

TARGETED STRATEGY PLAN—MCD OUTCOME 2

INTRODUCTION

The following amendments have been made to Targeted Strategy Plan—MCD Outcome 2 which was initially approved by the Independent Monitor on November 13, 2006.

Strategy 2.1: Continue to institutionalize tiered models of service delivery through professional development for general education and special education teachers to increase access and achievement of students with disabilities in the core curriculum, including the implementation of instructionally appropriate learning centers.

REVISED 2-1.1: *Continue to target lowest performing schools as measured by CST data for support through professional development and coaching for leadership and school teams in the effective implementation of tiered models of service delivery for students with disabilities.*

DELETED 2-1.2: *Review senior high learning centers for defined district-wide learning center operational standards and appropriate instructional materials that address the achievement needs of senior high students with mild-to-moderate disabilities.*

DELETED 2-1.3: *Review middle school learning centers for defined district-wide learning center operational standards and appropriate instructional materials that address the achievement needs of senior high students with mild-to-moderate disabilities.*

DELETED 2-1.4: *Review elementary school learning centers for defined district-wide learning center operational standards and appropriate instructional materials that address the achievement needs of senior high students with mild-to-moderate disabilities.*

Strategy 2-2: Continue a research-based intervention, including response to intervention (RtI), program for English/language arts and math in addition to the core curriculum using the same target criteria as for the first strategy.

REVISED 2-2.1: *Incorporate the research-based Tier II literacy intervention program, Voyager TimeWarp Plus with publisher support, into elementary ESY English/Language Arts instruction during 2006-2007 ESY for students with disabilities.*

REVISED 2-2.2: *Continue to support the Voyager Passport literacy intervention program with publisher and Least Restrictive Environment Specialist support to elementary schools on target list.*

REVISED 2-2.3: *Continue to incorporate the research-based Tier II math intervention program, TouchMath, with publisher support into elementary ESY math instruction during 2006-2007 ESY for students with disabilities.*

REVISED 2-2.4: *Provide and use additional TouchMath materials in elementary learning centers to ensure a range of supplemental instructional tools to support students with mild to moderate disabilities.*

ADD 2-2.5: *Integrate the English/Language Arts evidence-based intervention options available to middle schools to include in-school intervention through the existing DRW program, targeted use of the learning center elective, use of a specially designed reading elective, or after-school interventions provided through the Beyond the Bell program.*

ADD 2-2.6: *Integrate the Math evidence-based intervention options available to middle schools to include in-school intervention through the existing Algebra Readiness course for 8th grade students performing below basic or far below basic, targeted use of the learning center elective for 6th and 7th grade students performing below basic or far below basic, use of the Algebra Ready supplemental curriculum in the learning center or special day class, or after-school interventions provided through the Beyond the Bell program.*

Strategy 2.3: Make public the information and hold accountable all school personnel to implement IEP designated accommodations for instruction and test situations.

COMPLETED: 2-3.1: *Train APEIS, Bridge Coordinators and designated secondary administrators and coordinators in the use of the Welligent Accommodations and Modifications School Report to be used by teachers and testing coordinators in providing instructional and testing accommodations.*

REVISED 2-3.2: *Continue to hold applicable school staff accountable for using instructional and testing accommodations in accordance with the IEP as indicated on SIS test rosters.*

These primary strategies have been identified from a) an analysis of various data, (b) research findings, (c) focus groups, task forces, or committees convened relative to the outcome, and (d) a review of the impact of particular action steps from the prior annual plan or plans.

CST PERFORMANCE

Baseline performance data for Targeted Strategy Plan—Outcome 2 for 2006-2007 was based on the spring 2005 STAR individual student testing file. The STAR file provides student-level data and reflects the inclusion/exclusion rules recommended by the state. Data from the 2007 STAR individual student testing file will not be available until the fall 2007. For the Targeted Strategy Plan—Outcome 2, 2007-2008, the District proposes to continue the intervention programs for students in grades 2 through 5 and middle school-age students at the schools targeted in 2006-2007. Continuing the program at the 2006-2007 targeted schools is recommended for a variety of reasons:

- The *Voyager Passport* literacy intervention program is designed to be implemented for a 26 week period of time to show maximum benefit.
- All targeted Local Districts and/or schools did not implement the intervention programs at the same time providing varying lengths of intervention for individual students.
- Schools have been able to develop calendars and schedules in advance of the school year commencing to better provide opportunities for teachers and paraprofessionals to implement the program in 2007-2008.

Access to the core curriculum through increasing implementation of tiered models of service delivery with standards-based instruction provided by general education teachers, consistent implementation of intervention programs and appropriately utilized learning centers is expected to continue improving academic performance for students with disabilities.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TARGETED STRATEGY PLAN

Literacy and Math Intervention Programs

Approximately 90% of the targeted schools implemented the literacy intervention program for 2006-2007. The majority of non-participation was in Local District 2 where there was strong resistance to implementing an intervention program that was not part of the Open Court Program. Other non-participants tended to be schools that had few students with disabilities or schools where other intervention programs had already been implemented for the 2006-2007 school year. Seven thousand one hundred and eighteen elementary students consistently received the literacy intervention program. The number of participants anticipated to receive this supplemental instruction in the 2006-2007 plans varied from the actual number of participants for two key reasons: leave rate of fifth graders, transience rates, and lack of CST data for incoming second graders.

Implementation of the mathematics intervention program, *TouchMath*, proved more difficult than implementing the literacy intervention. Schools had difficulty removing students from the general education classroom for another block of 45 minutes when generally the same students were being pulled-

out for 45 minutes with the literacy intervention program. This significantly impacted schools' ability to maintain achievement of Outcome 6, and engage students in the core academic areas. In recognition of this impediment to implementation, the Division of Special Education instituted training on strategies to embed *TouchMath* within the core program and to use it in the learning center as appropriate based on student needs. For 2007-2008, additional *TouchMath* materials are being supplied for all elementary school learning centers.

Intervention programs were implemented to close the achievement gap for students with disabilities and bring them to the Basic category of achievement on State assessments. Assessment is an integral part of any instructional and intervention program to assist educators in identifying students in need of additional support and monitoring student progress. There are no definitive research findings at this time regarding effective math interventions as in the area of literacy. As such, the *TouchMath* program should be viewed as a supplemental program rather than an intervention. The *TouchMath* program did not have a progress monitoring system aligned with State standards as the *Voyager Passport* program does. The Division of Special Education has worked with *TouchMath* publishers to develop a consistent online monitoring system for 2007-2008. The Division of Special Education will also be collaborating with the Elementary Office of Instruction to ensure that special education issues including accommodations/modifications, scaffolding, and differentiated instruction are included in elementary mathematics and literacy instructional guides and training for all teachers.

Per Roland Good III, Associate Professor, University of Oregon and developer of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), students who have fallen behind in their reading skills need exponentially more time for intervention which is a tremendous challenge for teachers. Schools targeted in the 2006-2007 Targeted Strategy Plan, will better be prepared to face these scheduling challenges to increase intervention time to a minimum of 26 weeks for 2007-2008 as they have had advance preparation for the anticipated interventions. Least Restrictive Environment Specialists as well as Local District personnel will monitor and provide technical assistance to schools in fully implementing the intervention programs. Data from the 2006-2007 implementation may not be as powerful as anticipated due to the inability of some targeted schools to implement for an extended period of time. The goal for 2007-2008 is for a minimum of 26 weeks of intervention for the identified students.

Learning Centers

The implementation of the Observation Checklist by the Directors has proven to be an effective tool for monitoring the development of learning centers. Directors and schools reported positively on both the tool and the impact it had on implementation.

Each targeted school was required to establish one or more learning center(s) to provide intensive services to students with disabilities. The following guidelines assisted schools in the development of a learning center to support improved student outcomes in academics, behavior, social engagement, and transition at the secondary level.

1. The purpose of the learning center is to explicitly teach:
 - strategies for learning (access strategies),
 - extend the learning in the general education classroom (extension),
 - provide targeted intervention, and
 - monitor progress of students.
2. An effective learning center uses evidenced-based programs and strategies to meet the needs of students. It focuses on direct instruction in effective strategies for approaching academic, social, behavioral, and transition tasks. Swanson (1999) found the most effective instructional methods for students with learning disabilities incorporated the following elements:
 - Explicit explanations, elaborations, and/or plans to direct task performance.
 - Verbal modeling, questioning, and demonstration by teachers.
 - Students cued, reminded, and/or taught to use strategies, or procedures.

- Systematic prompts or multi-process instructions.
- Teacher-student dialogue.
- Questioning by the teacher.
- Assistance provided only when necessary.

These elements must be explicitly taught, modeled, and practiced then attached to a standards-based curriculum. The learning center provides a setting for this instruction.

Through the implementation of the MCD annual plan the last three years, LAUSD has provided extensive, differentiated professional development modules to school administrators and teachers on tiered models of service delivery and the role of learning centers. There have been some issues around appropriate implementation of tiered models of service delivery that had to be corrected in parts of the District. However, many schools have successfully established the tiered models which provide instruction with levels of intensity matched to IEP levels of performance. The concept of tiered models of service delivery continues to be integrated into all professional development activities of the Division of Special Education.

The most frequent issue regarding implementation of learning centers has been equipping them with appropriate resources, including instructional materials for pre-teaching, re-teaching, learning mode preferences, and test-taking strategies. As part of the 2006-2007 Targeted Strategy Plan--Outcome 2, the Division of Special Education provided appropriate literacy, mathematics, and behavioral materials for each elementary, middle school and high school within the District. Extensive training has been provided on the use of these materials for instruction, monitoring of progress, and behavioral support for students with disabilities. As these materials were not available for the start of the school year, the programs may not have been implemented as fully as intended. For 2007-2008, it is anticipated that schools have received the materials and training in their use and can implement the targeted interventions immediately based upon individual student needs.

A key ingredient of successful implementation of the learning center at individual schools is the support provided to the school by the Division of Special Education, the Support Units and Local District administrators. Least Restrictive Environment Specialists and Local District personnel will continue to assist in the implementation of identified intervention programs and learning centers through school visitations and the use of the Observation Checklist. Information has been shared and discussed with all Local District Superintendents and Directors in order to engage them in the implementation and monitoring of intervention programs and learning centers at their targeted schools for 2007-2008.

FLUENCY RESULTS

Fluency is a key component of successful reading. Effective fluency allows readers to focus on comprehending and gaining meaning from text. Given that the ultimate goal of reading is the construction of meaning (Anderson, Hiebert, Wilkinson, & Scott, 1985), it is important to understand the role that fluency plays in comprehension. Proficient readers have features in common; they not only read accurately but their recognition of words is automatic as well. The Vital Indicators of Progress (VIP) used by the *Voyager Passport* program categorizes students by their progress toward reading proficiency. VIP is equivalent to DIBELS and are both reliable and efficient predictors of elementary students' success on traditional measures of reading ability (Fuchs & Deno, 1991; Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001) and reading comprehension (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Maxwell, 1988; Jenkins, Fuchs, Espin, van den Broek, & Deno, 2000), with correlations generally in the .6 to .9 range. The significant relationship between oral reading fluency and pass rates on high-stakes tests has been demonstrated (Good, Simmons, Kame'enui, Kaminski, & Wallin 2002; Barger, J. 2003; Buck, J., & Torgesen, J. 2003).

It is anticipated that the majority of students will show fluency gains if provided the right instruction, with the right intensity, starting at the right level, with the right number of repetitions and opportunities for success. Based on Hasbrouck and Tindal's national study of fluency (2005), students below the 25th percentile typically gain less than 1 word per minute per week ranging from .60 words to 1.1 words per

minute per week over the course of a school year. In first grade, students above the 25th percentile gain from 1.3 to 2.2 words per minute. In second grade students above the 25th percentile gain 1.1 to 1.4 words per minute per week on average and in third grade students above the 25th percentile gain from 1.0 to 1.2 words per minute. The difference is that students above the 50th percentile are reading more words per minute. Students reading below the 25th percentile must grow substantially more to catch up with their grade level peers. If they grow at rates below the 25th percentile, they will remain below the 25th percentile. Consequently, if struggling students in the 25th percentile or lower do not exceed the typical rate of gain, the gap will only widen or maintain at best.

In their 2006 study, Hasbrouck and Tindal (see Table 1 below) completed further extensive study of oral reading fluency. The results of their study were published in “Oral Reading Fluency: 90 Years of Measurement” which is available on the University of Oregon’s website.

Table 1: 2006 Hasbrouck and Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Data

(*WCPM—Words Correct Per Minute)

Grade	Percentile	Fall WCPM*	Winter WCPM*	Spring WCPM*	Avg. Weekly Improvement**
1	90		81	111	1.9
	75		47	82	2.2
	50		23	53	1.0
	25		12	28	1.0
	10		6	15	0.6
2	90	106	125	142	1.1
	75	79	100	117	1.2
	50	51	72	89	1.2
	25	25	42	61	1.1
	10	11	18	31	0.6
3	90	128	146	162	1.1
	75	99	120	137	1.2
	50	71	92	107	1.1
	25	44	62	78	1.1
	10	21	36	48	0.8
4	90	145	166	180	1.1
	75	119	139	152	1.0
	50	94	112	123	0.9
	25	68	87	98	0.9

Grade	Percentile	Fall WCPM*	Winter WCPM*	Spring WCPM*	Avg. Weekly Improvement**
	10	45	61	72	0.8
5	90	166	182	194	0.9
	75	139	156	168	0.9
	50	110	127	139	0.9
	25	85	99	109	0.8
	10	61	74	83	0.7
6	90	177	195	204	0.8
	75	153	167	177	0.8
	50	127	140	150	0.7
	25	98	111	122	0.8
	10	68	82	93	0.8
7	90	180	192	202	0.7
	75	156	165	177	0.7
	50	128	136	150	0.7
	25	102	109	123	0.7
	10	79	88	98	0.6
8	90	185	199	199	0.4
	75	161	173	177	0.5
	50	133	146	151	0.6
	25	106	115	124	0.6
	10	77	84	97	0.6

Average weekly improvement is the average words per week growth that you would expect from a student. The results of this study showed that second grade students above the 25th percentile gain 1.1 to 1.2 words per week and third grade students above the 25th percentile gain 1.1 to 1.2 words per week. Fourth graders above the 25th percentile gain from 0.9 to 1.1 words per week and fifth graders typically gain from 0.8 to 0.9 words per week.

Kaminski and Good (2006), use the following (see Table 2) in their discussions, in terms of word per minute gains per week anticipated for students. Neither the Hasbrouck and Tindal nor the Kaminski and Good data identifies whether students receive special education services or not. It is a sampling of students across the range and hence the various rates of growth.

Table 2: Kaminski and Good Oral Reading Fluency Growth Rates

Oral Reading Fluency Growth Rates

Grade	Minimum growth rate	Slope of benchmark targets (growth per week)	Maximum growth rate
1	0.84	1.36	1.88
2	1.03	1.31	1.59
3	0.75	1.03	1.31
4	0.55	0.83	1.11
5	0.50	0.78	1.06
6	0.58	0.86	1.14
7	0.30	0.58	0.86
8	0.28	0.56	0.84

In the Kaminski and Good study, second grade students were anticipated to show growth in words per week from a minimum of 1.03 to a maximum of 1.59 with third grade students anticipated to show growth from 0.75 words per week to 1.31 words per week. Fourth grade student growth was anticipated to be from 0.55 to 1.11 words per week and fifth grade from 0.50 to 1.06 words per week.

Similarly, Reading First legislation requires that all students be evaluated according to particular standards. Since there are no national standards on fluency, the levels that Hasbrouck and Tindal established for attainment of the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles in winter and spring of second grade were used. Below is the rate of growth goals that Fuchs and Fuchs use:

Realistic and Ambitious Growth Rates for Oral Reading Fluency

Grade	Realist	Ambitious
1	2.0	3.0
2	1.5	2.0
3	1.0	1.5

In comparing the Local Districts' growth (Table 3) to the expected growth in grades two through five in the Hasbrouck and Tindal study, there are some results that can be highlighted. The number of weeks of implementation of the literacy intervention program in the Local Districts ranged from 8.04 weeks to 11.68 weeks. The Hasbrouck and Tindal studies looked at a minimum of 16 weeks of instruction and the *Voyager Passport* publisher based on their research recommends a 26 week intervention.

It is also important to note that students with disabilities targeted for the literacy intervention program in the Local Districts were those students who fell within the Far Below Basic and Below Basic categories on the CST. Students in the Far Below Basic category according to CST results are scoring below the 19th percentile. Students in the Below Basic category are scoring between the 20th and 39th percentile. Much of the anticipated growth rates indicated in the research look at students above the 25th percentile rather than those below the 25th percentile.

Table 3: Local District Overall Data

Local District 1				
	2nd Grade (N=50)	3rd Grade (N=105)	4th Grade (N=109)	5th Grade (N=128)
Initial RCT Score	30.00	40.00	50.31	63.83
Final RCT Score	32.94	52.59	73.15	84.17
Total Weeks of Instruction	11.68	10.25	10.06	10.72
Overall Gain	2.94	12.59	22.83	20.34
Weekly Rate of Gain	0.24	1.80	2.45	2.20

Local District 2				
	2nd Grade (N=57)	3rd Grade (N=75)	4th Grade (N=104)	5th Grade (N=117)
Initial RCT Score	22.04	27.64	38.53	47.89
Final RCT Score	33.05	40.96	61.56	71.55
Total Weeks of Instruction	8.04	8.71	8.90	9.86
Overall Gain	11.02	13.32	23.03	23.66
Weekly Rate of Gain	2.08	3.30	3.48	2.76

Local District 3				
	2nd Grade (N=72)	3rd Grade (N=105)	4th Grade (N=158)	5th Grade (N=165)
Initial RCT Score	27.92	39.41	42.28	51.89
Final RCT Score	34.24	50.20	61.54	66.41
Total Weeks of Instruction	10.69	11.57	11.01	10.75
Overall Gain	6.32	10.79	19.27	14.52
Weekly Rate of Gain	0.59	1.13	1.86	1.31

Local District 4				
	2nd Grade (N=125)	3rd Grade (N=190)	4th Grade (N=229)	5th Grade (N=263)
Initial RCT Score	27.53	38.31	39.10	53.23
Final RCT Score	34.90	46.82	66.06	72.48
Total Weeks of Instruction	11.58	12.70	12.51	12.18
Overall Gain	7.38	8.51	26.96	19.25
Weekly Rate of Gain	0.72	0.84	2.20	1.66

Local District 5				
	2nd Grade (N=107)	3rd Grade (N=245)	4th Grade (N=299)	5th Grade (N=326)
Initial RCT Score	25.00	32.53	37.64	53.00
Final RCT Score	33.15	42.71	58.74	67.89
Total Weeks of Instruction	12.58	11.89	12.16	11.03
Overall Gain	8.15	10.18	21.10	14.89
Weekly Rate of Gain	0.75	1.11	2.06	1.78

Local District 6				
	2nd Grade (N=85)	3rd Grade (N=212)	4th Grade (N=254)	5th Grade (N=255)
Initial RCT Score	28.18	35.93	41.65	57.07
Final RCT Score	34.13	44.31	62.38	72.13
Total Weeks of Instruction	9.89	9.93	10.01	10.44
Overall Gain	5.95	8.38	20.73	15.05
Weekly Rate of Gain	0.59	0.84	2.29	1.78

Local District 7				
	2nd Grade (N=93)	3rd Grade (N=148)	4th Grade (N=180)	5th Grade (N=249)
Initial RCT Score	22.19	29.56	38.18	47.00
Final RCT Score	31.22	36.11	56.08	62.13
Total Weeks of Instruction	8.91	10.57	10.51	9.44
Overall Gain	9.02	6.55	17.90	15.12
Weekly Rate of Gain	1.47	0.84	2.07	2.40

Local District 8				
	2nd Grade (N=88)	3rd Grade (N=167)	4th Grade (N=198)	5th Grade (N=215)
Initial RCT Score	39.39	35.87	41.82	57.31
Final RCT Score	38.95	48.40	63.77	78.20
Total Weeks of Instruction	8.17	9.37	9.89	8.95
Overall Gain	-0.43	12.53	21.95	20.89
Weekly Rate of Gain	-0.25	1.81	2.52	3.01

The weekly rate of growth for second graders across the Local Districts ranges from -0.25 words per week to 2.08 words per week. The Hasbrouck and Tindal study showed an average range from 0.6 to 1.2 words per week growth. Second grade students in four of the Local Districts showed average to better than average growth in fluency with the highest level of attainment in Local District 2 (2.08 w/week) and the lowest in Local District 8 (-0.25 w/week). An area of difficulty with the second grade was the lack of standardized assessment to assist schools in immediately implementing the program with the appropriate students and some inconsistency in providing the program on a daily basis. There is no CST data for the incoming second graders and placement depended upon teacher decision-making.

Third grade students, according to the research, can be anticipated to show growth of between 0.8 words per week and 1.2 words per week. Across the Local Districts the third grade students showed growth from 0.84 to 3.30 words per week. The average growth was 1.45 words per minute exceeding anticipated growth with accelerated growth in Local Districts 1, 2 and 8. Students who exceed the anticipated growth are making good progress towards closing the achievement gap in literacy.

Fourth and fifth grade students showed the most growth in fluency rates in the intervention programs. Anticipated growth for fourth graders is between 0.8 and 1.1 words per week. Across the Local Districts, fluency grew among fourth grade students in a range from 1.86 words per week to 3.48 words per week. Fifth grade students were anticipated to show growth between 0.7 and 0.9 words per week. Actual growth ranged from 1.31 words per week to 3.01 words per week which shows accelerated growth for these students in decreasing discrepancies between their performance and that of their peers.

Variations in achievement are likely due to alterable variables such as instructional time, rate of lesson coverage, group configurations, students having a challenging moment and the assessment of performance not being reflective of their reading ability, intervention fidelity, latency between instructional days, and environmental factors.

Use of Intervention 2006-2007

The ESY program for 2005-2006 was conducted for a total of 16 instructional days. With a student to teacher ratio established between 6:1 and 14:1, instruction was delivered by teachers and paraprofessionals for 5 days per week, 2 hours and 15 minutes per day. Approximately 600 teachers were trained to provide instruction. At the kindergarten level, District students showed an increase of 5 sounds in 16 instructional days and showed accelerated growth in all key early literacy measures including alphabet knowledge, phonemic awareness, and knowledge of the alphabetic principles. First grade students increased from 23.2 words per minute to 26.1 words per minute with accelerated growth in both critical literacy measures of alphabetic principle and oral reading fluency. Second graders increased their average number of words per minutes from 38 wpm to 43 wpm while third graders increased from 55 to 59 words per minute. Students in both grades accelerated oral reading fluency rates by 7 – 13% on average. The most significant improvement was shown in fourth and fifth grade where students increased from 55.5 to 66 wpm and 67 to 76 wpm respectively showing a 13-18% accelerated oral fluency rate. Although students were still achieving significantly below anticipated levels for on grade readers, they made considerable growth over the short period of time. *Voyager Passport* is designed to be implemented for a minimum 26 week period of time. Therefore, students had a short period of implementation. The Division of Special Education is implementing *Voyager TimeWarp Plus* for ESY 2006-2007 as it has been designed as a complete 4-6 week program.

Teachers, based on survey data, indicated that the literacy intervention program supported their instruction for students during ESY. They indicated that the program provided “direct, explicit instruction of phonics and decoding skills.” The majority of teachers appreciated the simplicity, sequencing and consistent practice built into the program. Students were highly motivated by the high interest materials and the fast pacing of the program. The scripted program made instruction easier for paraprofessionals and teachers. The field support by the representatives of the publisher and Division staff assisted teachers with the implementation. Teachers also expressed the ease of using the *TouchMath* program and indicated that it helped students learn and consolidate basic math concepts.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TARGETED STRATEGY PLAN AND TARGETED SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The process of institutionalizing a tiered model of service delivery for students with disabilities is one that is emerging as a part of ongoing practice. The three components of a tiered model, coplanning, coteaching, and the learning center are in practice at secondary schools with varying levels of integrity. Middle and high schools currently have established locations identified as learning centers. The Division of Special Education has supplied each learning center with a set of evidence-based supplemental materials and curriculum designed to support instruction in grade-level standards. Professional development has been provided on the three purposes of the learning center, access, intervention, and monitoring. Schools are moving forward in both the understanding and implementation of learning centers. Emphasis this year has been on providing professional development to school teams on the use of the instructional materials provided to better support students with disabilities in accessing core curriculum in general education classes.

While the academic success rate for students with disabilities continues to be below that of their peers, anecdotal information from teachers and administrators as well as observations of the targeted intervention programs indicate that these interventions will be effective over time in changing the pattern of failure for students with disabilities.. In the 2006/2007 school year, middle schools were required to provide evidence-based intervention to students with disabilities falling in the below basic or far below basic levels of proficiency in reading or math. Schools were notified of the requirement and given options for providing the intervention. (MEM-3450.0 and MEM-3309.0) Professional development was provided

in both identified intervention programs. Sixty of the sixty-five identified schools attended training and received materials for the Algebra Ready curriculum. Ten targeted multitrack schools attended training on the Voyager curriculum for use during intersession. An additional twenty targeted schools attended training for the Beyond the Bell Extended Learning Program. At this time, data is unavailable for the Beyond the Bell Required Learning Academy afterschool program.

The implementation of intervention programs in both reading and math were inconsistent across the District. This was due to several factors such as approval of the strategies in Outcome 2 not occurring until November of 2007. The structure of middle schools is such that the organizational components are already in existence at this time. Multitrack schools were able to implement during intersession but the time allotted here was not a match to the recommended intervention time for the Voyager program. Fall Beyond the Bell programs had already begun requiring schools to wait for the second round of afterschool programs to encourage student attendance. Both of these methods of intervention are voluntary. Attendance at multi-track intersession averaged 80%. Beyond the Bell attendance rates are not available as of yet.

A second challenge to the implementation of intervention programs was the process of scheduling students. Schools set up the matrix and scheduled students in the spring of the previous year. While schools have an opportunity in the second semester to schedule students into electives, most of the intervention programs are designed for a year-long process. Students are programmed in at the beginning of the year and remain in the program for the entire school year.

The third challenge to the specific intervention outlined in this plan was the existence of current interventions in reading. The use of Developing Reading and Writing using the LANGUAGE!! Curriculum was an existing intervention for approximately 1,300 targeted students. Growth data as a group is not available but 2007 CST scores will be analyzed for this group of students to verify growth. Another program, English as a Second Language, while not an intervention, was a better match to student needs at this time. Approximately 770 students participated in a two-period block of strategic English language development using the High Point curriculum.

Based on the data and experience of the 2006-2007 school year the following considerations were included in the proposed amendments of the targeted strategy plan for the 2007-2008 school year.

1. Integrate an array of intervention options for middle schools building out of existing systems and adding programs based on student need. Developing Readers and Writers (LANGUAGE!, Read 180) Voyager, and High Point curriculums are appropriate for some students with disabilities. Others will need strategy programs designed to assist in accessing content curriculum. These programs can and should be taught in the learning center, through specially designed reading or math electives, or after-school intervention provided through Beyond the Bell programs.
2. Provide inservice training for schools in how to use existing data to determine which intervention programs students should participate in and how to schedule students for targeted intervention.
3. Continue ongoing monitoring by the Support Unit and Local District personnel using the Observation Checklist to assist schools with the analysis of student data and implementing intervention programs. These strategies should verify that targeted students are placed in an intervention program and assist schools with the implementation of specific programs.
4. Continue professional development on the effective use of the learning center as a tool to provide targeted intervention to students in the targeted range.
5. Continue collaboration with Beyond the Bell to ensure students with disabilities are participating in afterschool programs.

CONCLUSION

Research, data and feedback from the field indicate targeted intervention programs can have a significant impact on student achievement in literacy and in mathematics as well as assisting students with disabilities at the targeted schools develop positive self-esteem that carries over into their academic, social, and behavioral skills in all classes. At the elementary level, it is difficult to implement both literacy and mathematics in-school intervention programs as the same students are frequently identified for both programs based on CST data. This significantly impacts the school's ability to integrate the students with disabilities into the general education core program to the maximum extent to meet Outcome 6. Key findings have been that the intervention programs must be implemented on a regular schedule for a minimum of 26 weeks to maximize progress and that some programs such as the mathematics interventions need to be embedded in the core program as a supplemental support for academic progress in the general education curriculum.

At the secondary level, issues related to scheduling and course requirements for credits impact the full implementation of intervention programs. The nature of the secondary program does not lend itself to the type of scheduling that can be implemented at an elementary school for "pulling out" students for targeted interventions. Secondary schools create master schedules for the following school year in the Spring semester before data is available regarding those students who may be performing at the Far Below Basic and Basic categories and it is difficult to reprogram schedules for these students. Many of the identified students at the targeted schools are already scheduled into double block literacy programs as well as math intervention classes. Key findings at the secondary level include the importance of building upon and supporting the interventions that are already available for these students and working with schools to ensure that students are appropriately identified for and supported in the type of program that meets their specific needs. It is essential that secondary schools have the tools available to support students through professional development regarding learning centers, electives, matching student needs to programs, scaffolding, and differentiated instruction.

Local District and Division of Special Education strategic support is essential in assisting schools to implement and particularly monitor interventions in an appropriate manner for the selected students. This will be continued in the 2007-2008 Targeted Strategy Plan, Outcome 2 through the assignment of Least Restrictive Environment Specialists to strategically support targeted schools and by continuing to support the use of the Observation Checklist by Local District personnel.

The District proposes these primary strategies—continued institutionalization of tiered models of service delivery to increase access and achievement of students with disabilities in the core curriculum, continued implementation of research-based interventions in English/language arts and math, accountability for implementation of IEP designated accommodations, and provision of strategic support in the development of learning centers through monitoring of the Observation Checklist by Least Restrictive Environment Specialists and Local District personnel—as the key strategies that will significantly impact LAUSD's opportunity to achieve the targets identified for Outcome 2 within the year. The District's proposed amendments and plan for Outcome 2 follows.

TARGETED STRATEGY PLAN
Key Strategies to Achieve MCD Outcomes
2006-2007
2007-2008

Approved by the Independent Monitor August 11, 2006

Amended June 20, 2007

Approved by the Independent Monitor July 16, 2007

OUTCOME #2: Performance in the Statewide Assessment Program—The percentage of students with disabilities in Grades 2-11 participating in the California Standards Test (CST) whose scores place them in the combined rankings of Basic, Proficient and Advanced will increase to at least 27.5% in English Language Arts and at least 30.2% in Mathematics.

2-1	<p>STRATEGY: Continue to institutionalize tiered models of service delivery through professional development for general education and special education teachers to increase access and achievement of students with disabilities in the core curriculum, including implementation of instructionally appropriate learning centers, in targeted local districts and schools.</p> <p>RESOURCE ALLOCATION: \$1.7 million (LRE Mini-Grants and \$4 million (Program Improvement-LEA Grant and CAHSEE grant carryover—also applied to 2-2)¹</p>
------------	---

REVISED 2-1.1: *Continue to target lowest performing schools as measured by CST data for support through professional development and coaching for leadership and school teams in the effective implementation of tiered models of service delivery for students with disabilities.*

Local District Target Criteria: Local Districts with a high percent (60% or more) of students with disabilities achieving at the Far Below Basic and Below Basic categories in English Language Arts and/or Mathematics based on 2004-2005 CST data will be targeted for institutionalizing tiered models of integrated service delivery. If the 2005-2006 CST data indicates a significant change in Local District performance, the identification of targeted Local Districts may change.

School Target Criteria: Schools within each targeted local district with a high percent (80% or more) of their students with disabilities achieving at the Far Below Basic and Below Basic categories in English Language Arts and/or mathematics based on 2004-2005 CST data will be targeted for institutionalizing tiered models of integrated service delivery. If the 2005-2006 CST data indicates a significant change in individual school performance, the identification of targeted schools may change.

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Identify target districts and schools.
- Analyze current school structures with the Local District and school to develop a plan, including quarterly benchmarks, for the implementation of tiered approaches and make recommendations for integrated professional development and interventions.
- Provide professional development for administrative-teacher school teams.
- Provide coaching support.
- Monitor implementation.

Local District Superintendents

- Collaborate in strategy implementation.

- Hold principals accountable for increased academic performance of students with disabilities.
- Hold bi-yearly meetings with targeted schools to define goals, mission and expectations, and review data regarding the implementation of tiered approaches to service delivery for students with disabilities.

Targeted School Principals

- Supervise implementation through on-site reviews, team meetings, and academic progress monitoring.
- Monitor the master schedule to ensure equity, access, and support to cores and teams at middle school and small learning communities at high schools.

Initiation Timeline: August 2007

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
December 2007	Progress monitoring of each targeted school will be conducted by Local District Directors in consultation with LRE Specialists using the school plan, an implementation checklist and a review of math and/or English Language Arts student data.
May 2008	Progress monitoring of each targeted school will be conducted by Local District Directors in consultation with LRE Specialists using the school plan, an implementation checklist, and a review of math and/or English Language Arts student data.

DELETED 2-1.2: *Review senior high learning centers for defined district-wide learning center operational standards and appropriate instructional materials that address the achievement needs of senior high students with mild-to-moderate disabilities.*

DELETED 2-1.3: *Review middle school learning centers for defined district-wide learning center operational standards and appropriate instructional materials that address the achievement needs of senior high students with mild-to-moderate disabilities.*

DELETED 2-1.4: *Review elementary school learning centers for defined district-wide learning center operational standards and appropriate instructional materials that address the achievement needs of senior high students with mild-to-moderate disabilities.*

2-2	<p>STRATEGY: Institute the research-based literacy intervention program and the math intervention program including a response to intervention (RtI) program for English/Language Arts, in addition to the core curriculum.</p> <p>RESOURCE ALLOCATION: \$4 million (included in 2-1 resource allocation)</p>	
-----	---	--

REVISED 2-2.1: *Incorporate the research-based Tier II literacy intervention program, Voyager TimeWarp Plus with publisher support into elementary ESY English/Language Arts instruction during 2006-2007 ESY for students with disabilities*

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Purchase program materials.
- Provide training for teachers of ESY programs so that they can implement literacy intervention program.
- Provide the following data to the Office of the Independent Monitor
- Number of administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals trained
- Oversee ESY implementation.

Elementary School ESY Principals

- Supervise ESY implementation of literacy program.

Initiation Timeline: July 2006

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
September 2007	Vital Indicators of Progress

REVISED 2-2.2: *Continue to support the Voyager Passport literacy intervention program with publisher and Least Restrictive Environment Specialist support to elementary schools on target list.*

Target School Criteria: Schools with a high percent (80%) of their students with disabilities achieving at the Far Below Basic and Below Basic categories in English/Language Arts based on 2005-2006 CST data will be targeted for implementation of the Voyager Passport intervention program. This represents 180 elementary schools. If the 2006-2007 CST data indicates a significant change in individual school performance, the identification of targeted schools may change.

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Identify target schools based on CST data.
- Provide training for additional teachers of students with disabilities in targeted 180 elementary for full implementation.

Local District Superintendents and Directors

- Supervise implementation through progress monitoring and school visits of target schools.

Elementary Principals

- Supervise the implementation of literacy intervention program.

- Track student achievement.

Initiation Timeline: July 2007

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
December 2007	Vital Indicators of Progress
May 2008	Vital Indicators of Progress

REVISED 2-2.3: *Continue to incorporate the research-based Tier II math intervention program, TouchMath, with publisher support into elementary ESY math instruction during 2006-2007 ESY for students with disabilities.*

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Purchase program materials.
- Provide training for teachers of ESY programs to implement math intervention programs.
- Number of administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals trained.
- Oversee ESY implementation.

Elementary School ESY Principals

- Supervise ESY implementation of math program.

Initiation Timeline: July 2006

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
September 2007	Pre/post student data

REVISED 2-2.4: *Provide additional TouchMath materials to elementary learning centers to ensure a range of supplemental instructional tools to support students with mild to moderate disabilities.*

Target School Criteria: Schools with a high percent (80%) of their students with disabilities achieving at the Far Below Basic and Below Basic categories in Mathematics based on 2005-2006 CST data will be targeted for implementation of the *TouchMath* intervention program. This represents 108 elementary schools. If the 2005-2006 CST data indicates a significant change in individual school performance, the identification of targeted schools may change.

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Identify target schools based on CST data.
- Purchase additional program materials.
- Provide training for additional teachers of students with disabilities and/or paraprofessionals to provide math interventions in target schools.

Local District Superintendents and Directors

- Supervise implementation through progress monitoring and school visits of target schools.

Elementary Principals

- Allocate necessary school resources.
- Oversee implementation of math intervention program.
- Track student achievement.

Initiation Timeline: July 2007

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
December 2007	Curriculum based measures
April 2008	Curriculum based measures

ADD 2-2.5: *Integrate the English/Language Arts evidence-based intervention options available to middle schools to include in-school intervention through the existing DRW program, targeted use of the learning center elective, use of a specially designed reading elective, or after-school interventions provided through the Beyond the Bell program.*

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Communicate to targeted schools the requirement for intervention for students with disabilities and the various methods to provide targeted intervention.
- Provide training on the use of evidence-based literacy interventions for use in the learning center or specially designed reading elective.
- Provide decision making guidelines as to placement of students into appropriate intervention programs.
- Train middle schools on a web-based progress monitoring process designed to monitor reading improvements in student with disabilities bimonthly.

Local District Superintendents

- Supervise implementation through progress monitoring and school visits of target schools

Middle School Principals

- Monitor the master schedule to ensure all students with disabilities performing at the below basic or far below basic levels are programmed into at least one approved intervention program,
- Supervise the effectiveness of the interventions through on-site observations and team meetings with an analysis of student progress monitoring data.

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
December 2007	Data regarding student participation in intervention programs

Intervals	Indicators
April 2008	Data regarding student participation in intervention programs

ADD 2-2.6: *Integrate the Math evidence-based intervention options available to middle schools to include in-school intervention through the existing Algebra Readiness course for 8th grade students performing below basic or far below basic, targeted use of the learning center elective for 6th and 7th grade students performing below basic or far below basic, use of the Algebra Ready supplemental curriculum in the learning center or special day class, or after-school interventions provided through the Beyond the Bell program.*

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Communicate to targeted schools the requirement for intervention for students with disabilities and the various methods to provide targeted intervention.
- Continue to provide training on the use of the Algebra Ready supplemental curriculum for use in the learning center or specially designed reading elective.
- Provide decision making guidelines as to placement of students into appropriate intervention programs.
- Train schools on a web-based progress monitoring process designed to monitor math improvements in student with disabilities bimonthly.

Local District Superintendents

- Supervise implementation through progress monitoring and school visits of target schools

Middle School Principals

- Monitor the master schedule to ensure all students with disabilities performing at the below basic or far below basic levels are programmed into at least one approved intervention program,
- Supervise the effectiveness of the interventions through on-site observations and team meetings with an analysis of student progress monitoring data.

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
December 2007	Data regarding student participation in intervention programs
April 2008	Data regarding student participation in intervention programs

2-3	<p>STRATEGY: Make public the information and hold accountable all applicable school personnel to implement IEP designated accommodations for instruction and test situations.</p> <p>RESOURCE ALLOCATION: No additional resource allocation necessary.</p>
------------	--

COMPLETED: 2-3.1: *Train APEIS, Bridge Coordinators and designated secondary administrators and coordinators in the use of the Welligent Accommodations and Modifications School Report to be used by teachers and testing coordinators in providing instructional and testing accommodations.*

REVISED 2-3.2: *Continue to hold applicable school staff accountable for using instructional and testing accommodations in accordance with the IEP as indicated on SIS test rosters.*

Accountable Personnel:

Assistant Superintendent, Planning, Assessment and Research Branch

- Include in written testing communications to schools the legal requirement for administering statewide assessments in accordance with the testing accommodations specified in students' IEPs.

Local District Superintendents and Directors

- Hold principals accountable for school staff using instructional and testing accommodations in accordance with students' IEPs through application of District administrative discipline procedures.

School Principals

- Hold applicable school staff (testing coordinators and teachers of students with disabilities) accountable for appropriate instructional and testing use of IEP designated accommodations as specified in Welligent accommodations reports.

Initiation Timeline: September 2007

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
Spring 2007	Principal certification