

**Office of the Independent Monitor***Study of the Accuracy of District Data on Placement in the Least Restrictive Environment*

There are two outcomes in the area of placement of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Both outcomes require the District to increase the number of students with disabilities in the general education setting to 40% or more of their school day. To correspond with the language of the outcome, the findings are presented in two categories: students in the special education setting for less than 60% of the day, and those in the special education setting for more than 60% of their day. The first, Outcome 6, is associated with the high incidence disabilities: specific learning disability (SLD) and speech and language impairment (SLI). These students comprise approximately 70% of the District's special education population.

*Outcome 6: Placement of Students with Disabilities (ages 6-22) with Eligibilities of SLD and SLI*

By June 30, 2006, the District will demonstrate a ratio of no less than 73% of students placed in the combined categories of 0-20% and 21-60% and not more than 27% of students placed in the 61-100% category according to Federal placement reporting requirements.

The second, Outcome 7, focuses on students in the low to moderate incidence disability categories such as autism and mental retardation. These students comprise approximately 30% of the District's special education population.

*Outcome 7: Placement of Students with Disabilities (ages 6-22) with All Other Disabilities*

By June 30, 2006, the District will demonstrate a ratio of not less than 52% of students placed in the combined categories of 0-20% and 21-60% and not more than 48% students placed in the 61-100% category according to Federal placement reporting requirements. In determining whether the District has achieved this outcome, any fractional percentage of .51 or above shall be rounded up to its nearest whole number.

In addition to monitoring progress toward the LRE outcomes, the Independent Monitor is required to "verify the accuracy of the District's data required to measure the District's performance and to make determinations only on data that the Independent Monitor finds accurate."<sup>1</sup> This study validates the accuracy of the District's LRE data for making a determination on Outcomes 6 and 7.

**Background**

During the fall of 2004, the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) conducted a pilot study to determine the accuracy of LRE data. The pilot consisted of file reviews of IEPs and schedules

---

<sup>1</sup> Modified Consent Decree, 3.18

for 13 high incidence and 12 low incidence students with disabilities in 25 schools and interviews with administrative staff and teachers. This pilot had three goals:

1. To determine whether the administrator in charge of special education in each school knew and understood District policy on instructional minutes. This is important because the calculation for percent of time in special education is based on the time a student spends in special education divided by the number of instructional minutes in a school week.
2. To determine whether school staff were accurately entering information for minutes spent in special education in students' IEPs and whether the Welligent system was accurately calculating the percent of time in special education from this information.
3. To determine whether there was a match between the percent of time calculated from students' IEPs and the percent of time in special education calculated from the same students' weekly schedules.

The pilot revealed that a number of staff in the pilot schools did not know or understand District policy on instructional time. It also revealed discrepancies between a majority of students' schedules and their Welligent IEPs. These discrepancies exposed errors in Welligent's computerized calculation of percent of time in special education. For example, Welligent identified special education related service time as general education instructional time. It also revealed that school staff were bypassing the Welligent "automatic" calculation and entering their own "invented" calculations for percent of time, sometimes derived from incorrect assumptions such as the belief that lunch was general education instructional time. Based on these findings, in 2004-2005, the OIM expanded the pilot into a full study.

#### *2004-2005 LRE Study Findings*

The 2004-2005 year LRE study was a continuation of the pilot with some modifications. In addition to the three research questions that guided the pilot, the 2004-2005 study also sought to determine if there were any differences in the data on percent of time in special education for students in the Welligent system compared to students not in the Welligent system, and if so, if these discrepancies had an impact on the overall calculation used to determine compliance with the targets of Outcomes 6 and 7.

The study included a review of 1,009 students from 173 schools. The study found that 86.4% of students placed in the special education setting for 60% or less of their total instructional time demonstrated category matches between the Welligent calculation and their actual class schedules. For students in the 60% or more reporting category this match decreased to 75.7%. The study also found a misunderstanding at the school level about the elements in the percent of time calculation and the process used to calculate percent of time.

#### **2005-2006 LRE Year Two Study**

This study was a continuation of the year 2004-2005 study. Due to the implications of the findings for this year's study on making determinations for compliance with Outcomes 6 and 7, a more robust sample was used to ensure higher accuracy in the findings. This resulted in a 150% increase in both the number of students selected for the sample and number of valid observations from year one. In addition, the study included 457 schools, an increase of 284 from the 2004-

2005 study. The study was guided by the 2004-2005 research questions and methodology, with minor modifications.

### *Research Questions*

The 2005-2006 study focused on the following questions:

1. Are there any differences between data on percent of time in special education for students who are in the Welligent system compared to students who are not in the Welligent system?
2. Is there a discrepancy between the school levels' knowledge of the number of weekly instructional minutes and the District's policy on instructional minutes?
3. Are there discrepancies between the percent of time in special education derived from an analysis of special education minutes in the IEP and the calculation of percent of time conducted by Welligent?
4. 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?
5. Do any discrepancies between the percent of time in special education in Welligent and in student schedule data have any impact on the overall calculation of percent of time in special education for Outcomes 6 & 7?

### **Methodology**

IEP data on percentage of time in special education was retrieved at the central level for all students in the Welligent system. In many cases, Welligent calculated the percent of time automatically based on information entered into specific fields of the IEP. For students whose IEPs had not been entered into the Welligent system, IEP data on percent of time was found in their school records. For these students, school staff made manual calculations by dividing the total number of special education minutes in a student's weekly schedule by the number of instructional minutes in the week.

One goal of the study was to compare the information on percent of time spent in special education in Welligent IEPs with those IEPs not in Welligent in order to determine if there were any significant differences between the two groups. To make this determination, a sample was drawn of students from both groups and their school level data was collected.

Weekly instructional minutes for each school type is defined in District policy. Each LAUSD school is placed on a traditional or year-round calendar. There are two types of year-round calendars: three-track and four-track. Each school calendar has a specific number of daily and weekly instructional minutes. In addition, there are different daily and weekly instructional minutes associated with pre-k, kindergarten, grades 1-5, grades 6-8, and grades 9-12. (See Attachment A for LAUSD policy guidelines on instructional minutes and weekly instructional minutes by school type).

During the pilot and first year study, we found that some school staff were not cognizant of District policy on the number of weekly instructional minutes for their school's particular calendar. This lack of knowledge resulted in inaccurate calculations in IEPs for percent of time

spent in special education. In order to determine whether this was a widespread problem, we collected self-reports on the number of weekly instructional minutes from administrators in each school that we visited and compared them to District policy on instructional minutes. In this way, we could determine if school staff were using the correct number of weekly instructional minutes when making manual calculations of percent of time in special education.

Using the correct policy minutes is an important first step. However, in order to derive an accurate number for percent of time spent in special education, school staff must also enter information on time spent in special education into the appropriate sections of the IEP. Welligent automatically calculates the percent of time based on information entered into specific fields in the IEP but the data must be placed in the appropriate fields in order to produce accurate results. Similarly, when making manual calculations with information from non-Welligent IEPs, school staff must accurately total the number of special education minutes in the IEP.

Lastly, an accurate calculation does not ensure an accurate percent of time unless accurate information from the student's weekly schedule is entered into the IEP. Indeed, the percent of time in special education in a student's IEP should match the percentage of time in special education in a student's weekly schedule. For example, a student that is placed in an elementary special day class without any mainstreaming would be expected to have a percent of time in special education of 100%. If the student were placed in a regular education classroom for 60 minutes a day for math and his school had 1500 instructional minutes per week, his percent of time would be 1200 weekly instructional minutes (1500 special education minutes – 300 general education minutes) divided by 1500 weekly instructional minutes or 80%. Similarly, a student in high school placed in four periods of special education and two periods of general education classes would be placed in special education roughly 66% of time<sup>2</sup>.

In order to compare students' schedule and IEP information, we collected student schedules, including weekly resource specialist program (RSP) and special education service minutes. This year, due to the implementation of provider logs within the Welligent system, we were able to collect Welligent logs when available. The percent of time derived from a schedule analysis was compared to the percentage of time derived from the analysis of IEP information and the percentage of time reported by the Welligent system.

### *Sampling Design*

The objective of our sampling strategy was to maximize efficiency in the data collection process for both the parent participation and LRE studies, without introducing bias. Two databases including both Welligent records and Student Information System(SIS) records were used to draw students for both the parent participation and LRE studies at four periods during the 2005-2006 school year.

LRE information from the SIS database was merged with the sample of students drawn for the parent participation study in order to use these students in the LRE study. The LRE samples were stratified by students having and not having information regarding the percent of time in special education and by high and low incidence disabilities. As students in the parent participation

---

<sup>2</sup> Length of homeroom and whether the homeroom was a special or general education setting was also factored into the percent of time in special education for students in middle and high school

sample generally had information on the percent of time in special education, secondary samples were drawn from the SIS to represent students who did not have information on percent of time. The resulting samples were also representative of the local school district and school level distributions in the overall special education population.

Tables 1 and 2 show the final distributions of the overall LRE sample (n=2,903) across local school districts and school type in comparison to the overall population of special education students in LAUSD.

Table 1: District Distribution for Special Education Population\* and Total LRE Sample

<b>Local School District</b>	<b>Students in Population</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Students in LRE Sample</b>	<b>%</b>
Missing	4,158	4.7%	2	0.1%
1	14,154	16.3%	482	16.6%
2	11,267	12.9%	415	14.3%
3	10,884	12.5%	434	15.0%
4	9,753	11.2%	365	12.6%
5	9,783	11.2%	364	12.5%
6	6,162	7.1%	218	7.5%
7	7,546	8.7%	276	9.5%
8	9,414	10.8%	347	12.0%
NPS	3,925	4.5	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>87,047</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,903</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Source: Combined database, June 1, 2006

Table 2. School Level Distribution for Special Education Population\* and Total LRE Sample

<b>School Level</b>	<b>Students in Population</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Students in LRE Sample</b>	<b>%</b>
Elementary	42,098	48.4%	1,196	41.2%
Middle	17,139	19.7%	715	24.6%
High	19,700	22.6%	892	30.7%
Special Centers	3,903	4.5%	90	3.1%
NPS	3900	4.5%	-	-
Other	128	0.1%	-	-
Missing	179	0.2%	10	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>87,047</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,903</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Source: Combined database, June 1, 2006

### *Data Collection and Analysis*

Research assistants (RAs) were trained to extract the necessary information from a student's cumulative and IEP folders and place the information on an instrument developed by the OIM (Attachment B). RAs collected self-reports from schools on the number of instructional minutes, copies of students' classroom or class schedules, and Welligent service logs and/or time spent

receiving related and/or other special education services. They also collected rosters of special education teachers. Each school received a fax three to five days prior to the visit containing a list of students and a checklist of the information that would be collected for each student (Attachment C). RA's were not required to interpret IEPs but to enter information exactly as it appeared.

Data collected from the schools was 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 such as Welligent service logs. Data from these sources was analyzed to determine the total number of special education minutes each student received and then was transferred to a data summary sheet (Attachment D). Each student file was reviewed three times by three separate reviewers in order to establish inter-rater reliability and ensure consistency of schedule and IEP data analysis. This information was then entered into an LRE database.

*Description of the Final LRE Sample*

As mentioned in the sampling description, 591 students were dropped from the analysis (due to exited/transferred students, pre-k status<sup>3</sup>, or records that had insufficient information on students' schedules), resulting in 2,312 records remaining. Although the number of students dropped was substantial, the large sample of students resulted in a representative number of valid observations by local district and school level in the LRE analysis. Tables 3 and 4 show the distributions for the sample and entire special education population. Table 5 shows the distribution by low and high incidence disabilities.

Table 3. Distribution of Students in the LRE Analysis by Local District

<b>Local District</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
1	383	16.6%
2	348	15.1%
3	326	14.1%
4	288	12.5%
5	286	12.4%
6	179	7.7%
7	210	9.1%
8	292	12.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,312</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

<b>School Level</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Elementary	1,005	43.47%
Middle	589	25.48%
High	630	27.25%
Spec Centers	88	3.81%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,312</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>3</sup> Pre-K students were dropped because there was no policy for weekly instructional minutes leading to considerable variation in school schedules. There were also no requirements for attendance.

Table 5. Distribution of Students in the LRE Analysis by High and Low Incidence Disabilities\*

<b>High/Low Incidence Disabilities</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
		23.01
Low Incidence	532	%
		76.99
High Incidence	1,780	%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,312</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Specific Learning Disabilities and Speech and Language Impairment are considered high incidence disabilities for this analysis. All others are low incidence.

Tables 6 and 7 show the local district and school level distributions across the 467 schools included in the school level analysis.

Table 6. Number of Schools in LRE Analysis by Local District

<b>Local District</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
1	87	18.63%
2	69	14.78%
3	57	12.21%
4	55	11.78%
5	56	11.99%
6	37	7.92%
7	51	10.92%
8	55	11.78%
<b>Total</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 7. Number of Schools in LRE Analysis by School Level

<b>School Level</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Elementary	298	63.81%
Middle	84	17.99%
High	68	14.56%
Spec Centers	17	3.64%
<b>Total</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Findings

### *I. Policy vs. School Reported Instructional Minutes*

The question for the school level analysis was: are there discrepancies between a school level knowledge of the number of weekly instructional minutes and the District policy on instructional minutes? If school staff use their own understanding in order to calculate percent of time, they may produce an inaccurate calculation.

In analyzing the alignment between LAUSD policy instructional minutes and school reported instructional minutes, approximately 68% of the schools in the sample reported instructional minutes that did not correspond with the LAUSD policy (Table 8).<sup>4</sup>

Table 8. Number and Percentages of Schools With and Without Matches of Policy and School Instructional Minutes<sup>5</sup>

	N	%
Minutes Do Not Match	316	67.67%
Minutes Match	151	32.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 9 shows that there are no statistically significant differences by local district in the percentage of schools whose instructional minutes matched or did not match the District policy. Conversely, Table 10 shows that the differences among the percentages of schools with and without matches at the school level. These findings are statistically significant. The rate of matches is lowest at the middle and high schools, with approximately 15% reporting an accurate match.

Table 9. Number and Percentages of Schools With and Without Matches of Policy and School Instructional Minutes, by Local District

District	Do Not Match		Match		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1	64	73.56%	23	26.44%	87
2	45	65.22%	24	34.78%	69
3	34	59.65%	23	40.35%	57
4	36	65.45%	19	34.55%	55
5	45	80.36%	11	19.64%	56
6	22	59.46%	15	40.54%	37
7	36	70.59%	15	29.41%	51
8	34	61.82%	21	38.18%	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>67.67%</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>32.33%</b>	<b>467</b>

Pearson chi2(7) = 9.6894 Pr = 0.207

<sup>4</sup> As there was often more than one student in the sample per school, there were instances in which the schools attended by these students had more than one set of total minutes. In these cases, the most commonly reported instructional minutes and corresponding district policy were analyzed.

<sup>5</sup> Confidence intervals for Tables 11, 14, 15, 16 and 17 are in Attachment E

Table 10. Number and Percentages of Schools With and Without Matches of Policy and School Instructional Minutes, by School Level

School Level	Do Not Match		Match		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Elementary	180	60.40%	118	39.60%	298
Middle	71	84.52%	13	15.48%	84
High	58	85.29%	10	14.71%	68
Spec Centers	7	41.18%	10	58.82%	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>67.67%</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>32.33%</b>	<b>467</b>

Pearson  $\chi^2(3) = 33.2064$  **Pr = 0.000**

The lack of alignment between the knowledge of school staff and the District policy may have negative implications for accurately calculating the percent of time for individual students. If school staff are manually calculating the percent of time, the use of an incorrect figure for weekly instructional minutes will produce a calculation for percent of time that is inevitably inaccurate. If they are using the automatic calculation in Welligent which contains the correct number of weekly instructional minutes, the incorrect understanding should have little or no impact. Thus, the lack of knowledge of District policy should have the greatest impact on the percent of time calculations for students who are not in Welligent. Since the number and percentage of students in Welligent continues to increase, this concern will have less of an effect on the accuracy of percent of time in the student’s IEP and overall outcome results. However, improvement in the knowledge of the variables necessary to calculate the percent of time in special education will not address the accurate programming of students to receive services in accordance with their IEPs. Additionally, this concern is compounded by an increase in flexible service delivery models and the use of ranges for frequency and duration of services which may cause discrepancies between the students IEP and actual time spent in the special education setting.

## II. Welligent and Non-Welligent Comparisons

A second question explored by this study was “are there any differences between the data on percent of time in special education for students who are in the Welligent system and students who are not in the Welligent system?” If the group of students not in the Welligent system different from those in the Welligent system, then assessments of progress toward the LRE outcomes may under or overestimate the District’s level of performance.

Table 11 compares the percent of time information for students with and without Welligent IEPs.<sup>6</sup> The following estimates have been weighted to represent the proportions of high and low incidence disability categories in the special education population of LAUSD (using the June 2006 Combined database).

There were no statistically significant differences between Welligent and non-Welligent students in the percentages of students who spend more than 60% (or less than 60%) of their time in

<sup>6</sup> For students lacking a percent of time in Welligent (e.g., non-Welligent students), the percent of time was calculated using the students’ school schedules.

special education. Therefore, the Welligent data on time spent in the special education setting is representative of the population of students with disabilities in the District.

Table 11. Proportions of Students by Educational Placement Time, by Non-Welligent and Welligent IEPs

	Less than 60% time in SE		60% or more time in SE		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Non-Welligent	175	68.1%	74	31.9%	<b>100%</b>
Welligent	1,389	64.5%	674	35.5%	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,564</b>	<b>64.9%</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Pearson:

Uncorrected  $\chi^2(1) = 1.2164$

Design-based  $F(1, 2311) = 1.1696$   $P = 0.2796$

### *III. Assessing the Percent of time in Special Education Accuracy of Welligent: Comparisons to Information from IEPs and School Schedules*

The prior section showed that there were no overall differences in the percent of time information for Welligent and non-Welligent students. This section examines whether the information on the percent of time in Welligent matches the percent of time information derived from the students' IEPs and school schedules. In this section, we consider the following questions:

1. Are there discrepancies between the percent of time in special education derived from an analysis of special education minutes in the IEP and the calculation of percent of time conducted by Welligent?
2. 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?
3. Do any discrepancies between percent of time in special education in Welligent and student schedule data have any impact on the overall calculation of percent of time in special education for Outcomes 6 & 7?

Only information from Welligent IEPs containing data for percent of time were analyzed in this section (2,036 IEPs). Please note that the weighted percentages in the following tables constitute the weighted estimates that reflect the proportions of high and low incidence disability categories in the total special education population. The text below discusses the weighted estimates only.

Over half (61.83%) of the percent of time records calculated by the Welligent system were an exact match to the information found in the IEP. This means that the information on the percent of time in the special education setting obtained from the Welligent system was the same as that found in the student's IEP at the school site. When we compare the data on the percent of time in the special education setting in the Welligent system to the actual percent of time derived from a student's class schedule obtained from the school, only 32.79% were exact matches (Table 12). The discrepancies between the Welligent and IEP may indicate problems in the automatic Welligent calculation or the failure of school staff to enter information into the appropriate fields on the IEP. We noticed in the data analysis that information on percent of time in the narrative

section (known as page12 of the IEP) often contradicted information in the goals and other sections.

There were considerable differences between students’ weekly school schedules and the percent of time calculated by Welligent. Some of these differences derived from the movement of students between grade levels. For example, a student at the elementary level who moved to middle school might still have an IEP and a percent of time based on their elementary schedule. Some differences were associated with moves between LAUSD schools with different school schedules. Some were associated with flexible delivery models and ranges written for service frequency and duration on the IEPs. For example, IEPs may indicate that a student would receive pull-out RSP services 1-5 days a week for a range of 30-300 minutes, while the student’s schedule was fixed. Another concern with flexible services was the ambiguity regarding which classroom setting the service would be provided in. The IEP has a section where providers are to enter the amount of time for each service and subsequently the time the service will be delivered in the special education setting. This was often left blank within the IEPs.

Differences were also derived from the varying understanding of school staff about what constituted special and general education time, and the entry of information on the IEP that clearly did not reflect the actual level of integration or segregation based on a student’s schedule. Since the schedule is the most accurate representation of the student’s percent of time in special education, these discrepancies indicated that the District must clarify procedures on updating IEPs to reflect changes in levels and schools, the definition of special and general education in a student’s school day, and the entry of information into the IEP.

Table 12. Number and percentages of students whose percentage of special education in the Welligent match the IEP and Schedule

Exact Matches	Welligent – IEP		Welligent - Schedule	
	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted	Weighted
Matches	1,294		690	
Non-Matches	769		1,371	
<b>Total N</b>	<b>2,063</b>		<b>2,061</b>	
Matches	62.72%	61.6%	33.48%	32.61%
Non-Matches	37.28%	38.4%	66.52%	67.39%
<b>Total %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Tables 13,14 and 15 look to determine if the discrepancies between the Welligent system and student schedules has an overall impact on the performance levels for determining compliance with Outcomes 6 and 7. Essentially, the outcomes require the District to increase the rate of students with disabilities who fall into the less than 60% category, or in other words, increase the percentage of time students with disabilities spend in the general education setting by two disability categories: students with eligibilities of SLD/SLI; and students with all other eligibilities. It is important to note that to determine whether the Welligent data on time spent in the special education setting is reliable for making a determination of Outcomes 6 and 7, the

discrepancies must be large enough to result in a shift in category. For example, if data from the Welligent system indicates that a student is in the special education setting for 45% of the instructional time, the student is considered to fall into the 60% or less category. For a shift in category to occur, the same student’s schedule would have to show an additional 15% more time in the special education setting to affect the District’s performance on the outcomes. A discrepancy of less than 15% would result in the student remaining in the 60% or less category.

To determine if the discrepancies found between the Welligent system and the students’ actual time by classroom schedule had an affect on the overall performance toward the outcomes, an analysis was conducted to determine the reliability of the data by the two primary variables: the appropriate reporting categories (less than 60% and more than 60%); and, disability categories SLD/SLI, and students with Non-SLD/SLI. Again, it is important to note that this analysis does not look at exact matches, therefore allowing for minor variations in schedules and discrepancies. Essentially, this analysis only captures students with discrepancies large enough to place them into a different category. Only the weighted findings are reported. In addition, confidence intervals are included.

Table 13 shows that for all students, the Welligent accurately represented 88.9% of students in their respective reporting category. This means that out of 1,387 students in the less than 60% category we found discrepancies for 102 students that shifted them into the more than 60%. Of the 674 students with Welligent data indicating placement in special education for more than 60% of the day, we found discrepancies for 121 students that shifted them into the less than 60% category.

Table 13. Number of Students in Welligent by Category with a Category Change Based on Schedule Information - All students

Schedule Information	Welligent Database		Total
	Less than 60%	More than 60%	
Total	1,387	674	2,061
Less than 60%	1,285	121*	1,406
More than 60%	102*	553	655*

\* Number that changed categories

% Unweighted Matches: 88.9%

% Weighted Matches: 88.9%

Confidence Interval at 5%:

Min: 87.9% Max: 90.6%

Table 14 shows the number and percent of students with eligibilities of SLD/SLI that remained in their designated reporting category was 88.9%. This means that for the 1,197 students in the less than 60% category, only 77 had discrepancies in their actual schedules that resulted in a shift into the more than 60% category. For the 389 students in the more than 60% category, 99 had discrepancies that shifted them into the other category.

Table 14. Number of Students in Welligent by Category with a Category Change Based on Schedule Information – SLD/SLI

Schedule Information	Welligent Database		Total
	Less than 60%	More than 60%	
Total	1,197	389	1,586
Less than 60%	1,120	99*	1,219
More than 60%	77*	290	367

\* Number that changed categories

% Unweighted Matches: 88.9%

% Weighted Matches: 88.9%

Confidence Interval at 5%:

Min: 87.4% Max: 90.5%

For students with non-SLD/SLI disabilities, 90.1% remained in the same reporting category when compared to their actual schedules. This means that 10% of students with non-SLD/SLI disabilities had discrepancies that shifted them to the other category. Of the 190 students in the less than 60% category, 25 shifted categories, while 22 students from the more than 60% category shifted.

Table 15. Number of Students in Welligent by Category with a Category Change Based on Schedule Information - Non- SLD/SLI

Schedule Information	Welligent Database		Total
	Less than 60%	More than 60%	
Total	190	285	475
Less than 60%	165	22*	187
More than 60%	25*	263	288

\* Number that changed categories

% Unweighted Matches: 90.1%

% Weighted Matches: 90.1%

Confidence Interval at 5%:

Min: 87.4% Max: 92.8%

## Implications

Overall the study found that the Welligent data is a fairly reliable indicator of time spent in the special education setting. More importantly, since the Welligent database is only a sample of the total population of students with disabilities in the LAUSD, confidence intervals can be applied for making determinations based on Welligent LRE data. Since the number of students in the Welligent system has increased making it a large sample, this will result in small confidence intervals providing an accurate description of the data. For example, the target for Outcome 6 requires that the District demonstrates 73% of students with SLD/SLI participate in the special education setting for less than 60% of the day. The District's performance is currently 73.7%. By applying confidence intervals to this performance, we can be 95% certain that the number of students in this category is between 73.3% and 74.1%.

The improvement in the number of students in the Welligent system has improved our ability to monitor this outcome. In addition, the implementation and availability of Welligent service logs enabled us to use different sources for determining time spent in the special education setting, therefore improving the quality of the data. However, the study found sources of error which

cause discrepancies between the Welligent data and students' actual time spent in special education. Although these discrepancies do not appear to have a significant impact on the outcomes, they may have considerable impact on the services students receive. Consistent with last year's results, the study found misunderstandings at the school-level about: the elements in the percent of time calculation and the process used to calculate percent of time; the definitions of special and general education time; the number of weekly instructional minutes by school level and type; the appropriate areas to enter the information on special education time in the IEP; ambiguity around flexible services; and the requirements for updating the IEP in response to major changes in a child's placement. We recommend that the District continue to address these concerns.

## Attachment A

### LAUSD Policy Guidelines on Instructional Minutes

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
REFERENCE GUIDE

---

**TITLE:** Online Bell Schedule And  
Calculator for Number Of  
Daily and Annual Instructional  
Minutes Required At:

Elementary Schools

**NUMBER:** REF-683.1 (Rev. #1)

**ISSUER:** Terri Minami, Director  
School Fiscal Services Division

**DATE:** January 11, 2005  
Due to Local District Offices by February 18, 2005

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this Reference Guide is to explain the rules for determining whether an elementary school is in compliance with Education Code Section 46201 and District policy regarding the requirements for daily and annual instructional minutes, and to provide instructions for using the Online Bell Schedule and Calculator form.

**MAJOR**

**CHANGES:**

1. Schools that used the online form last year will have the same data carried over onto this year's form. They will only need to edit this data for accuracy, rather than completely re-entering it, thus saving time in preparation of the schedule.
2. Schools that were not able to use the online form last year (Options, SPAN, some Special Education schools), will be able to use it this year, although there will be no data to carry over.
3. A new line has been added to accommodate Full-Day Kindergarten.
4. Local District Fiscal Service Managers will receive the certified copies from Principals for review by the school's Director of School Services, or Local District designee.

ROUTING

Principals, All Elementary Schools  
Local District Superintendents  
Local District Directors of Instruction  
Local District School Support Directors  
UTLA Representatives  
AALA Representatives

#### I. INTRODUCTION

It is the Principal's responsibility to review the bell schedule to ensure that the school meets the minimum required daily and annual instructional minutes.

#### II. DEFINITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

For an activity to be considered as instructional time, it must be under the direct supervision of a properly credentialed teacher employed by the District.

Treatment of Brunch, Lunch, and Recess Periods:

Lunch period may not be counted in the calculation of instructional time for either kindergarten or grades 1-6. Recess is counted in the calculation for AM/PM kindergarten, but not for full-day kindergarten or grades 1-6. Brunch, if offered on shortened or minimum days, may be classified as recess or lunch.

III. TOTAL NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL DAYS AND MINUTES REQUIRED

The number of annual instructional days required is set forth in the Education Code as 180 days for schools that follow a single or four-track calendar, or 163 days for school that follow a three-track calendar. The type of calendar adopted does not change the number of annual instructional minutes required.

District policy requires a greater number of instructional minutes to be offered annually than does the Education Code. Under District policy, the number of annual minutes required for Kindergarten and Grades 1- 6 is at least 36,000 and 55,100 minutes, respectively. In order to assist schools in developing a daily schedule that meets the annual minimum, and to assure reasonable uniformity in schedules among schools, a template has been developed. The following table shows the number of daily instructional minutes that are required for each type of school day in order to meet the annual minimum:

Grade Level (Type of School Day)	Daily Instructional Minutes	
	Single Track and Four Track Schools (180-day Calendar School)	Three Track Schools (163-day Calendar School)
AM/PM Kindergarten	200 minutes*	221 minutes*
Full Day Kindergarten	320 minutes**	354 minutes**
Grades 1 – 6 (regular day)	320 minutes	354 minutes
Grades 1 – 6 (Prof Dev day)	260 minutes	294 minutes
Grades 1 – 6 (minimum day)	250 minutes	276 minutes
Grades 1 – 6 (shortened day)	285 minutes	315 minutes
Grades 1 – 6 (hot weather day)	285 minutes	315 minutes

\*Does not change regardless of the type of school day.

\*\*Full-day kindergarten is treated the same as grades 1 – 6.

Elementary schools are allowed to take up to 10 minimum or 20 shortened days, or any combination thereof in the ratio of one minimum day being equal to two shortened days (since minimum days are excused twice as early as shortened days). (Bulletin No.1357, dated October 20, 2004.) The number and dates of Professional Days are fixed at 30. (MEM-906.2, May 21, 2004.)

Full-day kindergarten, introduced beginning with the 2004-05 school year, is treated the same as grades 1 – 6 for purposes of determining instructional minutes.

#### IV. ONLINE BELL SCHEDULE FORM AND CALCULATOR.

Schools must enter their bell schedules online at <http://sib.lausd.net/bell0405>. The procedures are set forth in the Attachment below.

Based on the data entered on the online form, the number of daily and annual instructional minutes completed will be automatically calculated and displayed next to the number of minutes required for each type of school day and school calendar. This will enable school staff to immediately make any necessary corrections to the data, or to take other steps to ensure that the school meets the minimum number of instructional minutes required. After the data has been entered, the data must be certified by the principal. Once the data has been certified, no further changes may be made online. Schools that need to make changes must contact School Fiscal Services Division, Attendance & Enrollment Section for assistance. Once entered, the data will remain available for future years so that only revisions will need to be entered.

A hard copy of the online form must be printed, signed by the principal, and sent to the Local District Fiscal Services Manager (FSM). The FSM will collect the forms from all schools, have them approved by the school's Director of School Services, or Local District designee, and forward the complete packet to this office.

#### V. DUE DATE FOR SUBMISSION OF BELL SCHEDULES

To Local District Fiscal Services Manager: February 18, 2005  
To School Fiscal Services: March 4, 2005

#### RELATED RESOURCES:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Request For Approval For Minimum and Shortened Day Schedules | Bulletin No.1357, dated October 20, 2004, issued by the Chief Instructional Officer, Instructional Services  |
| 2. School Day Schedule  | Bulletin No. M-97 (Rev), dated October 14, 2002, issued by the Deputy Superintendent, Instructional Services |

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
REFERENCE GUIDE

---

**TITLE:** Online Bell Schedule And  
Calculator for Number Of  
Daily and Annual Instructional  
Minutes Required At:

Middle Schools

**NUMBER:** REF-684.1 (Rev. #1)

**ISSUER:** Terri Minami, Director  
School Fiscal Services Division

**DATE:** January 11, 2005  
Due to Local District Offices by February 18, 2005

ROUTING

Principals, All Middle Schools  
Local District Superintendents  
Local District Directors of Instruction  
Local District School Support Directors  
UTLA Chairpersons  
AALA Representatives

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this Reference Guide is to explain the rules for determining if the District's Middle schools are in compliance with Education Code Section 46201 and District policy related to the requirements for daily and annual instructional minutes, and to provide instructions for using the Online Bell Schedule and Calculator form.

**MAJOR**

**CHANGES:**

1. Schools that used the online form last year will have the same data carried over onto this year's form. They will only need to edit this data for accuracy, rather than completely re-entering it, thus saving time in preparation of the schedule.
2. Schools that were not able to use the online form last year (Options, SPAN, some Special Education schools), will be able to use it this year, although there will be no data to carry over.
3. Local District Fiscal Service Managers will receive the certified copies from Principals for review by the school's Director of School Services, or Local District designee.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is the Principal's responsibility to review the bell schedule to ensure that the school meets the minimum required daily and annual instructional minutes.

II. DEFINITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

A. Actual Classroom Instruction

Actual classroom instruction is any regularly scheduled classroom activity offered under the direct supervision of a properly credentialed teacher employed by the school district for the number of minutes established by the district. Only that time during which courses are available to all students is counted when determining instructional time.

#### Homeroom

Homeroom may be considered instructional activity and counted as instructional time if that activity is under the immediate supervision of a credentialed teacher and students are regularly assigned with their attendance recorded and reported as part of daily program schedule.

#### C. Nutrition and Lunch

Nutrition and lunch periods are not considered instructional activity. Lunch time activities in classrooms are not counted as instructional time.

#### D. Passing Time

Passing time is that portion of the time between class periods in the same educational program in the same school day, that is necessary for students, as a group, to pass from the locations of their immediately preceding class sessions, to the locations of their immediately following class sessions. One passing time is authorized as instructional time for the periods after the lunch and nutrition breaks, but the passing time must be distinct from the actual lunch and nutrition breaks, and students must return to an instructional activity after the passing time. Passing time must be equal between all classes and every day of the week.

Passing time from one school to another is not considered as instructional time. Paid activities (such as dances, etc.), are not counted as instructional time and should be held after school hours.

### III. TOTAL NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL DAYS AND MINUTES REQUIRED

District policy requires a greater number of annual instructional minutes than does the Education Code. Under District policy, the total annual instructional minutes required for middle schools with Grades 6 - 8 is at least 65,300 minutes, except for middle schools with Common Planning Time.

For middle schools with an approved Common Planning Time (CPT) program, the total annual instructional minutes required is at least 62,160 minutes. Schools with approved CPT days must indicate on the online form the number of days and the dates when CPT days will be used. The CPT program must be approved annually by the Local District Director, School Services, before it is implemented, and a copy of the approved program kept at the Local District Office for audit purposes.

In order to assist schools in developing a daily schedule that meets the annual minimum, and to assure reasonable uniformity in schedules among schools, a template has been developed. The following table shows the number of daily instructional minutes that are required for each type of school day in order to meet the annual minimum:

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Daily Instructional Minutes</u>	
	<u>Single Track and Four-Track Schools</u> <u>180-day Calendar School</u>	<u>Three-Track Schools</u> <u>163-day Calendar School</u>
Grades 6-8 (regular day)	378 minutes	418 minutes
Grades 6-8 (minimum day)	248 minutes	274 minutes
Grades 6-8 (shortened day)	313 minutes	346 minutes
Professional Development Banked Time Day	288 minutes	328 minutes
Common Planning Time Day	318 minutes	358 minutes
Refer to Memorandum No. M-163 dated June 25, 2003		

Secondary schools are allowed to take up to 10 minimum or 20 shortened days, or any combination thereof in the ratio of one minimum day being equal to two shortened days (since minimum days are excused twice as early as shortened days). (Bulletin No.1357, dated October 20, 2004.) The number and dates of Professional Days are fixed at 16. (MEM-906.2, May 21, 2004.)

#### IV. ONLINE BELL SCHEDULE FORM AND CALCULATOR.

Schools must enter their bell schedules online at <http://sib.lausd.net/bell0405>. The procedures are set forth in the Attachment below.

Based on the data entered on the online form, the number of daily and annual instructional minutes completed will be automatically calculated and displayed next to the number of minutes required for each type of school day and school calendar. This will enable school staff to immediately make any necessary corrections to the data, or to take other steps to ensure that the school meets the minimum number of instructional minutes required. After the data has been entered, the data must be certified by the principal. Once the data has been certified, no further changes may be made online; schools that need to make changes must contact School Fiscal Services Division, Attendance & Enrollment Section for assistance. Once entered, the data will remain available for future years so that only revisions will need to be entered.

A hard copy of the online form must be printed, signed by the principal, and sent to the Local District Fiscal Services Manager (FSM). The FSM will collect the forms from all schools, have them approved by the school's Director of School Services, or Local District designee, and forward the complete packet to this office.

#### V. DUE DATES FOR SUBMISSION OF BELL SCHEDULES

To Local District Fiscal Services Manager:

February 18, 2005

Reference Guide No. REF – 684.1 (Rev. #1) Page 3 of 9  
School Fiscal Services Division

January 10, 2005

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
REFERENCE GUIDE

---

**TITLE:** Online Bell Schedule And  
Calculator for Number Of  
Daily and Annual Instructional  
Minutes Required At:

High Schools

**NUMBER:** REF-685.1 (Rev. #1)

**ISSUER:** Terri Minami, Director  
School Fiscal Services Division

**DATE:** January 11, 2005  
Due to Local District Offices by February 18, 2005.

ROUTING

Principals, All Middle Schools  
Local District Superintendents  
Local District Directors of Instruction  
Local District School Support Directors  
UTLA Chairpersons  
AALA Representatives

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this Reference Guide is to explain the rules for determining if the District's High Schools are in compliance with Education Code Section 46201 and District policy related to the requirements for daily and annual instructional minutes, and to provide instructions for using the Online Bell Schedule and Calculator form.

**MAJOR**

**CHANGES:**

1. Schools that used the online form last year will have the same data carried over onto this year's form. They will only need to edit this data for accuracy, rather than completely re-entering it, thus saving time in preparation of the schedule.
2. Schools that were not able to use the online form last year (Options, SPAN, some Special Education schools), will be able to use it this year, although there will be no data to carry over.
3. Local District Fiscal Service Managers will receive the certified copies from Principals for review by the school's Director of School Services, or Local District designee.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is the Principal's responsibility to review the bell schedule to ensure that the school meets the minimum required daily and annual instructional minutes.

II. DEFINITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

A. Actual Classroom Instruction

Actual classroom instruction is any regularly scheduled classroom activity offered under the direct supervision of a properly credentialed teacher employed by the school district for the number of minutes established by the district. Only that time during which courses are available to all students is counted when determining instructional time.

B. Homeroom

Homeroom may be considered instructional activity and counted as instructional time if that activity is under the immediate supervision of a credentialed teacher and students are regularly assigned with their attendance recorded and reported as part of daily program schedule.

C. Nutrition and Lunch

Nutrition and lunch periods are not considered instructional activity. Lunch time activities in classrooms are not counted as instructional time.

D. Passing Time

Passing time is that portion of the time between class periods in the same educational program in the same school day that is necessary for students, as a group, to pass from the locations of their immediately preceding class sessions, to the locations of their immediately following class sessions. One passing time is authorized as instructional time for the periods after the lunch and nutrition breaks, but the passing time must be distinct from the actual lunch and nutrition breaks, and students must return to an instructional activity after the passing time. Passing time must be equal between all classes and every day of the week.

Passing time from one school to another is not considered as instructional time. Paid activities (such as dances, etc.), are not counted as instructional time and should be held after school hours.

III. TOTAL NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL DAYS AND MINUTES REQUIRED

District policy requires a greater number of annual instructional minutes than does the Education Code. Under District policy, the total annual instructional minutes required for High Schools with Grades 9 - 12 is at least 65,300 minutes.

Continuation, Opportunity, and Community Day Schools have a requirement for minimum daily, but not annual, instructional minutes.

In order to assist schools in developing a daily schedule that meets the annual minimum, and to assure reasonable uniformity in schedules among schools, a template has been developed. The following table shows the number of daily instructional minutes that are required for each type of school day in order to meet the annual minimum:

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Daily Instructional Minutes</u>	
	<u>Single Track and Four-Track Schools</u>	<u>Three-Track Schools</u>
	<u>180-day Calendar School</u>	<u>163-day Calendar School</u>
Grades 9-12 ( regular day )	378 minutes	418 minutes
Grades 9-12 ( minimum day )	248 minutes	274 minutes
Grades 9-12 ( shortened day )	313 minutes	346 minutes
Professional Development		
Banked Time Day	288 minutes	328 minutes
Continuation/ Opportunity Schools	250 minutes	
Community Day Schools	360 minutes	

Secondary schools are allowed to take up to 10 minimum or 20 shortened days, or any combination thereof in the ratio of one minimum day being equal to two shortened days (since minimum days are excused twice as early as shortened days). (Bulletin No.1357, dated October 20, 2004.) The number and dates of Professional Days are fixed at 16. (MEM-906.2, May 21, 2004.)

#### IV. ONLINE BELL SCHEDULE FORM AND CALCULATOR.

Schools must enter their bell schedules online at <http://sib.lausd.net/bell0405>. The procedures are set forth in the Attachment below.

Based on the data entered on the online form, the number of daily and annual instructional minutes completed will be automatically calculated and displayed next to the number of minutes required for each type of school day and school calendar. This will enable school staff to immediately make any necessary corrections to the data, or to take other steps to ensure that the school meets the minimum number of instructional minutes required. After the data has been entered, the data must be certified by the principal. Once the data has been certified, no further changes may be made online; schools that need to make changes must contact School Fiscal Services Division, Attendance & Enrollment Section for assistance. Once entered, the data will remain available for future years so that only revisions will need to be entered.

A hard copy of the online form must be printed, signed by the principal, and sent to the Local District Fiscal Services Manager (FSM). The FSM will collect the forms from all schools, have them approved by the school's Director of School Services, or Local District designee, and forward the complete packet to this office.

# Attachment B

## Data Collection Instrument

Office of the Independent Monitor

LRE  Y

<b>Page 1</b>	District ID#	Last Name	First Name	Birthdate	Grade	Current IEP Date	IEP Date if different:	
				9/30/1999	0	4/16/2004		
	Attend School:		Local District:		Previous IEP Date: _____			
	IEP Meeting Location: _____							
<b>Page 4</b>	Eligibility: DD			Eligibility if different: _____				
<b>Page 5</b>	Performance area	Wk	Freq	Total	Month	Freq	Total	Minutes outside Gen Ed
	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	_____	_____
<b>Page 8</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Page 8 Missing		Welligent Percent of Time: <input type="text"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed	<input type="checkbox"/> RSP	<input type="checkbox"/> SDC	(Minutes per Week): _____	<input type="checkbox"/> DIS	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed/Inclusion	% of time: _____	
<b>Page 12</b>	_____							
	1. # of District Policy Total Instructional Minutes: <input type="text"/>			2. # of Total Instructional Minutes School Report: <input type="text"/>				

### Parent Participation

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

### Transition Plan

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

**Attachment C**

**School Visit Materials Checklist**

Please provide the following information:

**All Schools**

- 1. Total number of instructional minutes:      Senior High \_\_\_\_\_  
   Middle School \_\_\_\_\_  
   Elementary \_\_\_\_\_  
   Kindergarten \_\_\_\_\_  
   Pre-School \_\_\_\_\_

**Special Education Centers Only**

- 1. For students on the attached list, class schedules with any daily instructional minutes in mainstreaming in a general education setting (not fieldtrips, etc.)

**Elementary Only**

- 1. Elementary RSP students on the attached list please provide the day, time, and length of time of any RSP pull-out. Attach one week of RST logs.
- 2. For Elementary SDC students on the attached list, their daily classroom schedule and any mainstreaming time.
- 3. Simple Roster (List) of Special Education Teachers

**For Secondary Schools Only:**

- 1. A copy of the bell schedule
- 2. Simple Roster (List) of Special Education Teachers
- 3. Number of class periods \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Length of class period \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Length of homeroom \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Class Schedules for each student on the included list from the CL54
- 7. For RSP students on the list, day, time, and length of time for RSP pull-out services

Thank you for your assistance.  
If you have questions, please call Myrna Barragan or Jaime Hernandez at 213-241-6036

**Attachment D**

**Data Summary Sheet**

Name of Student: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade: \_\_\_\_\_

If information is not available, please mark N/A

\_\_\_\_\_ Total # of Instructional Minutes in LAUSD policy for this student

\_\_\_\_\_ Total # of Instructional Minutes from School Reports for this student

***Elementary and Pre-K***

\_\_\_\_\_ Total # of SPED Minutes in IEP  
(Add special education minutes from p. 5 + p. 8/ Default to p.12) Total # p.5  
Total # p.8  
Total # p.12 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Total # of SPED Minutes from Schedule  
(Total special education minutes in Elementary Classroom +DIS  
or from RSP + DIS Schedule) Total # Classroom  
Total # DIS  
Total # RSP \_\_\_\_\_

***Secondary – Middle and High School***

\_\_\_\_\_ Total # of SPED Minutes in IEP  
(Add special education minutes from p. 5 + p. 8/ Default to p.12) Total # p.5  
Total # p.8  
Total # p.12 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Total # of SPED Minutes from Schedule  
(Count # special education periods/multiply by #  
of minutes in a of period) Length of Period  
# of Sped periods  
DIS excluding APE \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Percent SPED time from IEP  
(IEP minutes/Policy minutes) \_\_\_\_\_ Percent SPED Time from Schedule  
(Schedule minutes/Policy Minutes)

\_\_\_\_\_ Total SIS \_\_\_\_\_ Total Welligent

## Attachment E

### Confidence Intervals for LRE Analysis

#### Number and Percentages of Schools With and Without Matches of Policy and School Instructional Minutes

	N	p	Min	Max
Minutes Do Not Match	316	0.6767	62.5%	72.8%
Minutes Match	151	0.3233	24.9%	39.8%

#### Number and Percentages of Schools Without Matches of Policy and School Instructional Minutes, by District

	N	p	Min	Max
1	64	0.7356	62.8%	84.4%
2	45	0.6522	51.3%	79.1%
3	34	0.5965	43.2%	76.1%
4	36	0.6545	49.9%	81.0%
5	45	0.8036	68.8%	92.0%
6	22	0.5946	38.9%	80.0%
7	36	0.7059	0.0%	85.5%
8	34	0.6182	0.0%	78.2%

#### Number and Percentages of Schools Without Matches of Policy and School Instructional Minutes, by School Level

	N	p	Min	Max
Elem	180	0.6040	53.3%	67.5%
Middle	71	0.8452	76.1%	92.9%
High	58	0.8529	76.2%	94.4%
Special Centers	7	0.4118	0.0%	77.6%

#### Proportions of Students by Educational Placement Time, by Non-Welligent and Welligent IEPs (Less than 60% SE)

	N	p	Min	Max
Non-Welligent	175	68.10%	61.2%	75.0%
Welligent	1,389	64.50%	62.0%	67.0%

#### Number and percentages of students whose percentage of special education in the Welligent Match the IEP and Schedule

	N	p	Min	Max
Welligent - IEP Matches	1,294	61.60%	59.0%	64.2%
Welligent - IEP Non Matches	769	38.40%	35.0%	41.8%
Welligent - Schedule Matches	690	32.61%	29.1%	36.1%
Welligent - Schedule Non Matches	1,371	67.39%	64.9%	69.9%

**Number and percentages of students whose percentage of special education in the Welligent Match the IEP and Schedule**

	N	p	Min	Max
Welligent - IEP Matches 20% of Less in SE	1,026	90.15%	<b>88.3%</b>	<b>92.0%</b>
Welligent - IEP Matches 20 - 60% SE	236	60.46%	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>
Welligent - IEP Matches 60+% in SE	628	88.47%	<b>86.0%</b>	<b>91.0%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 20% of Less in SE	995	85.54%	<b>83.4%</b>	<b>87.7%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 20 - 60% SE	155	32.25%	<b>24.9%</b>	<b>39.6%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 60+% in SE	553	73.51%	<b>69.8%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>

**Number and percentages of students whose percentage of special education in the Welligent Match the IEP and Schedule**

	N	p	Min	Max
Welligent - IEP Matches 60% or less in SE	1,348	93.53%	<b>92.2%</b>	<b>94.8%</b>
Welligent - IEP Matches 60+% in SE	628	88.47%	<b>86.0%</b>	<b>91.0%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 60% or less in SE	1,285	84.73%	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>86.7%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 60+% in SE	553	73.51%	<b>69.8%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>

**Policy vs. School Instructional Minutes Analysis  
Table 11**

	N	p	Min	Max
Minutes Do Not Match	64	0.4414	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>56.3%</b>
Minutes Match	81	0.5586	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>

**Welligent & Non-Welligent Comparisons  
Table 14 (Less than 60% SE)**

	N	p	Min	Max
Non-Welligent	63	0.362	<b>24.3%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>
Welligent	267	0.3589	<b>30.1%</b>	<b>41.6%</b>

**Assessing Accuracy of Welligent % Time  
Table 15 (Exact Matches)**

	N	p	Min	Max
Welligent - IEP Matches	363	0.4658	<b>41.4%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>
Welligent - IEP Non Matches	415	0.5342	<b>48.6%</b>	<b>58.2%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches	209	0.2719	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>33.2%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Non Matches	569	0.7281	<b>69.2%</b>	<b>76.5%</b>

**Table 16 (Matches by 3 Placement Categories)**

	N	p	Min	Max
Welligent - IEP Matches 20% of Less in SE	297	0.7743	<b>72.7%</b>	<b>82.2%</b>
Welligent - IEP Matches 20 - 60% SE	127	0.5665	<b>48.0%</b>	<b>65.3%</b>
Welligent - IEP Matches 60+% in SE	238	0.8396	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>88.6%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 20% of Less in SE	277	0.7624	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>81.3%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 20 - 60% SE	129	0.4666	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>55.3%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 60+% in SE	217	0.7568	<b>70.0%</b>	<b>81.4%</b>

**Table 17 (Matches by 2 Placement Categories)**

	N	p	Min	Max
Welligent - IEP Matches 60% or less in SE	492	0.9094	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>
Welligent - IEP Matches 60+% in SE	238	0.8396	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>88.6%</b>

Welligent - Schedule Matches 60% or less in SE	485	0.8644	<b>83.4%</b>	<b>89.5%</b>
Welligent - Schedule Matches 60+% in SE	217	0.7568	<b>70.0%</b>	<b>81.4%</b>