

**Office of the Independent Monitor**  
September 30, 2008

*Study on the Disproportionate Identification of African American  
Students as ED in LAUSD – Year Five*

**Introduction**

This report presents the findings of the fifth year of the study on the disproportionate identification of African-American students as emotionally disturbed (ED) in the Los Angeles Unified School Dist (LAUSD). The study measures the District's performance on Outcome 18: Disproportionality. The results of the 2007-2008 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 as mandated by the Modified Consent Decree (MCD). Outcome 18 states:

*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.*

The report will briefly discuss the methodology and sample design. The report will present findings and highlight areas of progress of the 2007-2008 year five study. Finally, recommendations are provided.

**Study on the Disproportionate Identification of African American Students as Emotionally Disturbed In LAUSD – Year Five (2007-2008)**

This study was a continuation of the 2006-2007 study. 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 in 2003. Furthermore, for purpose of the outcome each student must demonstrate evidence of all items provided to be considered met. 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.

**Methodology**

*Sample Design*

The study included all initial evaluations and a sample of re-evaluations of African American and White students identified as ED. A sample of initials and re-evaluations was drawn for Latino students and for students in all other race/ethnicities. The sample was drawn from a database provided monthly by the District of all students that received a comprehensive evaluation resulting in the identification and eligibility of ED. During the 2007-2008 school year,

the drawn sample for the study included a total of 530 students. Tables 1, 2 and 3 present the descriptions of the sample by race/ethnicity, local district and school level.

Table 1: ED Sample by Race/Ethnicity

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
African American	183	34.5%
Latino	205	38.7%
White	129	24.3%
Other	13	2.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2: ED Sample by Local District

<b>District</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	42	7.9%
2	35	6.6%
3	28	5.3%
4	29	5.5%
5	34	6.4%
6	12	2.3%
7	39	7.4%
8	28	5.3%
NPS	266	50.2%
Support Units	2	0.4%
Charter	15	2.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 3: ED Sample by School Level

<b>School Level</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Elementary/ preschool/early ed	74	14.0%
Middle School	73	13.8%
High School	105	19.8%
Special Centers	10	1.9%
NPS	265	50.0%
Other	3	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>100%</b>

### *Elements of the file review*

The development of the file review is well documented<sup>1</sup>. The review examines the provision of activities during four stages of the referral and identification process. These include: pre-referral and referral interventions; multi-disciplinary assessment; eligibility determination; and, IEP team considerations of supports upon ED identification. The specific elements of the review are summarized below and can be viewed on the comprehensive evaluation checklist (Appendix A).

- *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

Additional data collected included information on the referring party, such as parent or agency (License Children's Institution, DCFS) that requested 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.

### *Data Collection and Analysis*

Demographic and IEP information for all students identified as ED were uploaded from the District's database and verified for accuracy on a monthly basis. Comprehensive reviews of cumulative files and IEPs were conducted at schools and/or central office by trained research assistants. During the 2007-2008 school year, IEPs and psychological reports accessible through the Welligent IEP system were retrieved and reviewed as needed. Inter-rater reliability was established through multiple reviews by different raters which consisted of a minimum of three reviews. At the conclusion of the data collection, data was entered into a database and sent to AIR for statistical analyses.

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"<sup>2</sup> racial/ethnic groups. The sample of valid observations consisted of 181 African American, 202 Latino, 128 White, and 12 other race/ethnicity students throughout LAUSD. Tables 4, 5, and 6 demonstrate the analyzed sample descriptions by race/ethnicity, local district, and school level. As mentioned above, for the purpose of reporting and comparisons between groups, students that were exited from special education, no longer eligible as ED, or students in

---

<sup>1</sup> The report may be viewed at: [http://oimla.com/pdf/annrep2\\_docs/appendix\\_h\\_edreport.pdf](http://oimla.com/pdf/annrep2_docs/appendix_h_edreport.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> "Other" students were removed from the analysis due to the small size of the sample

the other race/ethnicity group were removed from the final analysis. Data collection included IEPs conducted between July 15, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

Table 4: ED Analyzed Sample, by Race/Ethnicity

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
African American	181	34.6%
Latino	202	38.6%
White	128	24.5%
Other	12	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 5: ED Analyzed Sample, by Local District

<b>District</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	42	8.0%
2	34	6.5%
3	27	5.2%
4	27	5.2%
5	33	6.3%
6	12	2.3%
7	39	7.5%
8	28	5.4%
NPS	264	50.5%
Support Units	2	0.4%
Charter	15	2.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 6: ED Analyzed Sample, by School Level

<b>School Level</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Elementary/ Preschool/Early Ed	72	13.8%
Middle School	73	14.0%
High School	102	19.5%
Special Centers	10	1.9%
NPS	263	50.3%
Other	3	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Findings

The findings are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and 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. For the purpose of determining compliance with the criteria of Outcome 18, the findings are combined to present overall progress toward the 90% target.

### *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. Table 7 demonstrates the overall number of students that met all of the criteria by race/ethnicity. During the 2007-2008 school year, 70.2% of African American students met this criteria. This continues to fall short of the 90% criteria established by Outcome 18. The results indicate that for all students identified as ED, approximately 77.2% met the criteria. Although the number of students meeting the entire criteria continues to be below the target, improvements are noted from year four where only 50.5% of African American students and 53% of all other students met the criteria. It is also noted, that statistically significant differences exist between race/ethnicities.

Table 7: Number and Percent of Students that Met Criteria, by Race/Ethnicity

<b>Number and Percent Met Criteria</b>	<b>African American</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total Observations	181	200	128	509
Number of students meeting criteria	127	156	110	393
<b>Percentage meeting criteria</b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>78.0%</b>	<b>85.9%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>

*Chi Square p value: 0.005    Exact Fisher p value: 0.004*

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

Overall, the study found high rates of occurrence for elements within the pre-referral and referral interventions, with 97.1% of all students having met all of the requirements within the criteria of pre-referral and referral interventions (Table 8). For African American students, approximately 91% met the criteria. This is a considerable improvement from the 2006-2007 school year, where 58% of all students and 64% of African American students met the criteria.

Table 8: Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Initials

<b>Number of students with Initial IEPs in analysis, by Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>African American N=32</b>		<b>Latino N=42</b>		<b>White N=31</b>		<b>Total N=105</b>	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Initial pre-referral intervention meeting.	29	90.6%	42	100%	31	100%	102	97.1%
Follow-up pre-referral intervention meeting.	29	90.6%	42	100%	31	100%	102	97.1%
Parent participation at the pre-referral intervention meeting.	30	93.8%	42	100%	31	100%	103	98.1%
Documentation of other factors	30	93.8%	42	100%	31	100%	103	98.1%
Documentation of behavioral/academic concerns	31	96.9%	42	100%	31	100%	104	99.0%
Supports such as: non-DIS counseling, behavior plan, and/or school-wide discipline program.	30	93.8%	42	100%	31	100%	103	98.1%
Assessment plan	32	100%	42	100%	31	100%	105	100%
<b>Number and percentage of students meeting criteria</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>97.1%</b>

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

Table 9 demonstrates the levels of support IEP teams are providing 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 and/or emotional difficulties, the IEP team would first attempt to intervene by providing a behavior support plan, counseling, and classroom accommodations and/or modifications. Although improvements are noted from the 2006-2007 school year, this area continues to be an area of weakness. One reason may be due to the change of the student’s eligibility which may occur as an amendment IEP that has potential to bypass the addition and implementation of such services, as well as an assessment plan for conducting a comprehensive evaluation.

Table 9: Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Change of Eligibility

Number of students with Eligibility Change in analysis, by Race/Ethnicity	African American N=48		Latino N=35		White N=30		Total N=113	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Behavior Support Plan	40	83.3%	31	88.6%	28	93.3%	99	87.6%
Academic modifications and accommodations	45	93.8%	34	97.1%	30	100%	109	96.5%
Consideration for counseling services and/or referrals to school-wide discipline programs	43	89.6%	35	100%	29	96.7%	107	94.7%
Assessment plan	42	87.5%	34	97.1%	27	90.0%	103	91.2%
<b>Number and percentage of students meeting criteria</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>79.2%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>82.3%</b>

*Assessment – All Students*

The study found that the majority of students assessed and found eligible with ED, (88.8%) received a comprehensive multidisciplinary assessment (Table 10). Overall, it is noted that the area of assessment occurring with less frequency continues to be health evaluations.

Table 10: Assessment – All Students

	African American N=181		Hispanic N=200		White N=128		Total N=509	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Health assessment	169	93.4%	186	93.0%	121	94.5%	476	93.5%
Formal academic assessment	180	99.4%	194	97.0%	126	98.4%	500	98.2%
Cognitive or general ability assessment	172	95.0%	186	93.0%	116	90.6%	474	93.1%
Multi-disciplinary social-emotional evaluation	179	98.9%	196	98.0%	128	100%	503	98.8%
Comprehensive behavioral evaluation.	179	98.9%	200	100%	128	100%	507	99.6%
<b>Number and percentage of students meeting criteria</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>90.1%</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>89.1%</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>88.8%</b>

*Determination of ED Eligibility – All Students*

The results indicate that approximately 99% of all students demonstrated evidence of an eligibility and exclusionary statement (Table 11). Despite this high level of frequency, it was noted that in very few instances the technological safeguards of the ED certification form established in the Welligent IEP system seem to be bypassed primarily through the utilization of an amendment IEP.

It is important to note that for students without an accompanying (co-morbid) eligibility, this element is considered not applicable and met. Furthermore, if a student is eligible for more than one eligibility, it is important that the IEP include an eligibility statement for all of the eligibilities listed on page four of the IEP.

Table 11: Determination of ED Eligibility – All students

<b>Determination of ED Eligibility</b>	<b>African American N=181</b>		<b>Latino N=200</b>		<b>White N=128</b>		<b>Total N=509</b>	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Comprehensive ED eligibility statement	179	98.9%	198	99.0%	126	98.4%	503	98.8%
Consideration of exclusionary criteria and other relevant factors	179	98.9%	198	99.0%	126	98.4%	503	98.8%
Justification of co-morbid disabilities	176	97.2%	198	99.0%	125	97.7%	499	98.0%
<b>Number and percentage of students meeting criteria</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>96.1%</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>98.0%</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>96.1%</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>96.9%</b>

*IEP Team Recommendations – All Students*

The study found that IEP teams were considering supports upon identification such as behavior support plans (99.4%) and counseling (99.8%) with high frequency for all students identified as ED (Table 12). Parent attendance and/or participation at the IEP meeting where the ED identification occurred, was an element noted with the least frequency (79.6%). Parent participation is a primary reason for not meeting compliance within this section for all students as well as a primary reason for not meeting the 90% target of the Outcome 18.

Table 12: IEP Team Recommendations – All Students

IEP Team Recommendations	African American N=181		Latino N=200		White N=128		Total N=509	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Consideration of a behavior support plan (BSP)	179	98.9%	200	100%	127	99.2%	506	99.4%
IEP team considerations for placement in the LRE	179	98.9%	200	100%	126	98.4%	505	99.2%
Consideration of DIS counseling services, and/or referral to mental health agency	181	100%	199	99.5%	128	100%	508	99.8%
Counseling goals, if appropriate	179	98.9%	197	98.5%	128	100%	504	99.0%
Parent participation at the IEP meeting determining eligibility and placement	146	80.7%	181	90.5%	126	98.4%	453	89.0%
<b>Number and percentage of students meeting criteria</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>79.6%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>96.9%</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>87.8%</b>

*Placement Recommendations – Prior placement General Education*

Due to the disproportionate number of African American students attending NPS, the study historically has collected data on placement recommendations made by IEP teams upon the initial identification of a student as ED (Table 13). For all students newly identified and a prior placement in the general education setting, approximately 50% were recommended for NPS placement. This figure is consistent with the recommendation patterns observed during the 2006-2007 school year. The findings indicate that African American students were recommended for NPS placements with less frequency (36.1%) than Latino (48.9%) and White (62.5%) students. However, this pattern is a shift in direction from the 2006-2007 school year, where African American students were recommended for non-public schools with the highest frequency (54% vs. Latino: 50% and White: 49%).

Table 13: 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	13	36.1%	23	48.9%	25	62.5%	61	49.6%
Non Residence School	9	25.0%	8	17.0%	1	2.5%	18	14.6%
School of Residence	14	38.9%	16	34.0%	14	35.0%	44	35.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>100%</b>

*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 other than Non-Public Schools or Special Education Centers and included all students regardless of IEP type and previous placement. Table 14 shows that IEP teams recommended special day programs specifically for students with ED, with more frequency for African American (59.0%) and Latino (52.3%) students than White (21.9%) students. White students were more likely (50%) to have less restrictive instructional settings such as RSP, general education classroom or designated instructional supports only, than Latino 19.9% and African American 19.7% students.

Table 14: 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	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	1	3.1%	2	1.1%
Gen Ed	0	0.0%	4	4.7%	2	6.3%	6	3.4%
RSP	12	19.7%	12	14.0%	13	40.6%	37	20.7%
SDP	13	21.3%	24	27.9%	9	28.1%	46	25.7%
SDP ED	36	59.0%	45	52.3%	7	21.9%	88	49.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Additional Findings**

To examine the effects of the intervention on disproportionality in LAUSD, two indicators are utilized: the risk and relative risk ratio. The risk or odds index provides the probability of a student within a racial/ethnic group of being identified in a disability category. The risk or odds index is calculated by dividing the number of students of a particular race/ethnic group in a given

disability category by the total enrollment for that racial or ethnic group in the population. For African American students in the LAUSD, the risk or odds of being identified with ED is 1.1, meaning that approximately 1.1 students out of 100 are identified with ED. The risk of being identified as ED for White students is 0.9 and for Latino students is 0.2.

To examine disproportionality, a relative risk ratio is calculated by comparing the risk of African American students to the risk of *all* other students. This results in a relative risk ratio of 3.92 and is considered significantly disproportionate.

Table 15 shows the risk and relative risk ratio indices from 2003-2004 through 2007-2008. The risk of being identified as ED has decreased for African American students from 1.67 to 1.1. Although the risk ratio for African American students has decreased since the 2003-2004 school year, the risk ratio has maintained stable over the past three years. This may be a result of the consistent decreases in the risk of ED identifications for all race/ethnicities.

Table 15: 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		2006-2007		2007-2008	
	Risk	Risk Ratio	Risk	Risk Ratio	Risk	Risk Ratio	Risk	Risk Ratio	Risk	Risk Ratio
African American	1.67	4.28	1.51	4.05	1.36	3.88	1.20	3.93	1.1	3.92

Table 16 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 43.0%. Further, the overall composition of African American students has demonstrated a decrease of approximately 4%. For students in racial/ethnic groups other than African American, similar decreases in ED identifications are observed.

Table 16: 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		2006-07		2007-2008	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
African American	1,477	35.97%	1,312	35.03%	1,129	33.01%	947	33.14%	840	32.2%
White	855	20.82%	747	19.95%	723	21.14%	635	22.22%	558	21.4%
Latino	1,666	40.57%	1,589	42.43%	1,489	43.54%	1,218	42.62%	1,135	43.5%
Other	108	2.63%	97	2.59%	79	2.31%	58	2.13%	75	2.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,106</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,745</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,420</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,858</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,608</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 17 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 35% decrease in the number of African

American students placed in NPS. In addition, the composition of African American students with ED enrolled in non-public schools, has decreased by approximately 6%.

Table 17: 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		2006-07		2007-2008	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
African American	823	38.8%	787	38.13%	678	35.26%	581	34.22%	533	33.0%
White	496	23.39%	473	22.92%	472	21.14%	440	25.91%	401	24.8%
Latino	757	35.69%	752	36.43%	728	37.86%	642	37.81%	636	39.4%
Other	45	2.12%	52	2.52%	45	2.34%	35	2.06%	46	2.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,121</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,064</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,923</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,698</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,616</b>	<b>100%</b>

A further examination of all students that did not receive a comprehensive evaluation (n=116, 23%) found that the majority of students were missing one item (n=70, 60%). In addition, the review found that 60% of the students that did not receive a comprehensive evaluation attended a non-public school. The review found that the two most common elements missing for students that did not receive a comprehensive evaluation were: missing at least one component of the multidisciplinary assessment (primarily health and cognition) (50%); and, the parent did not participate by either attendance or via telephone at the IEP meeting (50%).

For African American students, 54 of the 181 (29.8%) students reviewed did not receive a comprehensive evaluation. Of these students that did not meet the criteria 34 (63%) were missing one item. The most frequent element missing was parent participation, with 25 of the 34 (74%) of the cases not meeting this item. The second most frequent element was one area of a multidisciplinary assessment, with 7 out of the 34 (21%) cases not meeting this item.

Of the remaining 20 cases of African American students that did not meet the criteria, 11 (20%) were missing two items; and 9 (17%) were missing three or more items. Lastly, of the 54 African American students that did not meet the criteria, 35 students (65%) attended non-public schools.

### Conclusion and Implications

Overall, the study found improvements in the levels of compliance with the outcome that mandates that 90% of African American students identified as ED meet the elements of a comprehensive evaluation as defined by the Independent Monitor. The findings indicate that 70% of African American students identified as ED met the criteria. This is an improvement from the 50% of African American students that met the criteria in the 2006-2007 school year. Furthermore, many of the areas have improved considerably closer to the target levels necessary for compliance with the outcome. However, several areas continue to impede the District's

performance for meeting Outcome 18. First, levels of compliance with parent participation at the IEP meeting are at 71.1% for African American students. This means that even if all other requirements are met, the lack of parent participation at the IEP meeting will result in non-compliance with the overall outcome. It is important to emphasize that for the purpose of compliance with Outcome 18, parent attendance and/or participation at the IEP meeting is required and may consist of participation by either attendance at the IEP meeting or participation via telephone or any other means of communication. A parent conference after the completion of the IEP meeting is not considered parent participation.

Based on the analyses of African American students that did not meet the criteria, 34 of the 54 were missing only one item of the criteria. If these 34 students had met the criteria, the District's performance would have been at 89%, near the 90% target required by Outcome 18. This example is highlighted to demonstrate the relative proximity of the District's efforts toward meeting this outcome.

To continue further progress in meeting Outcome 18, the District should continue to emphasize the requirement of parental participation at IEP meetings for students identified with ED. The District would further benefit from targeting any interventions associated with this outcome to non-public school providers.

## 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.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12<br><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.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12<br><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.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12<br><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 <b>more than</b> 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.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Report Card <input type="checkbox"/> Cum Folder <input type="checkbox"/> SST Form <input type="checkbox"/> IEP p. 3, 4 or 12<br><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).<br><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) <b><i>Need to look at previous IEP</i></b>  |
| <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 <b><i>(of current or previous IEP)</i></b> |
| <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 <b><i>(Previous IEP)</i></b>           |
| <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.                               |
- Behavior Support Plan  p. 3  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

<b>DistrictID</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Birthday</b>
			8/31/1996

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Eligibility</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>IEP Date</b>	<b>IEP Type</b>
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: 8/31/2006