

Office of the Independent Monitor

October 5, 2009

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

This report presents the findings of the sixth year 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 2008-2009 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.

To meet this outcome, each student must demonstrate evidence of all items provided. 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 report will briefly discuss the methodology and sample design. It will also present findings, highlight areas of progress and summary.

Methodology*Sample Design*

The study included all initial and 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 tracking all students who received a comprehensive evaluation resulting in the identification and eligibility of ED. During the 2007-2008 school year, the sample included 765 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

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
African American	256	33.5%
Latino	333	43.5%
White	153	20.0%
Other	23	3.0%
Total	765	100%

Table 2: ED Sample by Local District

District	Number	Percent
1	58	7.6%
2	53	6.9%
3	46	6.0%
4	36	4.7%
5	30	3.9%
6	14	1.8%
7	29	3.8%
8	34	4.4%
NPS	426	55.7%
Charter	21	2.7%
Other (Adult, SU)	18	2.4%
Total	765	100%

Table 3: ED Sample by School Level

School Level	Number	Percent
Elementary/ preschool/early ed	115	15.0%
Middle School	101	13.2%
High School	117	15.3%
Special Centers	7	0.9%
NPS	415	54.2%
Other	10	1.3%
Total	765	100.0%

Elements of the file review

The development of the file review is well documented¹. 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 (Attachment B).

- *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, and 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 a parent or an agency (License Children's Institution, DCFS) that requested the evaluation. This was done to ensure that parents' and students' rights were protected considering the limitations schools may be under to fulfill the pre-requisite requirements.

Data Collection and Analyses

Demographic and IEP information for all students identified as ED were uploaded from the District's database and verified monthly for accuracy. Comprehensive reviews of cumulative files and IEPs were conducted at schools and/or central offices by trained research assistants. IEPs and psychological reports were retrieved from the Welligent IEP system. 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, the information was entered into a database and sent to the American Institute for Research (AIR) for statistical analyses.

The file reviews yielded 752 valid observations, which consisted of 254 African American, 325 Latino, 151 White, and 22 Other Race/Ethnicity students throughout LAUSD. Tables 4, 5 and 6 demonstrate the analyzed sample descriptions by race/ethnicity, local district and school level. Students whose data could not be obtained, had been found not eligible as ED or exited from special education were removed from the analyses. For the purpose of reporting comparisons

¹ The report may be viewed at: http://oimla.com/pdf/annrep2_docs/appendix_h_edreport.pdf

between groups, students from the “other” race/ethnicity group were removed from the final analyses². Data collection included IEPs conducted between July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

Table 4: ED Analyzed Sample, by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
African American	254	33.8%
Latino	325	43.3%
White	150	20.0%
Other	22	2.9%
Total	751	100.0%

Table 5: ED Analyzed Sample, by Local District

District	Number	Percent
1	55	7.3%
2	51	6.8%
3	45	6.0%
4	36	4.8%
5	29	3.9%
6	14	1.9%
7	29	3.9%
8	33	4.4%
NPS	422	56.2%
Charter	20	2.7%
Other	16	2.1%
Total	751	100.0%

Table 6: ED Analyzed Sample, by School Level

School Level	Number	Percent
Elementary/ Preschool/Early Ed	109	14.5%
Middle School	101	13.4%
High School	113	15.0%
Special Centers	7	0.9%
NPS	411	54.7%
Other	10	1.3%
Total	752	100.0%

² “Other” students were reviewed for compliance with the outcome but removed from the analysis due to the small size.

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. Complete data tables are included in Attachment A.

Met all of the Criteria – All Students

The outcome requires that 90% of African American students identified as ED shall meet *all* requirements of a comprehensive evaluation as defined by the Independent Monitor. Table 7 demonstrates the overall number of students who met all of the criteria by race/ethnicity. During the 2008-2009 school year, 81.1% of African American students met this criteria. This continues to fall short of the 90% criteria. The results also indicate that 84.1% of all students identified as ED met the criteria. Although the number of students meeting the entire criteria continues to be below the target, considerable yearly improvements have been noted.

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

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
Total Observations	254	325	150	729
Number of students meeting criteria	206	278	129	613
Percentage meeting criteria	81.1%	85.5%	86.0%	84.1%

To better understand the areas affecting compliance with all of the requirements of the comprehensive evaluation, the data were analyzed by IEP type, school type and the four stages of the pre-referral and identification process.

Met all of the Criteria – All Students by IEP Type

The study examined rates of compliance by IEP types. Students are placed into one of three IEP type categories: initials, change of eligibility and re-evaluations. Students that are newly identified with ED and do not have a previous special education eligibility are considered *initials*. Students receiving special education services under a different eligibility and are reassessed and found eligible with ED are placed in the category of *change of eligibility*. The last category is for students with a current eligibility of ED that receive a re-evaluation as part of their three-year review or upon request of a parent or IEP team. Students are separated since the pre-referral requirements will differ depending on the eligibility status of the student prior to the referral and identification of ED.

Rates of compliance were noted to be higher for African American students newly identified as ED compared over those students receiving a triennial re-evaluation. For newly identified African American students, 89.7% met compliance with the outcome, while 89.6% students with a change of eligibility IEP met compliance (Table 8). For those students that received a triennial

IEP, 76.6% met compliance. This is important since the initial point of identification is the critical juncture for reducing inappropriate identifications.

For all students, initial evaluations have higher rates of compliance, while triennial re-evaluations are negatively impacting compliance with the outcome.

Table 8. Number and Percent of All Students met Criteria by, IEP Type

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
<i>Initials</i>				
-Total Observations	39	87	29	155
-Number of students meeting criteria	35	77	29	14
-Percentage meeting criteria	89.7%	88.5%	100.0%	91.0%
<i>Change of Eligibility</i>				
-Total Observations	48	93	36	177
-Number of students meeting criteria	43	80	29	152
-Percentage meeting criteria	89.6%	86.0%	80.6%	85.9%
<i>Reevaluations</i>				
-Total Observations	167	145	85	397
-Number of students meeting criteria	128	120	71	319
-Percentage meeting criteria	76.6%	82.8%	83.5%	80.4%

African American students received all of the requirements of a comprehensive evaluation at LAUSD schools with higher frequency compared to non-public schools (84.1% vs. 79.5% NPS).

Table 9. By School Type, NPS and Public

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
<i>Public Schools</i>				
-Total Observations	88	180	58	326
-Number of students meeting criteria	74	155	51	280
-Percentage meeting criteria	84.1%	86.1%	87.9%	85.9%
<i>NPS</i>				
-Total Observations	166	145	92	403
-Number of students meeting criteria	132	123	78	333
-Percentage meeting criteria	79.5%	84.8%	84.8%	82.6%

The District exceeded the 90% criteria for all of the four stages of the identification process except one (Table 10). IEP team considerations fall slightly below 90% for African American students (87.0%), which is primarily due to the parent participation requirement. While improvements in the efforts to encourage parents to attend IEP meeting have been noted during file reviews, this requirement continues to impede the District from meeting this outcome.

Table 10. Compliance of the Elements of a "Comprehensive Evaluation" by Section and Race/Ethnicity

Section	Ethnicity	# of Observations	# of Students Meeting Criteria	% Meeting Criteria
Section 1. Pre-Referral Interventions Initials IEPs	African American	39	38	97.4%
	Latino	87	84	96.6%
	White	29	29	100.0%
	<i>Total</i>	<i>155</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>97.4%</i>
Section 1a. Referral Interventions Change of Eligibility IEPs	African American	48	46	93.8%
	Latino	93	85	91.4%
	White	36	33	91.7%
	<i>Total</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>164</i>	<i>92.7%</i>
Section 2. Assessments All IEPs	African American	254	235	92.5%
	Latino	325	307	94.5%
	White	150	138	92.0%
	<i>Total</i>	<i>729</i>	<i>680</i>	<i>93.3%</i>
Section 3. Determination of Eligibility All IEPs	African American	254	251	98.8%
	Latino	325	320	98.5%
	White	150	149	99.3%
	<i>Total</i>	<i>729</i>	<i>720</i>	<i>98.8%</i>
Section 4. IEP Team Considerations All IEPs	African American	254	221	87.0%
	Latino	325	296	91.1%
	White	150	138	86.7%
	<i>Total</i>	<i>729</i>	<i>655</i>	<i>89.8%</i>

As mentioned above, the parent participation requirement has historically been an area of weakness for meeting this outcome (Table 11). Of the 254 African American students in the sample, 48 were missing one or more element. Of these, 30 (62.5%) did not have a parent participate at the IEP meeting. To examine the impact of this requirement, this element was removed from the analysis, resulting in 90.2% of all African American students having met all of the requirements of the comprehensive evaluation.

Table 11. Students Met Criteria Removing Parent Participation

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American	Latino	White	Total
<i>All IEP Types</i>				
-Total Observations	254	325	150	729
-Number of students meeting criteria	229	291	136	656
-Percentage meeting criteria	90.2%	89.5%	90.7%	90.0%

Placement Recommendations – Prior placement General Education

Analyses of placement recommendations for students initially identified as ED indicate that less than half (44.2%) were recommended for a NPS (Table 12). African American students were recommended for NPS placements with higher frequency (46.8%) than Latino (43.5%) and White (42.4%) students.

Table 12: 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	46.8	40	43.5	14	42.4	76	44.2
Non Residence School	9	19.1	19	20.7	4	12.1	32	18.6
School of Residence	16	34.0	33	35.9	15	45.5	64	37.2
Total	44	100.0	92	100.0	33	100.0	172	100.0

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

Table 13 shows that IEP teams recommended special day programs specifically for students with ED more frequently for African American (51.5%) and Latino (45.5%) students than White (34.1%) students. White students were more likely (45.4%) to have less restrictive instructional settings such as RSP, general education classroom or designated instructional supports only, than Latino (22.7%) and African American (28.0%) students.

Table 13: 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	2	1.5	2	4.5	4	1.6
Gen Ed	1	1.5	4	3.0	2	4.5	7	2.9
RSP	18	26.5	24	18.2	16	36.4	58	23.8
SDP	14	20.6	42	31.8	9	20.5	65	26.6
SDP ED	35	51.5	60	45.5	15	34.1	110	45.1
Total	68	100.0	132	100.0	44	100.0	244	100.0

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. It 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. To examine disproportionality, a relative risk ratio is calculated by comparing the risk of African American students to the risk of *all* other students.

Table 14 shows the risk and relative risk ratio indices from 2003-2004 through 2008-2009. The risk of being identified as ED has decreased for African American students from 1.67 to 1.1. This means that approximately 1.1 African American students out of 100 are identified with ED.

This results in a relative risk ratio of 4.07 and is considered significantly disproportionate. Although the risk ratio for African American students has decreased since the 2003-2004 school year, the risk ratio has maintained relatively stable and still indicates severe disproportionality. This is a result of two factors: the consistent decreases in the ED identifications for students from all race/ethnicities and the impact of declining enrollments.

Table 14: 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		2008-2009	
	Risk	Risk Ratio	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	1.1	4.07

Table 15 shows the number and percentage of students identified as ED by race/ethnicity and school year. Since the 2003-2004 school year, the number of African American students identified as ED has decreased by 43.0%. Since the inception of the requirement to provide students a “comprehensive evaluation,” the District has noted consistent and considerable

reductions in ED identifications for all students. During the 2008-2009 school year, these reductions stabilized. This is a positive finding since it was expected that those students that may have been inappropriately identified as ED would have received a three-year re-evaluation resulting in a change of eligibility or exit from special education. This stability also indicates that the schools continue to identify students with ED that meet the eligibility requirements for services.

Table 15: Number and Percentage of ED students by Race/Ethnicity and School Year

	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-07		2007-2008		2008-2009	
	N	%	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	841	32.71
White	855	20.82	747	19.95	723	21.14	635	22.22	558	21.4	507	19.72
Latino	1,666	40.57	1,589	42.43	1,489	43.54	1,218	42.62	1,135	43.5	1,144	44.50
Other	108	2.63	97	2.59	79	2.31	58	2.13	75	2.9	79	3.07
Total	4,106	100	3,745	100	3,420	100	2,858	100	2,608	100	2,571	100

Table 16 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 36.2% decrease in the number of African American students placed in NPS. Similarly, the reduction in students attending NPS has stabilized. This also indicates that the population of students attending these placements are more likely to be appropriately placed.

Table 16: Number and Percentage of students in NPS, by Race/Ethnicity and School Year

	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-07		2007-2008		2008-2009	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
African American	823	38.8	787	38.13	678	35.26	581	34.22	533	33.0	525	33.0
White	496	23.39	473	22.92	472	21.14	440	25.91	401	24.8	371	23.32
Latino	757	35.69	752	36.43	728	37.86	642	37.81	636	39.4	647	40.67
Other	45	2.12	52	2.52	45	2.34	35	2.06	46	2.8	48	3.02
Total	2,121	100	2,064	100	1,923	100	1,698	100	1,616	100	1,591	100

Summary

Overall, the District continues to show improvements in the levels of compliance with the outcome, which mandates that 90% of African American students receive a “comprehensive evaluation.” During the 2008-2009 school year, 81.1% of African American students identified as ED met the criteria. Many of the areas within the pre-referral and identification processes have improved considerably and exceeded the 90% target level necessary for compliance with the outcome.

The stabilization of the population of students identified with ED and placed in NPS is a positive finding. This may indicate that students who were inappropriately identified with ED are now

either appropriately identified under another eligibility or have exited from special education. These findings support the premise that questioned the validity of many of the initial ED identifications reviewed which appeared to be driven by placements in more segregated settings.

The monitoring of this outcome raises some questions regarding the limitations within its structure. While the outcome established a high threshold for meeting compliance which requires that all elements of the comprehensive evaluation be met in order for that student to be counted for compliance, this design may limit the District's ability to meet this outcome. Mainly, missing even one of the 28 items automatically eliminates that student from complying with this outcome thereby negating the compliance of all other elements. While many of these elements are important and required by law, the requirement of parent participation continues to be the area that challenges schools the most. This requirement is important, however not required by IDEA. During the 2009-2010 school year, the District should consider requiring enhancing the documentation practices for when parents do not participate at the IEP meeting. This should include a letter advising the parent of this outcome's requirement to include a parent in the IEP meeting. The letter should offer alternative times, dates, and/or methods for attending. If then, a parent decides that they can not participate in the IEP meeting this letter should contain their approval for proceeding with the IEP.

Tables

Table 1: Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Initials

Number of students with Initial IEPs in analysis, by Race/Ethnicity	African American N=39		Latino N=87		White N=29		Total N=155	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Initial pre-referral intervention meeting.	39	100.0	86	98.9	29	100.0	154	99.4
Follow-up pre-referral intervention meeting.	39	100.0	84	96.6	29	100.0	152	98.1
Parent participation at the pre-referral intervention meeting.	39	100.0	85	97.7	29	100.0	153	98.7
Documentation of other factors	39	100.0	86	98.9	29	100.0	154	99.4
Documentation of behavioral/academic concerns	39	100.0	87	100.0	29	100.0	155	100.0
Supports such as: non-DIS counseling, behavior plan, and/or school-wide discipline program.	38	97.4	87	100.0	29	100.0	154	99.4
Assessment plan	39	100.0	87	100.0	29	100.0	155	100.0
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	38	97.4	84	96.6	29	100.0	151	97.4

Table 2: 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=93		White N=36		Total N=177	
	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%
Behavior Support Plan	47	97.9	86	92.5	33	91.7	166	93.8
Academic modifications and accommodations	47	97.9	91	97.8	36	100.0	174	93.8
Consideration for counseling services and/or referrals to school-wide discipline programs	46	95.8	88	94.6	35	97.2	169	95.5
Assessment plan	47	97.9	89	95.7	35	97.2	171	96.6
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	46	95.8	85	91.4	33	91.7	164	92.7

Table 3: Assessment – All Students

	African American N=254		Hispanic N=325		White N=150		Total N=729	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Health assessment	243	95.7	314	96.6	144	96.0	701	96.2
Formal academic assessment	253	99.6	321	98.8	146	97.3	720	98.8
Cognitive or general ability assessment	245	96.5	313	96.3	142	94.7	700	96.0
Multi-disciplinary social-emotional evaluation	252	99.2	320	98.5	147	98.0	719	98.6
Comprehensive behavioral evaluation.	253	99.6	323	99.4	147	98.0	723	99.2
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	235	92.5	307	94.5	138	92.0	680	93.3

Table 4: Determination of ED Eligibility – All students

Determination of ED Eligibility	African American N=254		Latino N=325		White N=150		Total N=729	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Comprehensive ED eligibility statement	253	99.6	322	99.1	149	99.3	724	99.3
Consideration of exclusionary criteria and other relevant factors	253	99.6	323	99.4	149	99.3	725	99.5
Justification of co-morbid disabilities	252	99.2	323	99.4	150	100.0	725	99.5
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	251	98.8	320	98.5	149	99.3	720	98.8

Table 5: IEP Team Recommendations – All Students

IEP Team Recommendations	African American N=254		Latino N=325		White N=150		Total N=729	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Consideration of a behavior support plan (BSP)	252	99.2	320	98.5	148	98.7	720	98.8
IEP team considerations for placement in the LRE	254	100.0	320	98.5	150	100.0	724	99.3
Consideration of DIS counseling services, and/or referral to mental health agency	252	99.2	321	98.8	150	100.0	723	99.2
Counseling goals, if appropriate	253	99.6	321	98.8	149	99.3	723	99.2
Parent participation at the IEP meeting determining eligibility and placement	224	88.2	308	94.8	140	93.3	672	92.2
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	221	87.0	296	91.1	138	86.7	655	89.8

Attachment B: 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 C: 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: 8/31/2006