

Office of the Independent Monitor
Validation Study of Individual Transition Plans
Outcome 9

Background

Outcome 9 focuses on the provision of transition plans for students with disabilities.

By June 30, 2006, 98% of all students with disabilities as defined in IDEA age 14 and over shall have an Individual Transition Plan developed in accordance with federal law.

Each student is expected to have a transition plan that outlines their career goals and details the steps that will be taken to achieve these goals. During the 2004-05 school year, the District's performance on Outcome 9 based on information in the Welligent data system was 99.6%. This means that 99.6% of students with disabilities age 14 and older had an individual transition plan (ITP). However, a review of Welligent data indicated that a large percentage of high school students had not been entered into the system. As a result, the Independent Monitor (IM) indicated that the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) would draw a sample of students ages 14 to 22 not in the Welligent system and determine whether they had transition plans by reviewing their IEPs. The goal of this review would be to determine whether the data on ITPs for students not in the Welligent system differed from the data for students in Welligent, and determine based on these results, whether Welligent was a reliable indicator of the provision of ITPs for students with disabilities in LAUSD.

Methodology

This ITP validation study was not conducted in the 2004-05 school year. The study was piloted in November 2005; however, because students with disabilities are entered into the Welligent system throughout the course of the year the larger sample for this study was not drawn until late May, giving the District as much time as possible to reduce the number of out-of-Welligent students' eligible for ITPs.

Sample Design

In order to determine whether there was a difference in the provision of transition plans for students not in the Welligent system compared to students with Welligent IEPs, the OIM asked the American Institutes of Research (AIR) to draw a sample of students with IEPs in the District Student Information System (SIS) data system. The ITP sample was drawn in late May 2006, to capture the maximum number of students in the Welligent system. These samples were stratified by disability type, 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 (LRE) and Parent Participation (PP) and clustered to maximize efficiency without introducing bias. Tables 1 and 2 show the distribution of the sample compared to the special education population and by low and high incidence populations (Table 3).

Table 1. ITP Sample by Local District

Local School District	Students in Population	%	Students in ITP Drawn Sample	%
Missing	4,132	4.7%	-	-
1	14,154	16.3%	29	10.5%
2	11,267	12.9%	39	14.1%
3	10,884	12.5%	54	19.6%
4	9,753	11.2%	53	19.2%
5	9,783	11.2%	54	19.6%
6	6,162	7.1%	6	2.2%
7	7,546	8.7%	21	7.6%
8	9,414	10.8%	20	7.2%
NPS	3,925	4.5%	-	-
Other	27	0.0%	-	-
Total	87,047	100%	276	100%

Table 2. ITP Sample by School Level

School Level	Students in Population	%	Students in ITP Drawn Sample	%
Elementary	42,098	48.4%	1	0.4
Middle	17,139	19.7%	28	10.1%
High	19,700	22.6%	239	86.6%
Spec Centers	3,903	4.5%	3	1.1%
NPS	3,900	4.5%	-	-
Others	128	0.1%	-	-
Missing	179	0.2%	5	1.8%
Total	87,047	100%	276	100.0%

Table 3. ITP sample by Disability Incidence

High/Low	Number	%
High	210	76.1%
Low	66	23.9%
Total	276	100%

Data collection and Data Entry

Research assistants (RAs) were trained to extract the necessary information from a student’s cumulative and IEP folders and place the information on an instrument developed by the OIM (Attachment A). Since this validation study only required the verification of the provision of an ITP for students not in Welligent, a section for data collection was added to the instrument for the LRE and PP study. Data was collected from the student’s IEP and consisted of one of the following:

1. IEP contained a Transition Plan
2. IEP did not contain a Transition Plan

Data was entered into a database and provided to AIR for analysis. A total of 50 students were removed from the final analysis due to missing IEP information and students exited from special education. The distribution of students by local district, school level, and high and low incidence populations are described in Tables 4, 5 and 6.

Table 4. ITP Analyzed Sample by Local District

Local School District	Number	%
Missing	0	0.0%
1	22	9.6%
2	32	14.0%
3	48	21.1%
4	44	19.3%
5	42	18.4%
6	5	2.2%
7	18	7.9%
8	17	7.5%
NPS	0	0.0%
Total	228	100%

Table 5. ITP Analyzed Sample by School Level

School Level	N	%
Middle	25	11.0%
High	201	88.2%
Spec Centers	2	0.9%
NPS	-	0.0%
Total	228	100.0%

Table 6. ITP Analyzed Sample by Disability Incidence

High/Low	Number	%
High	182	79.8%
Low	46	20.2%
Total	228	100%

Findings

Table 7 compares the provision of ITPs for students not in the Welligent system to those in the Welligent system. The following estimates have been weighted to represent the proportions of high and low incidence disability categories in the special education population of LAUSD using the June 1, 2006 combined database. The study found that overall, 82.5% of students not in Welligent had an ITP. There is a significant difference between students in Welligent and those not in Welligent. However, since the overall number of students not in Welligent is small, this difference has minimal impact on the overall number of students with ITPs.

Table 7. Percent of students with and without ITPs, by Welligent Status

School Level	No Plan	Plan	Total
Non-Welligent	17.5%	82.5%	100%
Welligent	0.14%	99.86%	100%

The study found significant differences between local districts. Table 8 shows the percentage of students with transition plans by local districts with a range of provision from a low of 40% (District 6) to a high of 93.2% (District 2).

Table 8. Percent of students with ITPs with Non-Welligent IEPs, by Local District

District	No Plan	Plan	Total
1	10.7%	89.4%	100%
2	6.8%	93.2%	100%
3	16.7%	83.3%	100%
4	8.2%	91.8%	100%
5	25.6%	74.4%	100%
6	60.0%	40.0%	100%
7	42.7%	57.3%	100%
8	16.2%	83.8%	100%
Total	17.5%	82.5%	100%

Pearson:

Uncorrected $\chi^2(7) = 21.4726$
 Design-based $F(6.88, 1562.34) = 3.0942$ $P = 0.0032$

Table 9 shows the percent of students with ITPs with non-Welligent IEPs by school level, with middle schools providing ITPs with the least frequency. Significant differences were found by school level.

Table 9. Percent of students with ITPs with Non-Welligent IEPs, by School Level

School Level	No Plan	Plan	Total
Middle	39.2%	60.8%	100%
High	15.1%	84.9%	100%
Spec Centers	0.0%	100%	100%
Total	17.5%	82.5%	100%

Pearson:

Uncorrected $\chi^2(2) = 9.3372$
 Design-based $F(1.92, 436.93) = 3.8022$ $P = 0.0245$

Students with low incidence disabilities with non-Welligent IEPs are more likely to have a transition plan than students with high incidence disabilities with non-Welligent IEPs (Table 10).

Table 10. Percent of students with ITPs with Non-Welligent IEPs, by Disability Incidence

Incidence	No Plan	Plan	Total
Low	8.7%	91.3%	100%
High	21.4%	78.6%	100%
Total	17.5%	82.5%	100%

Pearson:

Uncorrected $\chi^2(1) = 5.4703$
 Design-based $F(1, 227) = 3.8459$ $P = 0.0511$

Implications

Based on these findings, there appears to be a significant difference between students with Welligent IEPs compared to those with non-Welligent IEPs. However, this difference has minimal impact due to the high number of students in the Welligent system. At the time of this study, 1,522 students ages 14 to 22 were not in the Welligent IEP database. If we were to apply the discrepancy found to the population of students not in the Welligent system, the relatively small number of students without an ITP would not affect the District's performance toward meeting this outcome.

Attachment A: Parent Participation Instrument

Office of the Independent Monitor

LRE

Page 1	District ID#	Last Name	First Name	Birthdate	Grade	Current IEP Date	IEP Date if different:	
				9/30/1999	0	4/16/2004		
	Attend School:		Local District:		Previous IEP Date: _____			
	IEP Meeting Location: _____							
Page 4	Eligibility: DD			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 8	<input type="checkbox"/> Page 8 Missing		Welligent Percent of Time: <input type="text"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed	<input type="checkbox"/> RSP	<input type="checkbox"/> SDC	(Minutes per Week): _____	<input type="checkbox"/> DIS	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed/Inclusion	% of time: _____	
Page 12	_____							
	1. # of District Policy Total Instructional Minutes: <input type="text"/>				2. # of Total Instructional Minutes School Report: <input type="text"/>			

Parent Participation

Student in PP	Attended IEP	Attended IEP Different
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	_____
Page 10		
<input type="checkbox"/> Parent participated (If checked Stop)	Recorded Contacts	Date
<input type="checkbox"/> Parent indicated not able to attend (Look for documentation to proceed)	Method 1: _____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Parent did not attend (Look for documentation to proceed without them)	Who: _____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Parent notified 3 times (Look for documentation of 3 attempts to notify)	Method 2: _____	_____
	Who: _____	_____
Notification Form Present <input type="checkbox"/>	Method 3: _____	_____
1. <input type="checkbox"/> I intend, however, proceed	Who: _____	_____
(If checked indicate Yes)		
2. <input type="checkbox"/> I cannot attend, send copy	Evidence to convince: Yes/No _____	
3. <input type="checkbox"/> I intend, if unable, reschedule/phone conf.		
(If checked look for Contacts)		
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Not convenient, reschedule		

Transition Plan

Student in ITP <input type="checkbox"/>
Transition Plan Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Attachment B: Confidence Intervals

Confidence Intervals for ITP Results

Number and Percentages of Students Without an ITP, by Low/High Incidence

	N	p	Min	Max
Low Incidence	4	0.0870	0.0%	36.3%
High Incidence	39	0.2143	8.6%	34.3%
Overall	43	0.1749	6.1%	28.8%

Number and Percentages of Students Without an ITP, by Ethnicity

	N	p	Min	Max
African American	8	0.1048	0.0%	31.7%
Hispanic	34	0.2133	7.6%	35.1%
Other	1	0.4696	0.0%	100.0%
White	0	0.0000	.	.

Number and Percentages of Students Without an ITP, by District

	N	p	Min	Max
1	3	0.1065	0.0%	45.6%
2	2	0.0684	0.0%	41.8%
3	8	0.1667	0.0%	42.5%
4	4	0.0823	0.0%	35.2%
5	11	0.2563	0.0%	51.4%
6	3	0.6000	4.6%	100.0%
7	9	0.4269	0.0%	75.0%
8	3	0.1618	0.0%	57.9%

Number and Percentages of Students Without an ITP, by School Level

	N	p	Min	Max
Middle	11	0.3917	10.3%	68.0%
High	32	0.1513	2.7%	27.5%
Special	0	0.0000	.	.