

Office of the Independent Monitor
September 29, 2010

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

Introduction

This report presents the findings of a 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 2009-2010 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.

This report will briefly discuss the methodology, sample design, findings and highlight areas of progress.

Methodology

Sample Design

The study included all initial, eligibility changes and re-evaluations of only African American students identified as ED. This is a change from previous studies that included a sample of students from all other races/ethnicities. The sample was drawn from a database provided monthly by the District that tracks all students who received a comprehensive evaluation resulting in the identification and eligibility of ED. During the 2009-2010 school year, the sample included 242 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	242	100%
Total	242	100%

Table 2: ED Sample by Local District

District	Number	Percent
1	5	2.1%
2	5	2.1%
3	24	9.9%
4	3	1.2%
5	2	0.8%
6	0	0.0%
7	23	9.5%
8	15	6.2%
NPS	148	61.2%
Charter	3	1.2%
Other (Adult, SU)	14	5.8%
Total	242	100.0%

Table 3: ED Sample by School Level

School Level	Number	Percent
Elementary/ preschool/early ed	35	14.5%
Middle School	30	12.4%
High School	28	11.6%
Special Centers	0	0.0%
NPS	148	61.2%
Other	1	0.4%
Total	242	100.0%

Elements of the file review

The development of the file review is well documented. 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) requesting 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 African American students identified as ED were uploaded from the District’s database and verified monthly for accuracy. IEPs and psychological reports were retrieved from the Welligent IEP system and comprehensive reviews of these records were conducted by trained research assistants. Inter-rater reliability was established through multiple reviews by different raters which consisted of a minimum of three reviews. Data collection included IEPs conducted between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010. 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 237 valid observations¹. Two students were found ineligible for special education services at the time of their IEP and were removed from the analysis. Tables 4, 5 and 6 demonstrate the analyzed sample descriptions by race/ethnicity, local district and school level.

Table 4: ED Analyzed Sample, by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
African American	237	100.0%
Total	237	100.0%

¹ Five students were identified as duplicates and removed from the analyzed sample.

Table 5: ED Analyzed Sample, by Local District

District	Number	Percent
1	5	2.1%
2	5	2.1%
3	24	10.1%
4	3	1.3%
5	2	0.8%
6	0	0.0%
7	22	9.3%
8	14	5.9%
NPS	146	61.6%
Charter	3	1.3%
Other	13	5.5%
Total	237	100.0%

Table 6: ED Analyzed Sample, by School Level

School Level	Number	Percent
Elementary/ Preschool/Early Ed	34	14.3%
Middle School	30	12.7%
High School	26	11.0%
Special Centers	0	0.0%
NPS	146	61.6%
Other	1	0.4%
Total	237	100.0%

Findings

The findings are presented below. 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 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 2009-2010 school year, 83.0% of African American students met this criteria. This continues to fall short of the 90% criteria.

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

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American
Total Observations	235
Number of students meeting criteria	195
Percentage meeting criteria	83.0%

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 following analysis examines rates of compliance by IEP types. Students are placed into one of three IEP type categories: initials, change of eligibility and re-evaluations. Students who 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 who 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 students newly identified as ED and those receiving a re-evaluation compared to those students whose eligibility was changed (86.1%, 85.0% vs. 77.3%) (Table 8).

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

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American
<i>Initials</i>	
-Total Observations	36
-Number of students meeting criteria	31
-Percentage meeting criteria	86.1%
<i>Change of Eligibility</i>	
-Total Observations	66
-Number of students meeting criteria	51
-Percentage meeting criteria	77.3%
<i>Reevaluations</i>	
-Total Observations	133
-Number of students meeting criteria	113
-Percentage meeting criteria	85.0%

Data were analyzed to examine if compliance rates differed between district-operated schools and non-public schools. Table 9 shows that students received all of the requirements of a comprehensive evaluation at similar rates (82.2% vs. 83.4% NPS).

Table 9. By School Type, NPS and Public

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American
<i>Public Schools</i>	
-Total Observations	90
-Number of students meeting criteria	74
-Percentage meeting criteria	82.2%
<i>Non-Public Schools</i>	
-Total Observations	145
-Number of students meeting criteria	121
-Percentage meeting criteria	83.4%

The four processes of the comprehensive evaluation were examined to determine rates of compliance by section (Table 10). The District exceeded the 90% criteria for the pre-referral interventions for students initially referred (97.2%), assessments (97.4%) and determination of eligibility (99.1%).

Referral interventions for students with a change of eligibility and IEP team considerations fell slightly below the 90% criteria (86.4% and 88.1%).

Table 10. Compliance of the Elements of a “Comprehensive Evaluation” by Section

Section	# of Observations	# of Students Meeting Criteria	% Meeting Criteria
Section 1. Pre-Referral Interventions Initials IEPs	36	35	97.2%
Section 1a. Referral Interventions Change of Eligibility IEPs	66	57	86.4%
Section 2. Assessments All IEPs	235	229	97.4%
Section 3. Determination of Eligibility All IEPs	235	233	99.1%
Section 4. IEP Team Considerations All IEPs	235	207	88.1%

As mentioned above, to meet compliance with the outcome, students must demonstrate evidence of all items of the comprehensive evaluation. This creates a very high threshold as not meeting one item automatically results in the exclusion of that student in determining compliance with the outcome. To examine the impact of one missed item, the data were analyzed by removing one missing item (Table 11). This means that students missing only one item were considered as having met the entire criteria. Of the 235 students in the sample, seven students were missing more than one item. Therefore, by removing one missing item, 97% of all students received a “comprehensive evaluation.”

Table 11. Students Met Criteria Removing One Element

Number and Percent Met Criteria	African American
<i>All IEP Types</i>	
-Total Observations	235
-Number of students meeting criteria	228
-Percentage meeting criteria	97.0%

Placement Recommendations – Prior Placement General Education

Analyses of placement recommendations for students initially identified as ED indicate that students were recommended for each placement type equally (33.3%) (Table 12). This shows a decrease in placements of NPS compared to previous years.

Table 12: Type of Placement Recommended by Race/Ethnicity Whose Prior Placement was General Education

Placement recommendation	African American	
	N	%
NPS	14	33.3
Non Residence School	14	33.3
School of Residence	14	33.3
Total	42	100.0%

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

Table 13 shows IEP teams’ placement recommendations of instructional settings. Teams recommended special day programs (47.2%) and special day programs specifically for students with ED (38.9%) most frequently. Placements in less-restrictive instructional settings such as RSP (9.7%) and general education classrooms (4.2%) were recommended infrequently.

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	
	N	%
DIS Only	0	0.0
Gen Ed	3	4.2
RSP	7	9.7
SDP	34	47.2
SDP ED	28	38.9
Total	72	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 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 2009-2010. The risk of being identified as ED has decreased for African American students from 1.67 to 1.16. This means that approximately 1.16 African American students out of 100 are identified with ED.

This results in a relative risk ratio of 4.16, which 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

	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	Risk	Risk Ratio	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	1.16	4.14

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 41.2%. 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. Last year these reductions stabilized. While this year’s data show a slight increase, the percentages of students identified remain consistent. This stability indicates that the schools continue to identify students with ED who meet the eligibility requirements for services.

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

	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-07		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N	%	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	868	33.28
White	855	20.82	747	19.95	723	21.14	635	22.22	558	21.4	507	19.72	505	19.36
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	1,172	44.94
Other	108	2.63	97	2.59	79	2.31	58	2.13	75	2.9	79	3.07	63	2.42
Total	4,106	100	3,745	100	3,420	100	2,858	100	2,608	100	2,571	100	2,608	100

Table 16 shows the number and percentage of students with ED in NPS by race/ethnicity and school year. Since the 2003-2004 school year, there has been a 30.5% decrease in the number of African American students placed in NPS. Similarly, despite a small increase in the number of students attending NPS, the percentages by race/ethnicity remain consistent.

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

	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-07		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N	%	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	572	34.48
White	496	23.39	473	22.92	472	21.14	440	25.91	401	24.8	371	23.32	353	21.28
Latino	757	35.69	752	36.43	728	37.86	642	37.81	636	39.4	647	40.67	698	42.07
Other	45	2.12	52	2.52	45	2.34	35	2.06	46	2.8	48	3.02	36	2.17
Total	2,121	100	2,064	100	1,923	100	1,698	100	1,616	100	1,591	100	1,659	100

Summary

During the 2009-2010 school year, 83.0% of African American students identified as ED met the criteria. While the 90% target was not achieved, the limitations within the structure of the outcome arguably make reaching this target extremely difficult to meet. The District has demonstrated tremendous progress in improving the quality of the identification and placement processes for all students. Many of the areas within the pre-referral and identification processes exceed the 90% target level necessary for compliance with the outcome. To illustrate the challenges with an “all or nothing” criteria for compliance, data were analyzed and those missing one item was considered meeting the requirements of a “comprehensive evaluation.” This analysis found that 97.0% of all students identified with ED received a comprehensive evaluation. This progress and the stabilization of the population of students identified with ED and placed in NPS are evidence that the intent of this outcome to reduce inappropriate identifications and placements has been achieved.

Tables

Table 1: Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Initials

Number of students with Initial IEPs in analysis, by Race/Ethnicity	African American N=36	
	N	%
Initial pre-referral intervention meeting.	36	100.0
Follow-up pre-referral intervention meeting.	36	100.0
Parent participation at the pre-referral intervention meeting.	35	97.2
Documentation of other factors	36	100.0
Documentation of behavioral/academic concerns	36	100.0
Supports such as: non-DIS counseling, behavior plan, and/or school-wide discipline program.	36	100.0
Assessment plan	36	100.0
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	35	97.2%

Table 2: Pre-referral and Referral Interventions – Change of Eligibility

Number of students with Eligibility Change in analysis, by Race/Ethnicity	African American N=66	
	N	%
Behavior Support Plan	59	89.4
Academic modifications and accommodations	62	93.9
Consideration for counseling services and/or referrals to school-wide discipline programs	61	92.4
Assessment plan	64	97.0
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	57	86.4%

Table 3: Assessment – All Students

	African American N=235	
	n	%
Health assessment	232	98.7
Formal academic assessment	234	99.6
Cognitive or general ability assessment	233	99.1
Multi-disciplinary social-emotional evaluation	234	99.6
Comprehensive behavioral evaluation.	233	99.1
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	229	97.4%

Table 4: Determination of ED Eligibility – All students

Determination of ED Eligibility	African American N=235	
	n	%
Comprehensive ED eligibility statement	234	99.6
Consideration of exclusionary criteria and other relevant factors	234	99.6
Justification of co-morbid disabilities	234	99.6
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	234	99.6%

Table 5: IEP Team Recommendations – All Students

IEP Team Recommendations	African American N=235	
	n	%
Consideration of a behavior support plan (BSP)	232	98.7
IEP team considerations for placement in the LRE	231	98.3
Consideration of DIS counseling services, and/or referral to mental health agency	230	97.9
Counseling goals, if appropriate	234	99.6
Parent participation at the IEP meeting determining eligibility and placement	216	91.9
Number and percentage of students meeting criteria	207	88.1%

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: