8
7	7,534	109	1.45%	69.1	60	0.80%	125.6	52	47	2	8
8	9,409	207	2.20%	45.5	96	1.02%	98.0	77	107	4	19

2005-06 (July 1, 2005 thru March 30, 2006)

Local District	# of Special Education Students	# of Requests for Dispute Resolution Meeting	% of Requests for Dispute Resolution Meeting	Ratio of Requests for Dispute Resolution Meeting	# of State Due Process Filings	% of State Due Process Filings	Ratio of State Due Process Filings	# of Requests for State Hearing	# of Requests for Informal Dispute	# of Requests for Informal	# of Requests for State Mediation
Blank		3						2			1
1	13,770	222	1.61%	62.0	189	1.37%	72.9	177	33	0	12
2	11,122	135	1.21%	82.4	125	1.12%	89.0	115	10	0	10
3	10,526	236	2.24%	44.6	215	2.04%	49.0	194	21	0	21
4	9,516	135	1.42%	70.5	119	1.25%	80.0	109	16	0	10
5	9,897	39	0.39%	253.8	32	0.32%	309.3	30	7	0	2
6	6,282	32	0.51%	196.3	28	0.45%	224.4	25	4	0	3
7	7,474	47	0.63%	159.0	41	0.55%	182.3	40	6	0	1
8	9,344	68	0.73%	137.4	63	0.67%	148.3	59	5	0	4

Urban School District Comparison of Due Process Filings

Chart B.1

	Due Process Filings											
	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total
California	2,150		2,556		3,099		3,209		3,367		3,763	
LAUSD	492	22.88%	934	36.54%	1,048	33.82%	1,067	33.25%	1,153	34.24%	1,177	31.28%
Maryland	587		541		499		482		449		429	
Baltimore	154	26.24%	121	22.37%	128	25.65%	78	16.18%	53	11.80%	34	7.93%
Illinois	524		493		459		477		492		429	
Chicago	180	34.35%	142	28.80%	118	25.71%	121	25.37%	156	31.71%	169	39.39%
Nevada	65		47		54		57		61		52	
Clark County (Las Vegas)	49	75.38%	36	76.60%	49	90.74%	39	68.42%	44	72.13%	35	67.31%
Texas	361		433		379		436		414		398	
Dallas	7	1.94%	5	1.15%	5	1.32%	3	0.69%	4	0.97%	6	1.51%
Houston	NA		25	5.77%	24	6.33%	23	5.28%	26	6.28%	11	2.76%
New York	NA		NA		NA		4,542		4,699		5,422	
New York City	3,349		3,283		3,581		3,905	85.98%	4,053	86.25%	NA	
Florida	205		187		181		221		206		186	
Miami-Dade	38	18.54%	42	22.46%	47	25.97%	47	21.27%	47	22.82%	56	30.11%
Hawaii	131	100.00%	131	100.00%	174	100.00%	176	100.00%	171	100.00%	250	100.00%

Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Urban School District Comparison of Due Process Filings

Chart B.2

Total Enrollment

	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total
California	5,951,612		6,050,895		6,147,375		6,244,403		6,298,774		6,322,167	
LAUSD	710,007	11.93%	721,346	11.92%	735,058	11.96%	746,852	11.96%	747,009	11.86%	741,367	11.73%
Maryland	846,582		852,920		860,640		866,743		869,113		865,561	
Baltimore	103,000	12.17%	98,226	11.52%	95,475	11.09%	94,031	10.85%	91,738	10.56%	88,401	10.21%
Illinois	2,018,316		2,051,021		2,071,391		2,084,187		2,100,961		2,097,045	
Chicago	431,750	21.39%	435,470	21.23%	437,618	21.13%	438,589	21.04%	420,322	20.01%	410,874	19.59%
Nevada	325,610		340,706		356,814		369,498		385,414		401,211	
Clark County (Las Vegas)	217,526	66.81%	231,655	67.99%	245,659	68.85%	256,574	69.44%	268,111	69.56%	281,513	70.17%
Texas	3,991,783		4,059,619		4,146,653		4,239,911		4,311,502		4,383,871	
Dallas	160,477	4.02%	161,548	3.98%	163,562	3.94%	162,989	3.84%	160,319	3.72%	159,743	3.64%
Houston	209,716	5.25%	208,462	5.14%	210,670	5.08%	212,099	5.00%	211,157	4.90%	208,454	4.76%
New York State	2,850,824		2,844,110		2,839,536		2,832,217		NA		NA	
New York City	1,056,708	37.07%	1,048,692	36.87%	1,038,833	36.58%	1,030,008	36.37%	NA		1,075,338	
Florida	2,376,128		2,430,128		2,495,426		2,535,155		2,591,033		2,638,127	
Miami-Dade	360,114	15.16%	368,123	15.15%	374,806	15.02%	373,375	14.73%	371,691	14.35%	365,456	13.85%
Hawaii	NA		183,520	100.00%	183,629	100.00%	182,798	100.00%	182,434	100.00%	181,897	100.00%

Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Urban School District Comparison of Due Process Filings

Chart B.3

Special Education Enrollment

	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total	#	% of State Total
California	641,191		650,719		663,220		675,322		681,980		681,969	
LAUSD	81,739	12.75%	83,033	12.76%	85,768	12.93%	85,529	12.66%	85,441	12.53%	83,207	12.20%
Maryland	111,711		112,077		112,426		112,184		113,760		112,455	
Baltimore	12,888	11.54%	13,260	11.83%	13,313	11.84%	15,183	13.53%	15,313	13.46%	14,904	13.25%
Illinois	287,475		297,316		305,997		310,260		317,153		321,501	
Chicago	51,800	18.02%	54,016	18.17%	55,548	18.15%	NA		55,399	17.47%	55,364	17.22%
Nevada	35,703		38,160		40,227		42,532		42,543		45,831	
Clark County (Las Vegas)	22,586	63.26%	24,497	64.20%	25,833	64.22%	27,713	65.16%	29,617	69.62%	30,936	67.50%
Texas	482,427		483,442		485,010		491,259		499,587		506,391	
Dallas	13,837	2.87%	13,130	2.72%	12,829	2.65%	12,713	2.59%	12,541	2.51%	12,879	2.54%
Houston	21,714	4.50%	20,647	4.27%	20,706	4.27%	20,696	4.21%	21,128	4.23%	21,112	4.17%
New York State	457,820		468,282		467,303		476,266		476,406		484,543	
New York City	157,262	34.35%	161,069	34.40%	159,039	34.03%	NA		NA		177,103	36.55%
Florida	439,895		467,200		484,913		499,214		499,145		516,569	
Miami-Dade	61,451	14%	62,686	13%	65,228	13.45%	66,682	13.36%	66,697	13.36%	68,088	13.18%
Hawaii	NA		20,138	100.00%	20,320	100.00%	20,808	100.00%	20,469	100.00%	20,173	100.00%

Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Urban School District Comparison of Due Process Filings

Chart B.4

Number of Special Education Students per Due Process Filing

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
California	298	255	214	210	203	181
LAUSD	166	89	82	80	74	71
Maryland	190	207	225	233	253	262
Baltimore	84	110	104	195	289	438
Illinois	549	603	667	650	645	749
Chicago	288	380	471	NA	355	328
Nevada	549	812	745	746	697	881
Clark County (Las Vegas)	461	680	527	711	673	884
Texas	1,336	1,116	1,280	1,127	1,207	1,272
Dallas	1,977	2,626	2,566	4,238	3,135	2,147
Houston	NA	826	863	900	813	1,919
New York State	NA	NA	NA	105	101	89
New York City	47	49	44	NA	44*	44*
Florida	2,146	2,498	2,679	2,259	2,423	2,777
Miami-Dade	1,617	1,493	1,388	1,419	1,419	1,216
Hawaii	NA	154	117	118	120	81

\*Approximate figure using 2004-05 enrollment/2003-04 due process filings

Office of the Independent Monitor  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Due Process Study: Case Review Checklist**

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Birthday:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Grade:** 6

Eligibility1: SLD    Eligibility2: \_\_\_\_\_

School of Attendance: Dodson MS    Local District: 8    School of Residence: Dodson MS

Type of Filing: IDR    Petitioner: District     Parent

Interim Agreement     No Resolution     No Info on Resolution     Resolution

Lawyer     Parent Advocate     Other:     None

**Causes of Filing:**

1. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Resolution/s:**

	Requests	Resolution	
1.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>
2.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>
3.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>
4.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>
5.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>
6.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>
7.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>
8.			Plaintiff <input type="checkbox"/> District <input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/>



## Due Process Questionnaire Report Peter Goldschmidt

The total number of schools that responded to the Due Process Questionnaire was 659. These schools are located in the 8 local districts of Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), and serve students from kindergarten through high school. For more information about the characteristics of the schools within LAUSD, please see Appendix tables A through H.

This report presents tables summarizing the responses of due process questions from a confidential survey of all school administrators by the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM). Responses are based on the schools' experiences during the 2005-2006 school year.

### **Due Process Questionnaire Results**

The following eighteen tables present the frequency of responses to questions concerning due process items (questions 12 to 17 in the Welligent survey). Some of these tables are disaggregated by school level, local district and school calendar.

When asked about participating in a meeting that led to due process during the 2005-2006 school year, 42% of the schools surveyed reported participating in an IEP meeting that led to a due process filing. When asked about participating in a similar meeting that led to an informal dispute resolution, 47% of schools declared participating. When asked who held the authority to resolve IEP disputes with parents, 42% of schools responded they had the authority.

Around 68% of the schools declared they had participated in a training seminar in IEP dispute resolution. When asked if they had received the LAUSD Comprehensive Plan for Due Process, 66% responded that they had. An important note is that a moderate percentage of the respondents to this question did not know whether or not their school had received a copy of the plan. Considering that the majority of the respondents to the questionnaire were an Assistant Principal, Assistant Principal Elementary Instructional Services or a Principal, it is likely that their schools had not received such plan.

One activity that did not appear to be commonly used was the walk-in clinic for handling potential IEP disputes. Only 29% of schools reported having used this type of meeting.

The disaggregated results indicate that there was some variability in data by school level and local district. For example, Middle Schools were found to be more likely to have an IEP meeting that led to a due process filing or to an informal dispute resolution. Training seminars were more likely to occur in Elementary, Middle Schools, High Schools and Other schools. Respondents from Other High Schools appeared to think they had authority to resolve IEP disputes with parents at their school sites more so than respondents from the other school levels. In terms of local districts, District 3 schools appeared to be more likely to have IEP meetings that led to due process filings and to informal dispute resolutions than the other districts. The majority of schools in District 8 reported they had the authority to resolve IEP disputes, making them the district that reported having the most authority to resolve disputes across all districts.

**Table 1****Participation in an IEP Meeting that Led to Due Process, by All Schools**

Q12. Have you participated in an IEP meeting that led to a due process filing?	N	%
No	377	57.3
Yes	276	42.0
Don't Know	5	0.8
Total	658	100.0

**Table 2****Participation in IEP Meeting that Led to an Informal Dispute Resolution, by All Schools**

Q13. Have you participated in an IEP meeting that led to informal dispute resolution?	N	%
No	339	51.5
Yes	311	47.3
Don't Know	8	1.2
Total	658	100.0

**Table 3****Participation in Trainings to Resolve IEP Disputes, by All Schools**

Q14. Have you participated in any training seminars in IEP dispute resolution?	N	%
No	196	29.8
Yes	453	68.8
Don't Know	9	1.4
Total	658	100.0

**Table 4****Participation in Walk-in Clinic on Handling IEP Disputes, by All Schools**

Q15. Have you attended a district-sponsored walk-in clinic on handling potential IEP disputes?	N	%
No	463	70.4
Yes	190	28.9
Don't Know	5	0.8
Total	658	100.0

**Table 5****Percent of Schools that Received a Copy of the Plan, by All Schools**

Q16. Have you received a copy of the LAUSD Comprehensive Plan for due process?	N	%
No	99	15.1
Yes	437	66.4
Don't Know	122	18.5
Total	658	100.0

**Table 6****Percent of Schools that Report they have Authority to Resolve All IEP Disputes, By All Schools**

Q17. Does your school have the authority to resolve all IEP disputes with parents at your school site?	N	%
No	346	52.6
Yes	273	41.5
Don't Know	39	5.9
Total	658	100.0

**Table 7****Circumstances for Referring Disputes by Category**

Q18. Under what circumstances do you refer an IEP Dispute with a parent to your support unit, local district or central office?	N	%
Placement issues (NPS)	91	47.4
Services (speech, language, physical therapy)	62	32.3
AAA services	22	11.5
NPA services	17	8.9
Total	192	100

**Table 8**  
Response categories in question 12, by level

Q12. IEP Meeting that led to a Due Process Filing					
Level	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
Kindergarten	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	11
Elementary	0.5%	58.3%	41.2%	100.0%	434
Other Elementary	0.0%	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%	20
Middle School	0.0%	41.1%	<u>58.9%</u>	100.0%	73
High School	1.6%	57.4%	41.0%	100.0%	61
Other High School	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	9
Other	4.1%	53.1%	42.9%	100.0%	49
Total	0.8%	57.2%	42.0%	100.0%	657

**Table 9**  
Response categories in question 13, by level

Q13. IEP Meeting that led to a Dispute Resolution					
Level	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
Kindergarten	0.0%	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	11
Elementary	1.2%	50.2%	48.6%	100.0%	434
Other Elementary	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	20
Middle School	2.7%	37.0%	<u>60.3%</u>	100.0%	73
High School	0.0%	52.5%	47.5%	100.0%	61
Other High School	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	100.0%	9
Other	0.0%	61.2%	38.8%	100.0%	49
Total	1.2%	51.5%	47.3%	100.0%	657

**Table 10**  
Response categories in question 14, by level

Q14. Training Seminars in IEP Dispute Resolution					
Level	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
Kindergarten	0.0%	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%	11
Elementary	1.4%	22.1%	<u>76.5%</u>	100.0%	434
Other Elementary	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	20
Middle School	0.0%	37.0%	<u>63.0%</u>	100.0%	73
High School	3.3%	39.3%	<u>57.4%</u>	100.0%	61
Other High School	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%	9
Other	2.0%	46.9%	<u>51.0%</u>	100.0%	49
Total	1.4%	29.7%	69.0%	100.0%	657

**Table 11**  
Response categories in question 15, by level

Q15. Walk-in Clinics on Handling Potential IEP Disputes					
Level	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
Kindergarten	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	11
Elementary	0.9%	70.1%	29.0%	100.0%	434
Other Elementary	0.0%	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%	20
Middle School	0.0%	67.1%	32.9%	100.0%	73
High School	0.0%	72.1%	27.9%	100.0%	61
Other High School	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	9
Other	2.0%	75.5%	22.5%	100.0%	49
Total	0.8%	70.3%	28.9%	100.0%	657

**Table 12**  
Response categories in question 16, by level

Q16. Received LAUSD Comprehensive Plan for Due Process					
Level	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
Kindergarten	18.2%	18.2%	63.6%	100.0%	11
Elementary	20.1%	15.2%	64.8%	100.0%	434
Other Elementary	15.0%	15.0%	70.0%	100.0%	20
Middle School	15.1%	15.1%	69.9%	100.0%	73
High School	14.8%	16.4%	68.9%	100.0%	61
Other High School	22.2%	0.0%	77.8%	100.0%	9
Other	16.3%	12.2%	71.4%	100.0%	49
Total	18.6%	14.9%	66.5%	100.0%	657

**Table 13**  
Response categories in question 17, by level

Q17. Authority to Resolve all IEP Disputes					
Level	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
Kindergarten	9.1%	45.5%	45.5%	100.0%	11
Elementary	4.4%	53.2%	42.4%	100.0%	434
Other Elementary	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%	20
Middle School	4.1%	57.5%	38.4%	100.0%	73
High School	6.6%	60.7%	32.8%	100.0%	61
Other High School	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%	100.0%	9
Other	18.4%	36.7%	44.9%	100.0%	49
Total	5.9%	52.7%	41.4%	100.0%	657

**Table 14**

Response categories in question 12, by local district

Q12. IEP Meeting that led to a Due Process Filing					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	2.6%	48.3%	49.1%	100.0%	114
2	0.0%	62.4%	37.6%	100.0%	93
3	1.1%	39.8%	59.1%	100.0%	93
4	0.0%	53.4%	46.6%	100.0%	103
5	0.0%	64.2%	35.8%	100.0%	81
6	2.3%	69.8%	27.9%	100.0%	43
7	0.0%	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%	56
8	0.0%	69.3%	30.7%	100.0%	75
Total	0.8%	57.3%	42.0%	100.0%	658

**Table 15**

Response categories in question 13, by local district

Q13. IEP Meeting that led to a Dispute Resolution					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	0.9%	36.0%	63.2%	100.0%	114
2	2.2%	47.3%	50.5%	100.0%	93
3	2.2%	37.6%	60.2%	100.0%	93
4	1.9%	49.5%	48.5%	100.0%	103
5	0.0%	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%	81
6	2.3%	72.1%	25.6%	100.0%	43
7	0.0%	73.2%	26.8%	100.0%	56
8	0.0%	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%	75
Total	1.2%	51.5%	47.3%	100.0%	658

**Table 16**

Response categories in question 14, by local district

Q14. Training Seminars in IEP Dispute Resolution					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	0.9%	27.2%	71.9%	100.0%	114
2	2.2%	31.2%	66.7%	100.0%	93
3	2.2%	33.3%	64.5%	100.0%	93
4	1.0%	23.3%	75.7%	100.0%	103
5	0.0%	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%	81
6	2.3%	39.5%	58.1%	100.0%	43
7	1.8%	26.8%	71.4%	100.0%	56
8	1.3%	32.0%	66.7%	100.0%	75
Total	1.4%	29.8%	68.8%	100.0%	658

**Table 17**

Response categories in question 15, by local district

Q15. Walk-in Clinics on Handling Potential IEP Disputes					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	1.8%	71.1%	27.2%	100.0%	114
2	1.1%	77.4%	21.5%	100.0%	93
3	0.0%	65.6%	34.4%	100.0%	93
4	1.0%	67.0%	32.0%	100.0%	103
5	0.0%	72.8%	27.2%	100.0%	81
6	2.3%	72.1%	25.6%	100.0%	43
7	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	56
8	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	75
Total	0.8%	70.4%	28.9%	100.0%	658

**Table 18**

Response categories in question 16, by local district

Q16. Received LAUSD Comprehensive Plan for Due Process					
Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	10.5%	7.9%	81.6%	100.0%	114
2	15.1%	12.9%	72.0%	100.0%	93
3	22.6%	15.1%	62.4%	100.0%	93
4	21.4%	13.6%	65.1%	100.0%	103
5	16.1%	17.3%	66.7%	100.0%	81
6	27.9%	14.0%	58.1%	100.0%	43
7	16.1%	26.8%	57.1%	100.0%	56
8	25.3%	20.0%	54.7%	100.0%	75
Total	18.5%	15.1%	66.4%	100.0%	658

**Table 19**

Response categories in question 17, by local district

---

Q17. Authority to Resolve all IEP Disputes

---

Local District	Don't Know	No	Yes	%	Total
1	5.3%	57.0%	37.7%	100.0%	114
2	4.3%	54.8%	40.9%	100.0%	93
3	8.6%	53.8%	37.6%	100.0%	93
4	2.9%	57.3%	39.8%	100.0%	103
5	7.4%	53.1%	39.5%	100.0%	81
6	7.0%	53.5%	39.5%	100.0%	43
7	5.4%	46.4%	48.2%	100.0%	56
8	8.0%	38.7%	53.3%	100.0%	75
Total	5.9%	52.6%	41.5%	100.0%	658

---



## Appendix

**Table A**  
Distribution of the schools by city

	City	N	%
1	ARLETA, CA	4	0.5
2	BELL, CA	6	0.8
3	CANOGA PARK, CA	11	1.4
4	CARSON, CA	18	2.3
5	CHATSWORTH, CA	11	1.4
6	CUDAHY, CA	3	0.4
7	CULVER CITY, CA	3	0.4
8	ENCINO, CA	4	0.5
9	GARDENA, CA	13	1.7
10	GRANADA HILLS, CA	14	1.8
11	HARBOR CITY, CA	5	0.7
12	HAWTHORNE, CA	1	0.1
13	HIGHLAND PARK, CA	1	0.1
14	HOLLYWOOD, CA	1	0.1
15	HUNTINGTON PARK, CA	11	1.4
16	HUNTINGTON PK, CA	2	0.3
17	INGLEWOOD, CA	2	0.3
18	LAKE BALBOA, CA	1	0.1
19	LAKE VIEW TERRACE, CA	2	0.3
20	LOMITA, CA	3	0.4
21	LOS ANGELES, CA	396	51.3
22	LOS ANGELES,CA	5	0.7
23	MAYWOOD, CA	5	0.7
24	MISSION HILLS, CA	1	0.1
25	MONTEREY PARK, CA	1	0.1
26	NO HOLLYWOOD, CA	22	2.9
27	NORTH HILLS, CA	13	1.7
28	NORTHRIDGE, CA	15	1.9
29	PACIFIC PALISADES, CA	4	0.5
30	PACOIMA, CA	10	1.3
31	PANORAMA CITY, CA	6	0.8
32	PANORAMA CITY,CA	1	0.1
33	PLAYA DEL REY, CA	1	0.1
34	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	2	0.3
35	RESEDA, CA	18	2.3
36	SAN FERNANDO, CA	10	1.3
37	SAN PEDRO, CA	18	2.3
38	SANTA MONICA, CA	1	0.1
39	SHERMAN OAKS, CA	5	0.7
40	SOUTH GATE, CA	19	2.5
41	STUDIO CITY, CA	1	0.1
42	SUN VALLEY, CA	9	1.2
43	SUNLAND, CA	4	0.5
44	SYLMAR, CA	10	1.3
45	TARZANA, CA	4	0.5
46	TOPANGA, CA	1	0.1
47	TORRANCE, CA	3	0.4
48	TUJUNGA, CA	5	0.7
49	VAN NUYS, CA	29	3.8
50	VENICE, CA	4	0.5

51	W HOLLYWOOD, CA	1	0.1
52	WEST HILLS, CA	7	0.9
53	WEST HOLLYWOOD, CA	1	0.1
54	WILMINGTON, CA	9	1.2
55	WINNETKA, CA	1	0.1
56	WOODLAND HILLS, CA	14	1.8
Total		772	100.0

**Table B**

Distribution of the schools by local district

Local District	N	%
1	133	17.2
2	100	12.9
3	116	15.0
4	117	15.1
5	97	12.6
6	50	6.5
7	73	9.4
8	87	11.3
Total	773	100.0

**Table C**

Distribution of the schools by school level

Level	N	%
Kindergarten	14	1.8
Elementary	454	58.8
Other Elementary	30	3.9
Middle School	84	10.9
High School	107	13.9
Other High School	13	1.7
Other	70	9.1
Total	772	100.0

**Table D**

Distribution of the schools by School Calendar

Calendar	N	%
1 TRK	475	61.5
3 TRK	89	11.5
4 TRK	120	15.5
CONTIN	11	1.4
OTHER	77	10.0
Total	772	100.0

**Table E**

Average enrollment by school level

Level	General Enrollment			Special Education Enrollment		
	N	Mean	<i>SD</i>	N	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Kindergarten	14	211.4	77.32	13	18.1	12.65
Elementary	454	699.6	326.55	454	72.1	31.26
Other Elementary	30	313.1	194.48	30	26.9	21.04
Middle School	83	1631.8	762.46	83	198.7	86.03
High School	107	1508.4	1560.69	105	179.3	192.56
Other High School	13	801.5	921.89	11	93.3	114.81
Other	68	529.2	726.57	67	98.6	114.34
Total Schools	769			763		

**Table F**  
Average enrollment by local district

Local District	General Enrollment			Special Education Enrollment		
	N	Mean	<i>SD</i>	N	Mean	<i>SD</i>
1	133	807.0	800.77	132	103.5	95.60
2	100	956.3	810.42	99	110.4	98.78
3	116	706.3	650.77	114	90.8	94.50
4	115	749.4	848.92	114	82.1	96.58
5	97	938.3	894.61	96	101.2	117.37
6	50	1212.1	1110.28	50	123.6	117.28
7	72	1027.6	791.70	72	102.8	101.91
8	87	882.8	785.95	87	105.5	105.77
Total Schools	770			764		

**Table G**

Average enrollment by School Calendar

Calendar	General Enrollment			Special Education Enrollment		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1 TRK	475	785.7	719.92	472	97.6	94.01
3 TRK	88	1793.28	1273.141	89	192.2	156.78
4 TRK	120	954.6	406.40	120	92.5	43.77
CONTIN	11	142.7	91.85	10	28.1	24.59
OTHER	75	362.3	510.59	72	30.7	60.66
Total Schools	769			763		

**Table H**

Who answered the Welligent questionnaire?

Position	N	%
AP	171	24.4
APEIS	395	56.3
Coordinator	35	5.0
Principal	99	14.1
Other	2	0.2
Total	702	100.0

**Table I**

Number of schools that present problems using the Welligent System by city

City	Total N Schools	With Problems Using Welligent	
		N Schools	%
CUDAHY, CA	3	3	100%
ENCINO, CA	4	4	100%
HAWTHORNE, CA	1	1	100%
HOLLYWOOD, CA	1	1	100%
LAKE VIEW TERRACE, CA	2	2	100%
MISSION HILLS, CA	1	1	100%
PANORAMA CITY, CA	1	1	100%
SANTA MONICA, CA	1	1	100%
STUDIO CITY, CA	1	1	100%
TOPANGA, CA	1	1	100%
TORRANCE, CA	3	3	100%
VENICE, CA	4	4	100%
WEST HOLLYWOOD, CA	1	1	100%
WINNETKA, CA	1	1	100%
PANORAMA CITY, CA	6	5	83%
TUJUNGA, CA	5	4	80%
VAN NUYS, CA	29	22	76%
ARLETA, CA	4	3	75%
PACIFIC PALISADES, CA	4	3	75%
SUNLAND, CA	4	3	75%
TARZANA, CA	4	3	75%
NO HOLLYWOOD, CA	22	16	73%
WEST HILLS, CA	7	5	71%
BELL, CA	6	4	67%
CARSON, CA	18	12	67%
CULVER CITY, CA	3	2	67%
LOMITA, CA	3	2	67%
RESEDA, CA	18	12	67%
GRANADA HILLS, CA	14	9	64%
LOS ANGELES, CA	396	249	63%
NORTH HILLS, CA	13	8	62%
HARBOR CITY, CA	5	3	60%
NORTHRIDGE, CA	15	9	60%
SHERMAN OAKS, CA	5	3	60%
WOODLAND HILLS, CA	14	8	57%
SUN VALLEY, CA	9	5	56%
CANOGA PARK, CA	11	6	55%
HUNTINGTON PARK, CA	11	6	55%
GARDENA, CA	13	7	54%
SOUTH GATE, CA	19	10	53%
HUNTINGTON PK, CA	2	1	50%
RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	2	1	50%
SYLMAR, CA	10	5	50%

WILMINGTON, CA	9	4	44%
MAYWOOD, CA	5	2	40%
PACOIMA, CA	10	4	40%
SAN FERNANDO, CA	10	4	40%
SAN PEDRO, CA	18	7	39%
CHATSWORTH, CA	11	4	36%
LOS ANGELES, CA	5	1	20%
HIGHLAND PARK, CA	1		
INGLEWOOD, CA	2		
LAKE BALBOA, CA	1		
MONTEREY PARK, CA	1		
PLAYA DEL REY, CA	1		
W HOLLYWOOD, CA	1		
Total	772	477	