

**STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN
STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE**

Office of the Independent Monitor
Revised August 23, 2006

Introduction

This report presents the third year findings of the study on the disproportionate identification of African-American students as emotionally disturbed (ED) in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The study measures the District's performance on Outcome 18: Disproportionality. The results of the 2005-2006 school year study will be used by the Independent Monitor (IM) as the basis for determining whether the District has met the performance levels of Outcome 18 by June 30, 2006.

The report also provides background on the development of the outcome and presents an overview of the findings from year one and two of the study to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the District's performance from year one and two. Finally, recommendations are provided.

Background

During the initial negotiations of the Modified Consent Decree (MCD), the parties recognized the need to further examine the issue of the disproportionate identification of African-American students as emotionally disturbed (ED). As a result of this acknowledgement, the parties agreed to include a statement indicating that within the first year of the MCD, the District would provide the Independent Monitor with data and an analysis concerning whether African-American students were disproportionately identified as ED. The statement also charged the Independent Monitor with the responsibility of reviewing the District's data and analysis and any other information deemed appropriate, to determine whether a performance outcome should be established.

Study to Identify Sources of Disproportionality – Year One (2003-2004)

A review of the District's data found that African-Americans were 4.28 times more likely to be identified as ED than students from all other ethnic/racial groups, and 4.77 times more likely to be placed in the more segregated setting of a non-public school than all other students identified as ED. These findings led to a district-wide study to identify possible sources of disproportionality. The study focused on two possible sources of disproportionality: inappropriate referrals and inappropriate identification. An instrument was designed to examine the elements of the pre-referral, referral, assessment and identification processes. Comprehensive file reviews were conducted of 270 student records at 32 middle schools from 207 identifying schools. The sample consisted of 123 African-American, 118 Latino, 24 White, 5 Other race/ethnicity¹ students, 220 males, and 50 females.

The study found few significant differences between the pre-referral, referral, assessment, and identification processes of all ED students. Overall, the study found low rates of pre-referral interventions such as Student Study Team (SSTs); deficiencies in the provision of

¹ Other race/ethnicity students includes American Indian and Asian

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

psychological assessments with almost one third of all students lacking both a cognitive/general ability and socio-emotional evaluation; and, a substantial lack of eligibility statements and exclusionary criteria for all students regardless of race/ethnicity.

Based on the data review and findings of the Year One study, an outcome was established that would:

- Ensure the procedural due process rights of all students during the ED pre-referral, referral, assessment and identification processes
- Limit any unintended consequences
- Focus on improving the pre-referral, referral and identification processes for all students by establishing a criteria for a “basic” comprehensive evaluation

Outcome 18: To reduce overrepresentation of African-American students as emotionally disturbed, the District must demonstrate evidence that 90% of students identified as emotionally disturbed had a comprehensive evaluation as defined by the Independent Monitor and consideration for placement in the least restrictive environment as determined by the Independent Monitor during an initial or triennial evaluation.

Determination of the Criteria for Determining Compliance with the Outcome

The rationale for defining a comprehensive evaluation was derived from the results of the initial study, the basic pre-referral, referral and assessment practices of the LAUSD, and process outlined within IDEA for identifying students with disabilities. The elements identified by the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) reflected the practices of a basic and standard pre-referral, referral and evaluation process and were not intended to be considered best practices. In June 2004, upon the District’s request, the OIM and representatives from the District’s psychological services unit met to discuss the elements of the criteria, at which time the District requested additional items to be included within the criteria. The OIM advised the District that the criteria encompassed the fundamental elements of the pre-referral, referral, identification and placement process and informed the District of their right to expand their professional development to reflect best practices.

The rubric developed was presented to the District as a checklist and grouped into four categories: pre-referral and referral interventions; assessment; the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) team’s recommendations upon identification of ED; and the IEP team’s considerations for placement in the least restrictive environment. In order to collect data required by the outcome, the rubric was designed to collect information on three types of referrals and assessments: students newly identified as ED; students already receiving special education services whose eligibility changed to ED; and students receiving services as ED that received a comprehensive re-evaluation. The checklist consisted of twenty elements for students initially identified as ED, seventeen elements for students already receiving special education services whose eligibility had been changed to ED, and thirteen elements for students receiving a comprehensive re-evaluation.

**STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN
STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE**

Explanation of Criteria

Pre-referral and Referral Interventions for Students Initially Identified as ED

This section was designed to capture evidence of the efforts schools make to address and intervene with behavioral and academic concerns of the child *prior* to referral for special education services. It also identified practices and considerations schools engage in prior to changing the eligibility of students presently receiving services under an eligibility other than ED. This section does not apply to students presently receiving services as ED who were provided a comprehensive re-evaluation.

This section applies to two groups of students:

1. Newly identified students that have never received special education services
2. Students that are newly identified as ED, but were previously receiving services under another eligibility such as other health impairment (OHI), and/or specific learning disability (SLD)

This section was separated to reflect the respective pre-referral and referral processes for each group. For example, the process for students newly identified as ED that were previously receiving services under another eligibility will contain fewer elements of the pre-referral and referral process since these students have already been referred and assessed for special education services.

The criteria for students that are newly identified as emotionally disturbed specifically sought to determine if they had been afforded the following, prior to referral:

1. An initial pre-referral intervention meeting, such as an SST
2. Documentation of a follow-up pre-referral intervention meeting at least 3 months after the initial meeting, to discuss the results of the interventions on the behavior
3. Evidence of parent participation at the pre-referral intervention
4. Evidence that the pre-referral team considered factors such as: the student's home environment, primary language, attendance history
5. Documentation of behavioral and academic concerns for more than six months prior to the date of the referral
6. Evidence of participation in behavioral interventions such as: behavior modification plan, non-DIS counseling, school-wide discipline program
7. Evidence of an assessment plan or other documentation indicating behavioral concerns

The criteria for students that are newly identified as ED but were previously receiving special education services under another eligibility was as follows:

1. Evidence of a behavior support plan prior to identification

**STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN
STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE**

2. Evidence of academic modifications and accommodations attempted to address behavioral concerns
3. Consideration² for counseling services or school wide discipline programs
4. Evidence of an assessment plan or other documentation indicating behavioral concerns

Section 2: Assessment

This section was designed to determine if a child received a multidisciplinary comprehensive assessment and to capture the assessment process for the identification of all students as ED. This section simply looked for evidence of the following assessments:

1. Health
2. Academic
3. Cognitive or General Ability
4. Social Emotional
5. Behavioral Evaluations

Section 3: Eligibility

To measure how IEP teams determine whether a student meets the criteria of ED, the study collected evidence of a comprehensive ED eligibility statement and considerations of exclusionary factors, per IDEA 1997 regulations. Based on this evidence, a student could be considered eligible as ED if he/she meets one or more criteria, it is determined that the behaviors are pervasive and to a marked degree, and exclusionary factors are ruled out. Additionally, data was collected on the IEP team's justification of co-morbid or additional eligibilities, which was evidenced by a corresponding eligibility statement or other data indicating the need for additional eligibilities. It should be noted that for students that did not present additional eligibilities, this element was coded as N/A and the criteria was considered met. IDEA defines the eligibility and exclusionary criteria as follows:

Eligibility Criteria

1. an inability to learn that can not be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors
2. an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers/teachers
3. Inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances
4. A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression
5. A tendency to develop symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems

² Consideration of a support does not constitute provision of such support, therefore, criteria may have been met if there was evidence that the IEP team considered a support, such as a statement indicating that the student did not require the benefits of such support

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Exclusionary Criteria

1. Are behaviors a result of intellectual, sensory, or health factors?
2. Are behaviors due to a specific environmental stress or situational trauma?
3. Are behaviors a function of social maladjustment without evidence of an emotional disturbance?

Section 4: IEP Team Considerations

This section captured the IEP team's decision for supporting the child upon being identified as emotionally disturbed. This is important since the data and findings reviewed from the initial study demonstrated that African-American youngsters were more frequently placed in more segregated placements than their non African American counterparts. The supports provided for a student play an integral part in the consideration of the restrictiveness of placement and services in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Some of the supports include:

1. Consideration of a behavior support plan
2. Evidence of an IEP team's consideration for placement in the LRE
3. Consideration of DIS counseling, referrals to mental health agencies, or school-wide discipline programs
4. Counseling goals, if appropriate
5. Parent participation at the IEP meeting determining eligibility and placement

The outcome requires that for students identified as ED, IEP teams consider placement in the LRE. It is important to note that this does not imply that IEP teams must recommend least restrictive placements, but rather that they provide a statement indicating that the recommended placement was the LRE for the child. Data collected to determine whether the IEP team considered placements in the LRE was found within the IEP.

Determining Compliance with the Criteria

In order to meet the criteria of a comprehensive evaluation as defined above, students must have evidence of having met all of the elements for their respective criteria (i.e., newly identified ED, re-evaluations). This evidence was found in the child's IEP, cumulative records, and any other relevant documentation such as Resource Specialist Teacher (RST) or psychological report, if available.

For determining compliance, the criteria took into consideration a parent's right to request an assessment of their child. This may have reasonable impact on the ability of a school to adhere to the pre-referral and referral processes outlined in the rubric. This was addressed by collecting data on parental or agency³ requests for assessment. Students with evidence of such requests were considered as having met the criteria for the pre-referral and referral processes.

³ Some requests were made by residential agencies for students considered wards of the state

**STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN
STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE**

Study on the Disproportionate Identification of African-Americans as Emotionally Disturbed In LAUSD – Year Two (2004-2005)

As part of the outcome, the District was directed to develop a tracking system to capture and code all students that received a comprehensive evaluation identifying them as ED into three categories: students newly identified as ED; students whose eligibility changed to ED; and, those students already identified as ED that received a comprehensive re-evaluation. The database was to include all students identified as ED including those placed in non-public schools (NPS) and high schools, whose IEPs were held between November 11, 2004 and June 15, 2005. Limitations to obtaining a sample may have occurred, as periodic reviews of the District's Welligent database by the OIM found additional students newly identified as ED that had not been included in the District's database. In addition, errors in the coding of IEP types, dates of IEP, and demographic information were found during the file reviews.

Methodology

- Sample Design
 - All initial evaluations and a sample of all comprehensive re-evaluations for ED of African-American students
 - Sample of all initial evaluations and re-evaluations for all other racial/ethnic groups: White, Latino, and Other
 - Sample was drawn by the American Institutes of Research (AIR) on a monthly basis from a database provided by the District.
- Elements of the file review
 - Pre-referral and referral interventions: Evidence of a pre-referral intervention meeting and follow-up meeting with parent participation, evidence of participation in a behavior support program, documentation of behavioral and academic concerns
 - Assessment: Health, Cognitive/General abilities, Social-Emotional, Academic, Behavioral
 - Eligibility determination: Eligibility statement as per IDEA regulations, considerations of exclusionary criteria, and justification of co-morbid disabilities
 - IEP Team considerations of supports upon ED identification: Consideration of a behavior support plan, consideration of placement in the least restrictive environment, and consideration for counseling and/or referral to mental health agencies
- Data Collection and Analysis

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

- Demographic and IEP information for all students identified as ED were uploaded from District database and verified for accuracy on a monthly basis
- Comprehensive reviews of cumulative files and IEPs were conducted at schools by trained research assistants. Inter-rater reliability established through multiple reviews by different raters
- Data was entered into a database and sent to AIR for statistical analysis

Overall Findings from Year 2

- Few differences found for the pre-referral and identification processes of all students
- Minimal progress toward the outcome target, with only 3% of African-Americans having met the criteria required by Outcome 18
- Improvements in the areas of pre-referral intervention meetings and multi-disciplinary assessments from year one baseline
- Low rates of eligibility statements and exclusionary criteria

Table 1. Number and Percent of Students that Met Criteria, by Race/Ethnicity (Final 2004-2005)

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
Total Observations	73	119	45	237
Number of students meeting criteria	6	3	4	13
Percentage meeting criteria	8%	3%	9%	5.5%

Additional Findings from Year 2

- Decrease in the overall rates of identification for the ED category by 361
 - 165 were African-American
- Decrease in the NPS enrollments of ED students by 57
 - 36 were African-American
- Decrease in the risk and relative risk ratio for African-American students
 - Risk = 1.51 from 1.67 (2003-04)
 - Risk Ratio = 4.05 from 4.28 (2003-2004)

Improvements from Year One

- Improvements in pre-referral interventions
 - Evidence of SST’s for African-Americans went from 33% to 75%
- Improvements in assessment procedures for African-Americans
 - Increase in cognitive assessments from 68% to 92%
 - Increase in number of both cognitive and social emotional assessments from 66% to 93%
- Increased use of eligibility statements

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

- For all students from 37% to 52 %
- For African-American students from 34% to 44%

Study on the Disproportionate Identification of African-Americans as Emotionally Disturbed In LAUSD – Year Three (2005-2006)

This study was a continuation of the year two study with some minor modifications. The results of the year three study are to be used by the IM to determine whether the District has met the performance levels of Outcome 18, as outlined in the MCD. In order to meet the outcome, the District must demonstrate evidence that 90% of African American students identified as emotionally disturbed had a comprehensive evaluation during an initial or comprehensive re-evaluation as defined by the IM. Although this outcome focuses primarily on the provision of comprehensive evaluations for African American students, the nature of disproportionality and the outcome requires that data also be collected and included in the analyses for students in the White and Latino race/ethnicity groups. This ensures that the procedural due process rights of all students identified as ED are protected as well as limiting any unintended consequences⁴.

A review of the second year methodology resulted in minor modifications in the instrument to facilitate data collection. To reduce errors in the district's database, meetings were held with district representatives to clarify the three categories for students that had received a comprehensive evaluation. Data collection for year three began July 15, 2005 and concluded June 30, 2006 and yielded a total of 507 valid observations.

Methodology

- Data Collection and Analysis
 - Demographic and IEP information for all students identified as ED were uploaded from District database and verified for accuracy on a monthly basis
 - Comprehensive reviews of cumulative files and IEPs were conducted at schools by trained research assistants. To ensure accurate data collection, copies of the IEPs were collected at the school site and all observations underwent a second review prior to data entry
 - Data was entered into a database and sent to AIR for statistical analysis.

Sample Design

As aforementioned, the study included all initial evaluations and a sample of re-evaluations of African American students identified as ED. In addition, a change in sampling methodology was made in April 2006 to include all initial evaluations of White students to ensure sufficient sample size for comparisons. The sample was drawn from a database provided by the District of all students that received a comprehensive evaluation for an ED identification. This database was provided on a monthly basis and sent to AIR

⁴ Disproportionality could be reduced by the increase in identification rates of students in other ethnic/racial categories.

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

for sample selection. During the 2005-2006 school year, the drawn sample included a total of 546 students. However, due to errors in the database duplicates were found resulting in a sample of 535 students. Tables 2, 3 and 4 present the descriptions of the sample by race/ethnicity, local district and school level.

Table 2. ED Sample by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
African American	183	34.2%
Latino	224	41.9%
White	110	20.6%
Other	18	3.4%
Total	535	100%

Table 3. ED Sample by Local District

District	Number	Percent
1	59	11.0%
2	44	8.2%
3	60	11.2%
4	34	6.4%
5	29	5.4%
6	9	1.7%
7	33	6.2%
8	23	4.5%
NPS	224	41.9%
Other*	8	1.6%
Charter	11	2.1%
Total	535	100%

* Includes support units or continuation schools

Table 4. ED Sample by School Level

School Level	Number	Percent
Elementary/ preschool/early ed	102	19.1%
Middle School	87	16.3%
High School	110	20.6%
Special Centers	7	1.3%
NPS	226	42.2%
Missing	3	0.6%
Total	535	100%

Elements of the File Review

The elements specified for determining a comprehensive evaluation remained the same from year two. The instrument was modified from year two to facilitate the data collection of the following information. For initials, information was collected on the referring party, or if there was evidence of a parent or agency (License Children's

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Institution, DCFS) requesting the evaluation. This was done to ensure that parent and student rights' were protected and considered the limitations schools may be under to fulfill the pre-requisite requirements. If evidence of a parent or agency request was found within the IEP or student documentation, all elements of the pre-referral section were considered met. For re-evaluations, information was collected from the previous IEP to determine if IEP teams had determined that a comprehensive re-evaluation was necessary for establishing eligibility. If a team determined that a comprehensive re-evaluation was not necessary, the elements within the assessment section were considered met.

Data Collection and Entry

The procedures for data collection were similar to those of the year two study and consisted of a file review of cumulative records and IEP files, and sought to determine if the identification and placement process was appropriate for African American students identified as ED. Using the criteria defined above, an instrument (see Attachment A) was developed to capture the four areas within the identification process: pre-referral and referral interventions, assessment, determination of ED eligibility, and IEP team recommendations upon eligibility. The instrument was modified to facilitate data collection for the three assessment types: students newly identified as ED; students newly identified as ED that were previously receiving services under another eligibility; and, students currently receiving services as ED that had received a comprehensive re-evaluation. One notable difference in this third year was in the collection of data on the requesting party for evaluation, and for students with a three year re-evaluation, if the IEP team determined at the previous annual IEP that a comprehensive re-evaluation was not required.

Data collection was conducted by the OIM and a group of graduate research assistants. The research assistants participated in 16 hours of training, including conducting full cumulative file and IEP folder reviews. In addition, research assistants were supervised by the OIM and four experienced research assistants that had participated in the second year of the data collection. To ensure reliable data, copies of the IEPs were obtained and all reviews were subject to a second review. This means that all files were selected to be reviewed by two different reviewers and checked for accuracy by comparing for discrepancies.

To verify the accuracy of the District's database, a data cover sheet (see Attachment B) was developed by uploading information from the District's database regarding demographic and IEP information such as: race/ethnicity; gender, birth date, IEP type (initial, eligibility change, and re-evaluation), IEP date, and the location of the cumulative and IEP folder. Discrepancies found were recorded on the data cover sheet.

A total of 507 file reviews were completed and entered into a database developed by the OIM. The data was separated into three categories for analyses:

1. Students with valid data
2. Students with no valid data

**STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN
STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE**

3. Students found not eligible as emotionally disturbed or exited from special education

Data Analysis

The database was provided to AIR for analyses to measure levels of compliance with the outcome and to determine if any statistical differences occurred between racial/ethnic groups. The sample used for analyses removed those students whose data could not be obtained, students that had been found not eligible as ED or exited from special education, and those students from “other”⁵ racial/ethnic groups. Tables 5, 6, and 7 describe the sample of students with valid data included in the analyses by race/ethnicity, local district and school level.

Twenty eight students were considered invalid due to student mobility, inability to find student records, and errors in the database of IEP type as students had a different IEP type such as annual reviews. The sample of valid observations consisted of 175 African American, 210 Latino, 106 White, and 16 other race/ethnicity students throughout LAUSD. Tables 5, 6, and 7 demonstrate the sample descriptions by race/ethnicity, local district, and school level. As mentioned above, for the purpose of reporting and comparisons between groups, students in the other race/ethnicity group were removed from the final analysis. In addition, six students were removed due to IEPs that had exited them from special education or had an eligibility change from ED to another eligibility.

Table 5. ED Analyzed Sample by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
African American	175	34.5%
Latino	210	41.4%
White	106	20.9%
Other	16	3.2%
Total	507	100%

⁵ “Other” students were removed from the analysis due to the small size of the sample

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 6. ED Analyzed Sample by Local District

District	Number	Percent
1	58	11.4%
2	43	8.5%
3	52	10.3%
4	32	6.3%
5	26	5.1%
6	8	1.6%
7	32	6.3%
8	23	4.5%
NPS	215	42.4%
Other	6	0.0%
Charter	10	2.0%
Total	507	100%

Table 7. ED Analyzed Sample by School Level

School Level	Number	Percent
Elementary/ Preschool/Early Ed	99	19.5%
Middle School	79	15.6%
High School	102	20.1%
Special Centers	7	1.4%
NPS	217	42.8%
Missing	3	0.6%
Total	507	100%

Findings

The findings are disaggregated by race/ethnicity. For the purpose of the year three analysis, findings are presented for all students identified as ED, regardless of the IEP type with one exception. Pre-referral and referral interventions findings are disaggregated by IEP type due to the differences of individual requirements, however, the findings are combined to present overall findings to determine compliance with the criteria. Lastly, to examine the policy effects of the criteria⁶, findings are presented disaggregated by two sample dates: IEPs held prior to January 2006 and those held after January 2006. Overall, the study found few significant differences and indicate progress toward the outcome.

Met all of the Criteria – All Students

The basis of the outcome is that 90% of African-American students identified as ED shall meet all of the requirements of a comprehensive evaluation as defined by the Independent Monitor. During the 2005-2006 school year 25.3% of African American students met this criteria. This falls considerably short of the 90% criteria established by Outcome 18. The

⁶ During January 2006, the District distributed the criteria for a “comprehensive evaluation” as defined by the IM, via the Welligent system.

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

results indicate that for all students identified as ED, approximately 30% met the criteria. Although the number of students meeting the entire criteria continues to be poor, improvements are noted from year two. Furthermore, the results disaggregated by sample date provide further insight into improvements found during the assessment process for students identified as ED. Table 8 demonstrates the overall number of students that met all of the criteria, by race/ethnicity.

Table 8. Number and Percent of Students that Met Criteria, by Race/Ethnicity

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
Total Observations	174	206	105	485
Number of students meeting criteria	44	73	35	152
Percentage meeting criteria	25.3%	35.4%	33.3%	30.6%

Pearson Chi2 (2)=4.7631 Pr=0.092
Exact Fisher P value= 0.089

Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Initials and Change of Eligibility

Overall, the study found low rates of occurrence for elements within the pre-referral and referral interventions, as only 55% of all students met all of the requirements of this criteria (Table 9). However, this is an improvement from year two, where only 8% of all students met the criteria. For African American students, approximately half met the criteria. Another notable improvement from year two is the evidence of behavioral and academic difficulties (90.3%) and provision of behavioral supports (97.3%) prior to a referral.

**STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN
STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE**

Table 9. Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Initials

Number of students with Initial IEPs in analysis, by Race/Ethnicity	African American N=42		Latino N=42		White N=29		Total N=113	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Initial pre-referral intervention meeting.	31	73.8%	32	76.2%	23	79.3%	86
Follow-up pre-referral intervention meeting.	23	54.8%	25	59.5%	22	75.9%	70	61.9%
Parent participation at the pre-referral intervention meeting.	24	57.1%	28	66.7%	22	75.9%	74	65.5%
Documentation of other factors	33	78.6%	30	71.4%	21	72.4%	84	74.3%
Documentation of behavioral/academic concerns	38	90.5%	38	90.5%	26	89.7%	102	90.3%
Supports such as: non- DIS counseling, behavior plan, and/or school-wide discipline program.	41	97.6%	40	95.2%	29	100%	110	97.3%
Assessment plan	31	73.8%	33	78.6%	26	89.7%	90	79.6%
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	21	50.0%	23	54.8%	19	65.5%	63	55.8%

Pearson Chi2(2)=1.701 Pr=0.427
Exact Fisher P value= 0.472

Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Change of Eligibility

The results (Table 10) indicate that IEP teams are not providing the appropriate supports available within the child’s pre-existing IEP before determining a change in eligibility to ED. For instance, one may expect that if a child already receiving special education services begins to experience behavioral difficulties, IEP teams would first attempt to intervene by providing a behavior support plan, counseling and classroom accommodations and modifications. The results found indicate that this is not the case, with only 54% of the students observed having received the appropriate interventions prior to being identified as ED. However, it is noted that this is an improvement from year two.

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 10. Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Change of Eligibility

Number of students with Eligibility Change in analysis, by Race/Ethnicity	African American N=30		Latino N=31		White N=17		Total N=79	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Behavior Support Plan	22	73.3%	23	71.9%	13	76.5%	58	73.4%
Academic modifications and accommodations	24	80.0%	27	84.4%	16	94.1%	67	84.8%
Consideration for counseling services and/or referrals to school-wide discipline programs	27	90.0%	26	81.3%	15	88.2%	68	86.1%
Assessment plan	19	63.3%	26	81.3%	14	82.4%	59	74.7%
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	15	50.0%	16	50%	12	70.6%	43	54.4%

Pearson Chi2(2)=2.28 Pr=0.32
Exact Fisher P value= 0.349

Initial and change of eligibility IEPs are reported separately because of the different requirements as described in the rationale for the criteria. For the purpose of the outcome, both IEP types newly identify students as ED and are combined to demonstrate compliance of pre-referral and referral criteria. Table 11 presents the findings.

Table 11. Number and Percent of Students that Met the Pre-referral and Referral Criteria Combined Initials and Change of Eligibility, by Race/Ethnicity

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
Total Observations	72	74	46	192
Number of students meeting criteria	36	39	31	106
Percentage meeting criteria	50%	52.7%	67.4%	55.2%

Pearson Chi2(2)=3.7387 Pr=0.154
Exact Fisher P value= 0.155

Assessment – All Students

The results indicate that the majority of students received formal academic (95.1%), social emotional (93.8%) and behavioral (94.2%) evaluations; while health evaluations (85.2%) occurred with less frequency (see Table 12). Overall, it is noted that approximately three-fourths of all students in the sample met the criteria for a complete multidisciplinary assessment.

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 12. Assessment – All Students

	African American N=174		Hispanic N=206		White N=105		Total N=485	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Health assessment	142	81.6%	180	87.4%	91	86.7%	413	85.2%
Formal academic assessment	166	95.4%	197	95.6%	98	93.3%	461	95.1%
Cognitive or general ability assessment	152	87.4%	178	86.4%	91	86.7%	421	86.8%
Multi-disciplinary social-emotional evaluation	162	93.1%	191	92.7%	102	97.1%	455	93.8%
Comprehensive behavioral evaluation.	167	96.0%	195	94.7%	95	90.5%	457	94.2%
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	126	72.4%	161	78.2%	73	69.5%	360	74.2%

Pearson Chi2(2)=3.1748 Pr=0.204
Exact Fisher P value= 0.198

Determination of ED Eligibility – All Students

The results of the study indicate that approximately 70% of all students demonstrated evidence of an eligibility (Table 13). Additionally, about 60% of students had evidence of a statement considering exclusionary factors that may exclude a child from being ED, such as whether behaviors were a result of environmental stress or due to a social maladjustment. The study found 57.9% of all students met the criteria for this section. This is improvement from year two.

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 13. Determination of ED Eligibility – All students

Determination of ED Eligibility	African American N=174		Latino N=206		White N=105		Total N=485	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Comprehensive ED eligibility statement	122	70.1%	140	68.0%	76	72.4%	338	69.7%
Consideration of exclusionary criteria and other relevant factors	102	58.6%	120	58.3%	66	62.9%	228	59.4%
Justification of co-morbid disabilities	168	98.6%	204	99.0%	104	99.0%	476	98.1%
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	100	57.5%	118	57.3%	63	60.0%	281	57.9%

Pearson Chi2(2)=0.2352 Pr=0.889
Exact Fisher P value= 0.895

IEP Team Recommendations – All Students

The results indicate that IEP teams were considering supports upon identification such as behavior support plans (94.8%) and counseling (96.9%) with high frequency for all students identified as ED. Significant differences were found in the area of parent attendance at the IEP meeting where the identification and placement of their child was discussed. This element occurred with the least frequency (79.2%) and appears to be a primary reason for the overall low compliance within this section.

The outcome requires that IEP teams demonstrate consideration of placement in the LRE. Consideration of placement in the LRE is not synonymous to placement in the LRE such as a general education setting. This item is considered met if IEP teams document that different placement options were considered, regardless of the final placement decision. Overall, IEP teams were considering placement in the LRE for the majority of students (94.8%).

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 14. IEP Team Recommendations – All Students

IEP Team Recommendations	African American N=174		Latino N=206		White N=105		Total N=485	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Consideration of a behavior support plan (BSP)	169	97.1%	195	94.7%	96	91.4%	460	94.8%
IEP team considerations for placement in the LRE	166	95.4%	194	94.2%	98	93.3%	458	94.4%
Consideration of DIS counseling services, and/or referral to mental health agency	170	97.7%	201	97.6%	99	94.3%	470	96.9%
Counseling goals, if appropriate	165	94.8%	197	95.6%	98	93.3%	460	94.8%
Parent participation at the IEP meeting determining eligibility and placement	122	70.1%	173	84.0%	89	84.8%	384	79.2%
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	109	62.6%	146	70.9%	74	70.5%	329	67.8%

Pearson Chi2(2)=3.3567 Pr=0.187

Exact Fisher P value= 0.200

Placement Recommendations – Prior placement General Education

Due to the disproportionate number of African-American students attending NPS, the study collected data on placement recommendations made by IEP teams upon the initial identification of a student as ED. For all students newly identified with prior placement in the general education setting, 45% were recommended for NPS placement. The findings indicate that African-American students were recommended for NPS placements with more frequency (53.7%) than Latino (40.4%) and White (40.4%) students. The study also found that IEP teams recommended school of residence placements for African-Americans with less frequency (26.8%) than Latino (38.3%) and White (43.3%) students.

The findings indicate that IEP teams considered placements other than the home school placement for ED students with high frequency for all students (African Americans 80.5%, White 83%, and Latinos 78.7%).

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 15. Type of Placement Recommended by Race/Ethnicity Whose Prior Placement was General Education

Placement recommendation	African American		Latino		White		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
NPS	22	53.7%	19	40.4%	12	40.0%	53	44.9%
Non Residence School	8	19.5%	10	21.3%	5	16.7%	23	19.5%
School of Residence	11	26.8%	18	38.3%	13	43.3%	42	35.6%
Total	41	100%	47	100%	30	100%	118	100%

Pearson Chi2(4)=2.7561 Pr=0.599
Exact Fisher P value= 0.607

Placement Recommendations – Instructional Setting Recommendations for Students Attending Schools other than Non-public Schools and Special Education Centers

Overall placement trends were captured to understand the restrictiveness of placement decisions by IEP teams for students identified as ED attending schools other than non-public schools or special education centers. This was done to examine the placement decisions made by IEP teams for students attending schools with the general education population and included all students regardless of IEP type and previous placement. Table 16 shows that IEP teams recommended special day programs and special day programs specifically for students with ED, with more frequency for African American and Latino students. White students are placed with more frequency in the resource specialist program than African American and Latino students.

Table 16. Instructional Setting Recommended by Race/Ethnicity for Students attending Schools other than Non-Public Schools or Special Education Centers

Instructional setting recommendation	African American		Latino		White		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
DIS Only	1	1.7%	1	1.0%	1	2.4%	3	1.5%
Gen Ed	2	3.4%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	5	2.5%
RSP	9	15.5%	13	13.0%	16	38.1%	38	19.0%
SDP	22	37.9%	38	38.0%	18	42.9%	78	39.0%
SDP ED	24	41.4%	45	45.0%	7	16.7%	76	38.0%
Total	58	100%	100	100%	42	100%	200	100%

Pearson Chi2(8)= 18.78 Pr=0.0016
Exact Fisher P value= 0.007

Findings by Sample Date

To highlight the impact of the policy on practice, the year three study was able to look at the District’s performance toward the outcome upon the District’s distribution of the criteria for identifying students as ED. After minimal progress toward the outcome was observed in the year two study, the IM directed the District to distribute the criteria to all relevant personnel participating in the identification process for students with disabilities. The IM also recommended that the District create an ED certification form as part of the

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

IEP to serve as a guide for IEP teams for determining ED eligibility. The District’s method for distribution of the criteria was through the implementation of an ED certification form via the Welligent system. This form provides schools and service providers with the requirements of a comprehensive evaluation as mandated by Outcome 18, and required schools to acknowledge that all requirements have been met. In addition, the form serves as evidence of an eligibility statement and exclusionary criteria.

Tables 17 and 18 show the overall effect of the policy on progress toward the outcome. For those IEPs reviewed prior to the distribution of the criteria (July – December 2005), only 11% of all students had met the criteria of the outcome. The samples from January through June 2006, show an increase in overall compliance compared to those IEPs held prior to the distribution of the criteria. Statistically significant differences were found between African American students, Latino and White students reviewed after January 2006, with African American students having met the criteria with less frequency.

Table 17. Number and Percent of Students that Met Criteria, by Race/Ethnicity and Sample July 2005 – December 2005

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
Total Observations	74	89	46	209
Number of students meeting criteria	9	11	3	23
Percentage meeting criteria	12.2%	12.4%	6.5%	11.0%

Pearson Chi2=1.2120 Pr=0.546
Exact Fisher P value= 0.607

Table 18. Number and Percent of Students that Met Criteria, by Race/Ethnicity and Sample January 2006 – July 2006

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
Total Observations	100	117	59	276
Number of students meeting criteria	35	62	32	129
Percentage meeting criteria	35.0%	53.0%	54.2%	46.7%

Pearson Chi2=8.7056 Pr=0.013
Exact Fisher P value= 0.013

Tables 19 and 20 demonstrate the differences in the provision of eligibility statements and exclusionary criteria by sample date. As aforementioned, the ED certification form within the Welligent system serves as the eligibility and exclusionary criteria statement for identifying a child as ED. The findings demonstrate considerable improvements in the provision of eligibility and exclusionary criteria statements.

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 19. Determination of ED Eligibility – Sample July 2005 – December 2005

Determination of ED Eligibility	African American		Latino		White		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Comprehensive ED eligibility statement	33	44.6%	32	36.0%	19	41.3%	84	40.2%
Consideration of exclusionary criteria and other relevant factors	14	18.9%	14	15.7%	10	21.7%	38	18.2%
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	14	18.9%	13	14.6%	8	17.4%	35	16.7%

Pearson Chi2=0.5565 Pr=0.757

Exact Fisher P value= 0.746

Table 20. Determination of ED Eligibility – All Students, Sample January 2006 – July 2006

Determination of ED Eligibility	African American		Latino		White		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Comprehensive ED eligibility statement	89	89.0%	108	92.3%	57	96.6%	254	92.0%
Consideration of exclusionary criteria and other relevant factors	88	88.0%	106	90.6%	56	94.9%	250	90.6%
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	86	86.0%	105	89.7%	55	93.2%	246	89.1%

Pearson Chi2=2.075 Pr=0.0354

Exact Fisher P value= 0.363

Additional Findings

The nature of Outcome 18 addresses the issue of disproportionality in African American students identified as ED in the LAUSD by establishing a process that ensures a student’s procedural due process rights. This was done by the development of a “basic” criteria defining a comprehensive evaluation and setting a target to determine compliance. The rationale behind this approach was that if a process is set in place that ensures students receive appropriate pre-referral and referral supports, a multidisciplinary evaluation, justification of eligibility as defined by state law and IDEA, and supports upon

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

identification including consideration for placement in the least restrictive environment, disproportionality would decrease. To avoid any unintended consequences such as the cessation of ED identification of African American students or the increase of ED identification of students from other racial/ethnic groups, the outcome did not include targets to decrease the risk of identification for African American students or a comparison of risk between groups (risk ratio).

Having stated this rationale it is important to examine the effects of the efforts and policy on disproportionality in LAUSD. Two indicators for examining this effect are to look at the risk and risk ratios by year from the initial 2003-2004 study to 2005-2006. In addition, the identification rates of African American students may be examined as an indicator for examining any unintended consequences.

Overall, there has been a consistent decrease in the number of all students identified as ED and in students placed in the most restrictive environment of NPS. These decreases are observed across the three racial/ethnic groups and may be considered reasonably incremental. In addition, there has been a reasonable decrease in the risk of identification and the risk ratio for African American students.

Table 21 shows the number and percentage of students identified as ED by race/ethnicity and school year. Since the 2003-2004, the number of African American students identified as ED has decreased by 23.5%. It is also noted that similar decreases have occurred for students in all racial/ethnic groups, with the overall composition of ED students remaining constant. For example, in the 2003-2004 school year, African American students made up 35.97% compared to 33.01% in the 2005-2006 school.

Table 21. Number and Percentage of ED students by Race/Ethnicity and School Year

Number and Percentage of ED Students by Race/Ethnicity and School Year	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	African American	1,477	35.97%	1,312	35.03%	1,129	33.01%	-348
Latino	855	20.82%	747	19.95%	723	21.14%	-132	-15.4%
White	1,666	40.57%	1,589	42.43%	1,489	43.54%	-177	-10.6%
Other	108	2.63%	97	2.59%	79	2.31%	-29	-26.8%
Total	4,106	100%	3,745	100%	3,420	100%	-686	-16.7%

STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE

Table 22 shows the number and percentage of students in NPS by race/ethnicity and school year. Since the 2003-2004 school year, there has been a 17.6% decrease in the number of African American students placed in NPS. The decrease in NPS placements have occurred across the three main racial/ethnic groups, with the composition of students remaining constant for all racial/ethnic groups.

Table 22. Number and Percentage of students in NPS, by Race/Ethnicity and School Year

Number and Percentage of ED Students in NPS by Race/Ethnicity and School Year	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	African American	823	38.8%	787	38.13%	678	35.26%	-145
Latino	496	23.39%	473	22.92%	472	21.14	-24	-4.5%
White	757	35.69%	752	36.43%	728	37.86	-29	-3.8%
Other	45	2.12%	52	2.52%	45	2.34	0	0%
Total	2,121	100%	2,064	100%	1,923	100%	-198	-9.3%

The risk and relative risk of being identified as ED has decreased for African American students (Table 23). This decrease appears reasonable for a two year intervention period.

Table 23. Risk and Risk Ratio of African American Students Identified as ED, by School Year

Risk and Risk Ratio by School Year	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006	
	Risk	Risk Ratio	Risk	Risk Ratio	Risk	Risk Ratio
African American	1.67	4.28	1.51	4.05	1.36	3.88

Conclusion and Implications

Overall, the study found low levels of compliance with the outcome that mandates that 90% of African American students identified as ED meet the elements of a standard evaluation as defined by the Independent Monitor. The findings indicate that only 25% of African-American students identified as ED met the criteria. However, this is an improvement from the 3% of African American students that met the criteria in the 2004-2005 school year. Furthermore, the percentage of African American students that met the

**STUDY ON THE DISPROPORTIONATE IDENTIFICATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN
STUDENTS AS ED IN LAUSD – YEAR THREE**

entire criteria is considerably better after the distribution of the criteria in January 2006 (46.7%) than the sample between June 2005 and December 2005 (11.0%). Despite the low level of overall compliance, the decrease in the risk and relative risk of being identified as ED for African American students is evidence that disproportionality has been reduced. This is especially encouraging with the overall decrease in the number of *all* students identified as ED and placed in the most restrictive setting of NPS.

The District has made improvements in providing all students with a more comprehensive evaluation for identification than was first observed during the 2003-2004 baseline year. However, for the District to continue to make progress toward the 90% target to meet the outcome, it needs to continue to provide additional professional development guided by the checklist to psychologists, administrators and other relevant school personnel. Although the District has now provided personnel involved in the pre-referral, referral and assessment process with the criteria as part of the Welligent IEP, this method of distribution does not ensure that personnel are aware of the pre-referral and referral intervention requirements. Additionally, based on our interactions with school psychologists, senior district staff and school personnel, there appears to be misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the requirements for this outcome.

One of the more positive findings is in the number of students with evidence of an eligibility statement and exclusionary criteria. For those IEPs held after January 2006, 92% of all students demonstrated evidence of an eligibility statement and 90.6% consideration of exclusionary factors.

Although the study found high rates of evidence that IEP teams considered the LRE upon identification, it was also found that IEP teams continued to rely on placements outside of a child's residence school with high frequency. This finding may suggest that ED identification is driven by the placement decisions of an IEP team, and provides insight into the availability of programs and supports to educate students at their home schools and in less segregated settings.

Lastly, the study continues to find discrepancies in the accuracy of data contained within the database provided by the District. This has been an ongoing problem and is of particular concern as the database contained miscoding of IEP types and missing students, which may considerably impact the sample selection and monitoring efforts of the outcome. The District needs to verify the accuracy of the data submitted monthly to my office. I expect that District personnel will meet with my office to clarify these expectations in a timely manner.

Attachment A: Instrument

STUDENT'S NAME: _____

DATE OF BIRTH: _____

REVIEWER: _____

DATE OF REVIEW: _____

- File review is complete
 - File review is not complete, child was exited from SPED (must make a copy of all relevant IEPs)
 - File review is not complete, child is no longer eligible as ED (must make a copy of all relevant IEPs)
 - File review is not complete due to the child's records being unavailable
-

1. REVIEW OF PRE-REFERRAL AND REFERRAL INTERVENTION

- Request for assessment (PARENT) (AGENCY) if checked must circle one
- No information on request / teacher request

FOR STUDENTS INITIALLY REFERRED FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Documentation of an initial pre-referral intervention meeting, such as an SST or 504 plan, that addresses the behavioral and/or academic concerns and actions to address these concerns. <input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12 <input type="checkbox"/> Student Intervention Record Form (BUL-2075) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Documentation of a follow-up pre-referral intervention meeting, such as an SST or 504 plan (at least 3 months after the initial meeting) documenting the results of the interventions and the effect on the behavior. <input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12 <input type="checkbox"/> Student Intervention Record Form (BUL-2075) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Evidence of parent participation at the pre-referral intervention meeting, such as an SST and/or parent conference. <input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12 <input type="checkbox"/> Student Intervention Record Form (BUL-2075) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-referral teams documentation of the following considerations: <input type="checkbox"/> attendance history; <input type="checkbox"/> recent changes in student's home environment; <input type="checkbox"/> student's primary language (if applicable); and, <input type="checkbox"/> vision and hearing screening.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Report card or cumulative file comments indicate behavioral and academic concerns for more than one semester (secondary) or one year, prior to the date of referral.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Documentation of one of the following; non-DIS counseling, behavior modification plan, and/or participation in a school-wide discipline program. <input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12 <input type="checkbox"/> Student Intervention Record Form (BUL-2075) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment plan and/or other documentation indicating behavioral concerns and consideration for ED as a suspected disability (such as Request for Assessment by parent). <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan <input type="checkbox"/> Student Intervention Record Form (BUL-2075)

1. REVIEW OF PRE-REFERRAL AND REFERRAL INTERVENTION (CONTINUED)

FOR STUDENTS CURRENTLY RECEIVING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES UNDER *ANOTHER* ELIGIBILITY (NOT ED)

- | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Behavior support plan (IEP Behavior Support Plan) <i>Need to look at previous IEP</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Academic modifications and accommodations attempted to address the behavioral concerns <input type="checkbox"/> p. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> p.4 <input type="checkbox"/> p. 12 <i>(of current or previous IEP)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Consideration for counseling services and/or referrals to school-wide discipline programs <input type="checkbox"/> p. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> p. 4 <input type="checkbox"/> p. 12 <i>(Previous IEP)</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Assessment plan indicating behavioral concerns and consideration for ED as a suspected disability (or statement in <i>IEP p. 3 or 12</i> indicating a re-evaluation due to behavioral concerns) |

Begin here for students currently identified as emotionally disturbed (triennial or re-evaluation).

For triennials, review previous annual IEP to determine if the IEP team determined that a formal assessment would *not be required* at the triennial to re-establish eligibility.

Preparation for Three Year Review p. 6: Section H (must mark one)

- No Formal Assessment needed to re-establish eligibility Formal Assessment needed
 Previous IEP is unavailable or did not indicate either

2. ASSESSMENT

Present Levels of Performance p. 3

- | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Health assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Formal academic assessment and consideration of assessments based on curriculum and classroom performance. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cognitive or general ability assessment identifying the student's strengths and weaknesses |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Multi-disciplinary social-emotional evaluation considering home and community behavior using the following measures: <input type="checkbox"/> observation in various settings (formal and informal); <input type="checkbox"/> ratings scales and/or other psychometric instruments; and, <input type="checkbox"/> interviews with at least one teacher and/or parent. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Comprehensive behavioral evaluation such as a functional behavioral analysis, functional assessment analysis or other behavioral evaluation that identifies the function of the behavior, the frequency and duration of the behavior, and the identification of alternative behaviors that may serve to replace the undesired behavior.
<input type="checkbox"/> Behavior Support Plan <input type="checkbox"/> p. 3 <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____ |

3. DETERMINATION OF ED ELIGIBILITY

Yes No

- Comprehensive ED eligibility statement identifying specific areas of eligibility as per IDEA 1997 regulations (must have at least one within the context of explaining ED as disability)
- p.3 (psych) p. 4 p. 12 Ed Certification Form Other:
- an inability to learn that can not be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors
 an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers/teachers
 inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances
 a general pervasiveness mood of unhappiness or depression
 a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems
- Consideration of exclusionary criteria and other relevant factors (must be in the context of explaining eligibility consideration)
- p.3 (psych) p. 4 p. 12 Ed Certification Form Other:
- are behaviors a result of intellectual, sensory or health factors?
 are behaviors due to a specific environmental stress or situational trauma?
 are behaviors a function of social maladjustment without evidence of an emotional disturbance?
- Justification of co-morbid disabilities (i.e. additional disabilities)
 N/A Statement providing an explanation or reason for more than one eligibility
- p. 3 p. 12 SLD certification form (at the back of IEP)

4. IEP TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Yes No

- Consideration of a Behavior Support Plan (BSP) p. 12
- IEP team considerations for placement in the least restrictive environment, including appropriate supports and modifications to ensure participation in the LRE, with responsible personnel
- p. 12 other:
- Placement recommendations p. 8 Section M: IEP team recommendations or p.12: Summary:*
Location of Services: School of residence non-residence school SPED center
 nonpublic school (NPS) **no need to indicate instructional setting**
Instructional Setting: Gen. Ed. RSP SDC SDC ED DIS
- Identify placement prior to IEP: initial evaluations should be General Ed*
 Gen. Ed. RSP SDC DIS (ie. Speech and Language, Counseling, OT, PT)
- Consideration of DIS counseling services, and/or referral to mental health agency for such services (AB3632)
- p. 4 p. 12
- Counseling goals, if appropriate (If counseling not provided but there is evidence of consideration, mark N/A: not applicable)
 N/A
- p. 5
- Parent participation at the IEP meeting determining eligibility and placement
- p. 10 Section Q (date must be the same as IEP date) other: _____

Attachment B: Data Cover Page

Los Angeles Unified School District
Office of the Independent Monitor

Data Cover Page

DistrictID	Last Name	First Name	Birthday
			8/31/1996

Gender	Ethnicity	Eligibility	Grade	IEP Date	IEP Type
M	H	ED	4	5/31/2006	Re-eval

School of Attendance		
Loc Code	School	Local District
NP0094	PARKHILL SCHOOL	NPS

Location of Cum Folder		
Loc Code	School	Local District
	PARKHILL	

Location of Psych Folder		
Loc Code	School/Office	Local District
	PARKHILL	

SampleDate: 6/15/2006