

Office of the Independent Monitor

October 5, 2009

*Study of the Accuracy of District Data on Placement
in the Least Restrictive Environment Multiple Disabilities Orthopedic 2008-09*

Outcome 7B is a new outcome which requires the District to increase to 23% the number of students with multiple disabilities orthopedic (MDO) (Ages 6-18) placed in the general education setting for 40% or more of the instructional day. At the time of the negotiation that created this outcome, during the 2007-2008 school year, the Welligent data reported 10.30% of students with an eligibility of MDO as being placed in the general education classroom for 40% or more of the day. This rate was determined as the baseline for this outcome.

Outcome 7B: Placement of Students with Disabilities (Ages 6-18) with MDO Eligibility. The District will demonstrate a ratio of not less than 23% of students placed in the combined categories of 0-20% and 21-60%, and not more than 77% of students placed in the 61-100% category utilizing instructional minutes as the methodology. In determining whether the District has achieved this outcome, any fraction percentage of .51 or above shall be rounded up to its nearest whole number.

This study examines the accuracy of the District's LRE data for making a determination of the District's progress on Outcome 7B. Since the population of students with MDO in the District is relatively small (n=1,109), the study re-established the baseline of students with MDO in the general education setting for more than 40% of the instructional day¹. To develop a profile of students with MDO, the study also examined variables of student abilities and instructional supports and services. The intent of this study was to gain insights regarding student and instructional strengths and commonalities that may assist the District in developing targeted strategies that may facilitate the integration of students with MDO in the general education setting. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Are there discrepancies between the percent of time in special education calculated from information on the IEP and the percent of time in special education calculated from the number of special education minutes in a student's schedule?
2. Do any discrepancies between the percent of time in special education in Welligent and in the student schedule data have any impact on the overall calculation of percent of time in special education for Outcome 7B?
3. Are there differences in the supports and services students with MDO receive, by school type (i.e., general education campus and special education centers)?

Methodology

The methodology for this study contains two parts. The first utilizes the methodology of the LRE study which validates the accuracy of the Welligent LRE data by comparing the time spent in special education reported by the IEP document and student schedule. The second part of this study included conducting a comprehensive IEP review to identify areas of students' strengths

¹ At the time of the negotiation, the Welligent LRE data had not been validated.

and commonalities within their instructional programs between those attending general education schools and special education centers.

Sample Design

The sampling for the MDO study included the entire population of students with MDO attending general education campuses², and a random sample of students attending special education centers. Since the majority of students with MDO attend special education centers, the sample is not representative of the student population within the District. However, since the performance on this outcome is directly related to those students attending general education campuses³, all students with MDO attending these schools were selected in order to determine the actual number of students placed in the general education setting for more than 40% of the instructional day. This count will establish an accurate view of the District’s performance on this outcome based on the entire population of students with MDO as opposed to a sample.

Tables 1 and 2 show the final distributions of the overall MDO LRE analysis sample (N=272) across local school districts and school type. The sample was not able to obtain class schedules for 20 students and removed them from the analyzed LRE sample. This distribution also differs slightly from the initial population of students attending general education campuses, as 15 students were re-categorized into those attending special education centers due to their participation in the Carlson Home School program. These students do not attend any school and receive instruction within their homes. Since the IEP meetings are typically held at the student’s home school, these IEPs indicated the student attended a general education campus. However, for the calculation of the District’s performance on Outcome 7B, these students are considered as attending special education centers.

Table 1. Distribution of Students in the MDO LRE Analysis by Local District

Local District	N	%
1	45	16.5
2	41	15.1
3	34	12.5
4	17	6.3
5	37	13.6
6	36	13.2
7	11	4.0
8	27	9.9
R – Charter schools	5	1.8
T – I Division Schools	19	7.0
Total	272	100.0

² The sample did not include all of the 75 students attending Pacific Boulevard School, which was formerly a special education center, since the data did not indicate integration in the general education setting for more than 40% of the instructional day. However, the sample does include some of these students.

³ The majority of students attending special education centers do not have an opportunity to integrate into the general education setting since these schools do not have a general education population.

Table 2. Distribution of Students in the MDO LRE Analysis by School Level

School Level	N	%
Elementary	110	40.4
Middle	49	18.0
High	52	19.1
Spec Centers	61	22.4
Total	272	100

Tables 3 and 4 show the final distributions of the overall sample of the MDO profile analysis (N=292) across local school districts and school type.

Table 3: Distribution of Students in the MDO Profile Analysis by Local District

Local District	N	%
1	49	16.8
2	44	15.1
3	35	12.0
4	19	6.5
5	38	13.0
6	42	14.4
7	11	3.8
8	28	9.6
R – Charter Schools	7	2.4
T – I Division Schools	19	6.5
Total	292	100

Table 4. Distribution of Students in the MDO Profile Analysis by School Level

School Level	N	%
Elementary	126	43.2
Middle	51	17.5
High	54	18.5
Spec Centers	61	20.9
Total	292	100

Data Collection and Analyses

Data including student demographic information and the percentage of time in the special education setting were uploaded centrally and placed on an instrument developed by the OIM (Attachment A). The data were verified through a review of the student’s most current IEP and the IEP identified at the time of the sampling. Classroom schedules detailing the time spent

either in the general or special education setting and a roster of special education teachers also were collected.

Consistent with the methodology of the LRE study, collected data were used to create student files. Each file was expected to contain a report on the number of instructional minutes reported by school staff, a completed data collection instrument and the student's classroom/class or other available schedules. Data from these sources were then analyzed to determine the total number of special education minutes each student received and then were transferred to a data summary sheet (Attachment B).

To develop a profile of students' strengths and instructional supports and services, a data collection instrument (Attachment C) was designed to identify the following:

- Levels of mobility: independent, walker, wheelchair, fully dependent
- Levels of self-care or adaptive skills
 - Toileting: independent, with assistance, fully dependent
 - Feeding: independent, with assistance, fully dependent
 - Respiratory: independent, with assistance, fully dependent
- Levels of communication: fluent, partial oral, basic needs, alternate mode
 - Types of alternate mode: Voice output device, communication board, sign language
- Instructional Program: general education curriculum, alternate curriculum
- Participation in the statewide assessment program: California Standards Test (CST) or California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)
- Instructional Services: additional adult assistants (AAA), speech and language services (LAS), occupational therapy (OT), adapted physical education (APE), Assistive Technology (AT), health care assistants (HCA), inclusion specialist, LRE counselor, specialized nursing, physical therapy, behavior specialist (BII/BID), and resource specialist (RSP)
- Accommodations and assistive technology: Gait Trainer, Hoyer lift, adaptive seating, specialized software, computer, Braille, adapted keyboards, other

Each student file was reviewed three times by three separate reviewers in order to establish inter-rater reliability and to ensure consistency of LRE data and elements of the profile analysis. This information then was entered into databases created by the OIM and sent to the American Institutes for Research (AIR) for analyses.

Consistent with the LRE study, time spent in the general education setting is maintained within Welligent based on the time spent in special education. Therefore, findings are presented in two categories: students in the special education setting for 60% or less of the day, and those in the special education setting for more than 60% of their day.

Findings

LRE Data Verification

To determine if the LRE data were reliable for determining the District's performance on this outcome, data were analyzed to examine if inaccuracies found between the Welligent System

and students' class schedules impacted the number of students in each LRE time category. Since the number of students with MDO attending general education campuses is small (n=231), inaccuracies resulting in a shift into the 40% or less LRE category considerably impacts the District's performance. While the study was able to identify the reliability (i.e. errors) of the Welligent data, the analysis was able to establish an accurate count of students with MDO in each LRE category. This count translates into the District's performance toward meeting the outcome's target of 23%.

Table 5 shows the number of students in the special education setting for less than 60% of the day by data source. At the time of the Welligent data extract, 107 students with MDO were reported as being in the LRE category of less than 60%. The LRE time reported on students' class schedules found that only 45 students were in the special education setting for less than 60% of the day. Furthermore, this shows that the LRE data within the Welligent system is not reliable for determining progress with this outcome.

Table 5. Number and Percentages of Students in Two Reporting Categories Based on Welligent, IEP, and Schedules

	Source of Information					
	Welligent		IEP		Schedule	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
60% or Less in Special Education	107	39.34	84	30.88	45	16.54
More than 60% in Special Education	165	60.66	188	69.12	227	83.46
Total N	272	100.0	272	100.0	272	100.0

To better understand the level of integration for students with MDO, LRE data were analyzed by data source and the Federal reporting categories of 0-20%, 21-60%, and 61-100%. Table 6 shows that half of the students in special education for less than 60% of the day are integrated in the general education setting for the majority of the day (0-20%). This also shows that the LRE data entered in the Welligent IEP was more reliable for students with this level of integration than for students in the 21-60% range. This means that the largest source of inaccurate LRE data lies within those students with reported levels of integration within the 21-60% range.

Table 6. Number and Percentages of Students in the Federal Reporting Categories Based on Welligent, IEP, and Schedules

	Source of Information					
	Welligent		IEP		Schedule	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-20% in Special Education	30	11.03	25	9.19	23	8.46
21-60% in Special Education	77	28.31	59	21.69	22	8.08
61-100% in Special Education	165	60.66	188	69.12	227	83.46
Total N	272	100.0	272	100.0	272	100.0

To establish the District’s performance toward meeting the target of this outcome, the count of students in the less than 60% LRE category were divided by the total population of students with MDO (Table 7). During the 2008-2009 school year, the population of students with MDO consisted of 1,109 with 325 students (20.8%) attending general education campuses. Of these, 45 students or 4.05% had schedules that reflected placement in the special education setting for less than 60%. This percentage is considerably lower than the 10.3% baseline established during the development of the outcome. To meet the 23% target of the outcome, the District will need to integrate 255 students for less than 60% of the day⁴.

Table 7. Number and Percentages of Students in the Two LRE Categories by Population and School Type

	Students with MDO					
	Population		General Education Campus		Special Education Centers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 60%	45	4.04	45	13.84	0	0.0
More than 60%	1,064	96.0	285	87.69	784	100.0
Total	1,109	100.0	325	29.3	784	70.69

MDO Profile Analysis

To establish a profile of the student population with MDO, information was obtained on the strengths and levels of independence in areas of adaptive skills as noted within the student’s IEPs. In some areas, more than one item may have been selected for each student. As example, if a student was able to ambulate independently yet still used a walker and/or wheelchair when needed, all three items were included for analysis. In other cases, only one level of independence was selected.

In the area of mobility, students attending general education demonstrate higher levels of independence (ambulate independently) compared to those at special education centers (46.8% vs. 19.7%). For students attending special education centers, approximately half (49.2%) utilized a wheelchair for mobility.

⁴ This calculation is based on 1,109 students in the population and may vary depending on fluctuations within the population.

Table 8. Levels of Mobility by School Type

	MDO- Gen ED School N=231		MDO- SPED Center N=61		Totals N=292	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Independent	108	46.8	12	19.7	120	41.1
Walker	69	29.9	14	23.0	83	28.4
Wheelchair	74	32.0	30	49.2	104	35.6
Fully Dependent	20	8.7	17	27.9	37	12.7

In the area of adaptive skills, over half of the students (58.6%) attending general education campuses are able to toilet independently or with some adult assistance. Of the students attending special education campuses, 44.3% required more intensive support (fully dependent) which may include the change of diapers or maintenance of catheters.

Similarly, higher levels of independence were noted for students attending general education campuses, with 57.6% able to feed themselves or with some adult assistance. Over one-third (36.1%) of the students attending special education centers are fully dependent on adults for feeding.

Table 9. Levels of Toileting and Feeding by School Type

	MDO- Gen ED School N=231		MDO- SPED Center N=61		Totals N=292	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Toileting						
Independent	54	23.4%	7	11.5%	61	20.9%
W/ Assistance	86	37.2%	16	26.2%	102	34.9%
Fully Dependent	50	21.6%	27	44.3%	77	26.4%
Not Specified	26	11.3%	7	11.5%	33	11.3%
Feeding						
Independent	97	42.0%	16	26.2%	113	38.7%
W/ Assistance	55	23.8%	14	23.0%	69	23.6%
Fully Dependent	27	11.7%	22	36.1%	49	16.8%
Not Specified	36	15.6%	5	8.2%	41	14.0%

Larger differences were noted in the levels of communication by school type (Table 10). Students attending special education centers utilize alternate modes of communication with higher frequency than those at general education campuses (72.1% vs. 36.8%). This finding has considerable instructional implications for many reasons, particularly those associated with the need to increase the capacity of general education teachers to effectively modify and deliver curriculum for students needing alternate modes of communication. While many students use a combination of communication devices, the majority rely on voice output devices and a variety of communication boards.

Table 10. Levels of Communication by School Type

	MDO- Gen ED School N=231		MDO- SPED Center N=61		Totals N=292	
Communication						
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fluent	69	29.9	6	9.8	75	25.7
Partial Oral	48	20.8	3	4.9	51	17.5
Basic needs	53	22.9	21	34.4	74	25.3
Alternate mode	85	36.8	44	72.1	129	44.2
Alternate Communication						
Voice Output Device	37	16.0	22	36.1	59	20.2
Communication Board	28	12.1	5	8.2	33	11.3
Sign Language	9	3.9	5	8.2	14	4.8

Information regarding types of services documented within IEP was collected to identify the levels of support provided. This data was based on those services present within the student's most current IEP at the time of the review. Therefore, this may not represent all of the services a student is receiving or supports available in the classroom. For instance, students may have received an assessment or services of assistive technology in the past. These services or accommodations that resulted from this previous assessment may currently be available for the student but not reflected within the most recent IEP. Further, many classrooms have one or more adult assistants available in the classroom which may not be reflected within the student's IEP.

For students attending general education campuses, the following services were noted with the highest frequency: adapted physical education (73.2%), speech and language services (52.8%), adult assistant (52.4%), occupational therapy (40.3%) and physical therapy (38.5%). Interestingly, services to support the integration of students into the general education setting such as LRE counselor (16.9%) and inclusion specialist (8.7%) services were observed with less frequency.

Overall, the frequencies of services are lower for students attending special education centers. This may be due to the differences in programming for students attending special education centers that embed supports and services during the instructional day.

Table 11. Frequency of Services by School Type

	MDO- Gen ED School N=231		MDO- SPED Center N=61		Totals N=292	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
APE	169	73.2	14	23.0	183	62.7
AA	121	52.4	21	34.4	142	48.6
AT	11	4.8	0	0.0	11	3.8
BII/BID	12	5.2	0	0.0	12	4.1
Health Care Assistant	24	10.4	4	6.6	28	9.6
INCLUSION	20	8.7	0	0.0	20	6.8
LAS	122	52.8	10	16.4	132	45.2
LRE Counseling	39	16.9	0	0.0	39	13.4
Nurse	1	0.4	5	8.2	6	2.1
OT	93	40.3	11	18.0	104	35.6
PT	89	38.5	19	31.1	108	37.0
RSP	6	2.6	0	0.0	6	2.1
OTHER	31	13.4	3	4.9	34	11.6

The use of adaptive seating, gait trainers and instructional accommodations were observed with the highest frequency for students in both school types. Similar to the data on services, this represents only those accommodations listed within the students' current IEP. Therefore, these findings are an underestimation of the accommodations provided.

Table 12. Frequency of Accommodations by School Type

	MDO- Gen ED School N=231		MDO- SPED Center N=61		Totals N=292	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gait Trainer	27	11.7	12	19.7	39	13.4
Lift (Hoyer)	8	3.5	1	1.6	9	3.1
Adaptive Seating	52	22.5	23	37.7	75	25.7
Software	32	13.9	5	8.2	37	12.7
Computer	44	19.0	3	4.9	47	16.1
Braille	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Stander	14	6.1	9	14.8	23	7.9
Adapted Keyboard	22	9.5	2	3.3	24	8.2
Other – Instructional	44	19.0	8	13.1	52	17.8

Delivery of the general education curriculum and participation in the California Standards Test (CST) are good indicators of integration into the general education setting. Approximately one in five students (19.5%) attending general education campuses had IEPs that indicated participation in the general education curriculum and CST program. Of the 45 students attending general education campuses who were receiving instruction in the general education curriculum and participating in the California Standardized Test, about one-third (35%, n=16) were integrated in the general education setting for 40% or more of the day. Although it is possible to deliver the general education curriculum in the special education setting, the low rate of integration for these students raises questions as to why the majority are not being integrated for a larger percentage of their instructional day.

The California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) is for students who receive instruction with the alternate curriculum. The CAPA consists of five levels, with the level of skills assessed increasing with each level. For instance, CAPA Level One is the most basic of levels, while CAPA Level Five assesses higher level instructional skills. Table 13 shows the distribution of CAPA levels by school type and may indicate that students attending general education campuses have higher levels of academic skills than those attending special education centers.

Table 13. Curriculum and Statewide Assessment Type by School Type

	MDO- Gen ED School N=231		MDO- SPED Center N=61		Totals N=292	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Curriculum						
GE	45	19.5	1	1.6	46	15.8
ALT	170	73.6	60	98.4	230	78.8
Assessment						
CST	45	19.5	1	1.6	46	15.8
CAPA 1	61	26.4	50	81.9	111	38.0
CAPA 2	22	9.5	0	0.0	22	7.5
CAPA 3	22	9.5	3	4.9	25	8.6
CAPA 4	31	13.4	1	1.6	32	10.9
CAPA 5	25	10.8	1	1.6	26	8.9

Summary

During 2008-2009 school year, the OIM conducted a study to better understand the population of students with MDO and validate the accuracy of the District's LRE data for students with MDO. The validation study found inaccuracies within the Welligent LRE data that show considerably lower performance on this outcome than the initial baseline of 10.3%. This is mainly a result of poor quality data at the time of the negotiation which resulted in an over-estimation of the baseline. Based on the findings of the validation study, 45 students (4.04%) have classroom schedules that reflect time in the general education setting of 40% or more of the day.

The study also sought information on the abilities of students with MDO to create a profile to help the District develop strategies for increasing the integration of students with MDO. The study found that students attending general education campuses generally demonstrated higher levels of independence in mobility, toileting, communication and feeding. The study also noted that of the students attending general education campuses, receiving instruction in the general education curriculum and participating in the California Standardized Test, only one-third were integrated in the general education setting for 40% or more of the day. This finding should be explored further as the integration of students with MDO in the general education setting will inevitably require the delivery and modification of the general education curriculum. The District should also examine the role of the LRE counselor and inclusion specialist, and the reasons so few students receive these supports. These supports would seem to be invaluable resources for the integration of students with MDO.

A challenge for achieving this outcome is the integration of students attending special education centers. While the District needs 255 more students integrated into the general education setting for more than 40% of the day, it is safe to assume that not all students attending general education campuses will be integrated at this level. Integration in the general education setting is an IEP team's decision based on the individual needs of each student. Therefore, when considering interventions and strategies for increasing the number of students integrated in the general education setting, the District should consider and respect the rights and opinions of parents and IEP teams when making placement decisions for these students.

Last, the District should identify schools that are successfully integrating students with MDO to examine the best practices that may be generalized across schools. Additionally, the district should develop and target professional development that improves the capacity of general education teachers to educate students with moderate to severe disabilities.

Least Restrictive Environment

Student in MDO

Page 1

District ID#	Last Name	First Name	Birthday	Grade	Current IEP Date	IEP Date if different:
				3	2/11/2009	

Attend School: BERTRAND EL Local District: 1

IEP Meeting Location: _____

Page 4

Eligibility: MDO Eligibility if different: _____

Page 5

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

Page 8

Page 8 Missing Welligent Percent of Time:

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

Page 12

1. # of Weekly District Policy Total School Minutes 2. # of Weekly Total School Minutes School Report

MDO Data Summary Sheet (2008-2009)

Name of Student: _____

Eligibility: _____

Check if different from instrument

School: _____

IEP Date: _____

Check if different from instrument

Grade: _____

If information is not available, please mark N/A

_____ Total # of Instructional Minutes in LAUSD policy for this student

Elementary and Pre-K

_____ Total # of SPED Minutes in IEP	Total # p.5	_____
For SDP Total = p. 8 + p.5 DIS	Total # p.8	_____
	Total # p.12	_____

_____ Total # of SPED Minutes from Schedule	Total # SDP Classroom	_____
Total # SPED = SDP Classroom/RSP + DIS	Total # DIS	_____
	Total # RSP	_____

Secondary – Middle and High School

_____ Total # of SPED Minutes in IEP	Total # p.5	_____
For SDP Total = p. 8 + p.5 DIS	Total # p.8	_____
	Total # p.12	_____

_____ Total # of SPED Minutes from Schedule	Length of Period	_____
Total # Minutes = [(# Periods x length of period +	# of Sped periods	_____
(Total HR min x 5)]	# Mins Hr x 5	_____
	DIS excluding APE	_____

_____ Total # of SPED Minutes in IEP _____ Total# SPED minutes Schedule

_____ Percent SPED time from IEP	_____ Total % SPED Time Schedule
(IEP minutes/Policy minutes)	(Schedule minutes/Policy Minutes)

_____ Total % Welligent (Directly from p. 8 of IEP)

Office of the Independent Monitor
MDO Instrument

Attachment C

Student's Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____
Grade: _____ Date of Review: _____
Reviewer: _____ IEP Date: _____
Type of Meeting: _____

I. Mobility p.3,12, transportation data form

- Independent Walker Wheelchair
 Fully Dependent (requires full adult assistance, ie. gurney and chair)

II. Basic Needs p.3,12, current or previous provider report (w/in one year)

Health Condition: _____

- Toileting: Independent W/Assistance Fully Dependent Not Specified
Feeding: Independent W/Assistance Fully Dependent Not Specified
Respiratory: Independent W/Assistance Fully Dependent Not Specified

- Communication: Fluent
 Partial Oral Language (phrases)
 Basic Needs (1-2 word utterances)

- Alternate Mode:
 Voice Output Device
 Communication board
 Sign Language
 Other _____

III. Services p.4, 5, 6, 8, 12

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> APE _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> AA _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OT _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> BII/ BID _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PT _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> RSP _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LAS _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> LRE Counselor _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistive Technology _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Specialized Nurse _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Healthcare Assistant _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion Facilitator _____ | |

IV. Accommodations and Modifications/ (Assistive Technology) p.3, 4, 6, 8, 12

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gait Trainer | <input type="checkbox"/> Braille Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanical Lift (Hoyer) | <input type="checkbox"/> Stander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Seating | <input type="checkbox"/> Keyboard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computer | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Specialized Software | |

V. Curriculum and Assessment p. 7, 8

- CST testing Alternate CAPA Level _____
 General Education Alternate

Notes:

VI. Goals: p. 5

Performance Area	Wk	Freq	Total	Month	Freq	Total	Minutes outside Gen Ed	Personnel Re.
1. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____	_____

VII. Recommendations: p. 8

Placement: _____

Page 8 Missing Welligent Percent of Time: Secondary Only: CBI

Gen Ed RSP SDC (Minutes per Week): _____ -- SDC Program: _____

DIS Gen Ed/ Inclusion %of time: _____

VIII. Service Summary: Page 12

(Copy any mentions of Assistive Technology):

Behavior Support Plan

GED Mainstreaming – IEP

Subject	Freq	Duration
1. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____

GED Mainstreaming -- Schedule

Subject	Freq	Duration
1. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____