

TARGETED STRATEGY PLAN—MCD OUTCOME 7

INTRODUCTION

The following strategies will be used to target the barriers to achievement of Outcome 7:

1. Target general education schools with students with disabilities with higher incidence of eligibilities other than SLD and SLI who are in general education 1%-25% less than MCD target and/or have enrollments of 10 or more students with primary eligibilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance for the purposes of providing support from integration support teams and focused professional development for increasing general education placement to 40%.
2. Expand Kindergarten collaborative models for students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI while establishing capacity for general education and special education teachers to provide integrated instruction for students 40% or more of the school day.

These primary strategies have been identified from the (a) 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.

PERFORMANCE

Performance on this outcome is based on Welligent IEP data through June 30, 2006. The Independent Monitor determined that 37.84% of students with disabilities other than specific learning disability (SLD) and speech and language impairment (SLI) were in general education classrooms 40% or more of the instructional day.¹ This was considerably short of the 52% target. Local Districts 1 (55.3%), 2 (53.4%) and 4 (53.6%) achieved the 2006 goal; all other local districts did not, with Local Districts 3 (43.8%) 5 (35.9%), 6 (33.8%), 7 (30.4%) and 8 (32.8%) performing the less than 52%.² According to the Independent Monitor's report, the District performance on this outcome has been relatively unchanged over the past two years.³

Data prepared for the Division of Special Education by the Program Evaluation and Research Branch (PERB) in September 2006 provides information regarding placement of students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI by disability type, Local District, and school levels.⁴ Some findings regarding this data are as follows:

Table 1

- A little more than 1200 (6.4%) students are outside of the general education classroom 61-70% of the instructional day. The three largest populations by disability type are students with primary eligibilities of mental retardation (389), autism (307) and other health impairment (242).

¹ *Report on the Progress and Effectiveness of the Los Angeles Unified School district's Implementation of the Modified Consent Decree during the 2005-2006 School Year—Part II*, Office of the Independent Monitor, Outcome 7, Placement of Students with Disabilities (Ages 6-22) with All Other Disabilities, August 22, 2006.

² MCD Progress Report, Districts 1-8, June 30, 2006.

³ *Report on the Progress and Effectiveness of the Los Angeles Unified School district's Implementation of the Modified Consent Decree during the 2005-2006 School Year—Part II*, Office of the Independent Monitor, August 22, 2006, page 6.

⁴ *A Preliminary Look at Counts of Students Receiving Special Education Services by Disability Type, Local District, and Grade Level*, Program Evaluation and Research Branch, September 2006.

- Over 80% of students have one of four primary eligibilities: (1) autism; (2) mental retardation; (3) other health impairment; or (4) emotional disturbance. Approximately 6,000 of these students attend a general education campus and spend more than 60% of their instructional day in a special education setting.
- Nearly 30% of special education students are receiving services in non-public schools or special education centers.

Table 2

- The percentage of students with autism that spend 60% of their day in a special education setting ranges from approximately 40% in Local District 1 to 65% in Local District 7.
- The proportion of students with emotional disturbance that spend 60% of their day in a special education setting ranges from nearly one half in Local District 1 to two thirds in Local District 7.
- The percentage of students with mental retardation that spend more than 60% of their day in a special education setting ranges from 76% in Local District 4 to 87% in Local District 6.
- The percentage of students not meeting Outcome 7 is more variable across local districts for students with autism, in which 26 percentage points separate the districts with the lowest and highest percentages, than for students with mental retardation or emotional disturbance, in which the gap is 11 and 18 percentage points, respectively.

Table 3

- For all categories except autism and traumatic brain injury, a higher percentage of elementary school students than middle school students spend over 60% of their time in a special education setting.
- The percentage of students with autism and traumatic brain injury that spend over 60% of their time in a special education setting is higher among high schools than among elementary schools.
- For most disability categories, the percentage of students that spend over 60% of their day in a special education setting is fairly consistent among elementary and middle schools. However, there are three notable exceptions. The percentage of students with other health impairments that spend over 60% of their day in a special education setting is substantially lower among middle schools than among elementary schools. Similarly, the percent of students with deafness that spend over 60% of their day in a special education setting is 25% lower among middle schools than among elementary schools and the percentage of students with emotional disturbance is 10% lower among middle schools than elementary schools.

The findings from this data suggest the identification of target schools based on (1) highest percentages of students out of general education 61-70% of the instructional day, (2) the largest number of students with specific primary eligibility categories, (3) consideration of emphasis on particular school levels (elementary, middle school, or high school), and (4) consideration of emphasis on particular local districts regarding the need for additional assistance and supports. Consideration of appropriate special education supports and services that support the integration of students with disabilities for the range of eligibilities other than SLD and SLI will need to be factored into the professional development provided to individual school staffs, the capacity of integration support teams to assist schools, and consideration of the appropriateness of services and supports identified by IEP teams.

2005-2006 ANNUAL PLAN

Professional Development

Several actions related to professional development were taken in 2005-2006 which provide a foundation for strategy implementation in 2006-2007. Individual trainings were developed for school staff and posted on the Division of Special Education web site providing information on the characteristics of autism, deaf/hard-of-hearing, emotional disturbance, mental retardation, orthopedic impairment, and visual impairment. The training included strategies and supports for integrating students with moderate-to-severe disabilities and providing them differentiated collaborative instruction.⁵ Multi-level professional development on scaffolding and differentiating instruction, positive behavior supports, use of accommodations and modifications of curricular materials, and collaborative strategies for integration of students with disabilities were provided in November 2005 and continued in January 2006.⁶ Detailed information for IEP teams to use in considering and calculating increased time in general education classes was also disseminated to schools in May 2006.⁷

Focus Group of Experts

Three focus groups of university experts were convened during 2005-2006.⁸ These included Dr. Caron Melblom and Dr. Carrie Blackaller, California State University, Dominguez Hills; Dr. Mary Falvey and Dr. Sherwood Best, California State University, Los Angeles; and Dr. Victoria Graf, University of Loyola Marymount. In addition to those actions already under implementation by the District, recommendations from this group of experts included using LRE counselors in the transition of students with orthopedic impairments into general education classrooms for a greater percentage of the school day, providing para-educator training to support integration of students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI. Both recommendations were acted upon.

Program Accessibility

A school level campaign to increase awareness of “rapid response” funding available for schools to address program accessibility issues was expanded in 2005-2006.⁹ Monthly monitoring of the program accessibility projects approved by the Division of Special Education and executed by the Facilities Division occurred throughout the year.¹⁰ Monthly reports were revised as issues were raised to provide clarification of information related to the projects. As of August 2006, 52.1% of the \$20 million budgeted for program accessibility between 2003 and 2008 has been committed to either completed or estimated expenditures of approved projects. The remaining balance will be a valuable resource toward the reduction of program accessibility barriers for students with physical disabilities as part of the targeted strategy plan for 2006-2007.

Parent Information

The Division of Special Education maintained information for parents on its web site regarding least restrictive environment, including information on collaborative services and expectations for integrating opportunities.¹¹ Additional announcements regarding regionalized parent training opportunities which included similar information was also maintained on the web site throughout 2006-2007 in order to expand parent awareness and knowledge related to LRE options and strategies.

⁵ *Schools for All Children: Modified Consent Decree 2005-2006 Annual Plan, 7.C.4.*

⁶ *Schools for All Children: Modified Consent Decree 2005-2006 Annual Plan, 7.C.6.*

⁷ *Schools for All Children: Modified Consent Decree 2005-2006 Annual Plan, 7.C.10 and 7.C.11.*

⁸ *Schools for All Children: Modified Consent Decree 2005-2006 Annual Plan, 7.C.12.*

⁹ *Schools for All Children: Modified Consent Decree 2005-2006 Annual Plan, 7.C.14.*

¹⁰ *Schools for All Children: Modified Consent Decree 2005-2006 Annual Plan, 7.C.13.*

¹¹ *Schools for All Children: Modified Consent Decree 2005-2006 Annual Plan, 7.C.8.*

RESEARCH

The traditional separation of special education has reinforced the separateness of students with disabilities and created additional problems of disproportionate overrepresentation of students of color in particular eligibility categories (Shapiro, Loeb, Bowermaster, Wright, Headden, & Touch, 1993; Lipsky & Gartner, 1997), and overrepresentation of male students in some categories and service models (Lichtenstein, 1996). A unified or integrated general and special education system can be responsive to issues of over-identification by utilizing resources collaboratively to address any student's need through special education as a set of supports and services a student requires within a general education program instead of special education as a separate place (Halvorsen & Neary, 2001).

Several elements are critical to the change process for creating integrated settings for instruction of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities. Karasoff, Alwell, and Halvorsen (1992) provide a blueprint for district-level systems change involving key stakeholders and Davern, Schnorr, Erwin, Ford, and Togan (1997) provide a site-level process. Both top-down and school level stakeholder efforts are essential to the change process (Fullan, 1993).

In terms of professional development supports, Berends and King (1994) identified that staff should participate in the training design, which is based on their local needs and that teachers should function in differentiated roles, including mentoring, peer supervision, collegial planning, curriculum development, and policy making. To address these needs, McGregor et al. (1998) proposes that knowledge about adult learning should be used to design professional development that is (1) based on research, best practices, and needs assessment, (2) school focused, with emphasis on both individual and organizational development, (3) directed by a cohesive school-site plan, (4) embedded as much as possible within the job of teaching, through participatory learning (coaching, study groups, peer observation), (5) focused on student outcomes relative to identifying necessary teacher skills, (6) planned and facilitated by members of the school community including parents, principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff, and other support personnel. School staff embarking on a change to integrated instructional programs often visit other integrated programs or invite teams from those schools to meet with school staff to share experiences and strategies and/or establish a relationship with local universities to assist in guiding their efforts toward change (Halvorsen and Neary, 2001)

CONCLUSION

The District has had a long-established culture of placing students with moderate-to-severe disabilities in special education placements for the majority of the school day. Demonstration of continuation of this practice is evident in the 2005-2006 Outcome 7 data which indicated little movement above the 2004-2005 results. It would appear that school staffs need focused professional development on integration strategies and assistance from integration support teams to knowledgeably institutionalize a change in practices. Many schools would benefit from visiting schools that have established, or have begun to establish, research-based practices that support successful integration of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities and would be useful as demonstration schools.

1200 students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI ended the 2005-2006 school year in the category 1%-10% below the target goal of 40% or more in general education. A strategy aimed at increasing their time in general education from 30%-39% to 40% or greater with appropriate special education supports and services will significantly contribute to the District's achievement of the outcome. The largest number of students spending 60% or more of their instructional day in a special education setting fall within the four primary eligibilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance. Implementation of specific targeted strategies to achieve Outcome 7 should include focus on the integration of many of these students and the specific special education supports and services that will support their participation in general education classrooms.

With the exception of autism and traumatic brain injury, a higher percentage of elementary school students than middle school students spend over 60% of their time in a special education placement. A strategy targeted at elementary schools with consideration of particular eligibility groups within grades K-3 will also significantly assist the District in achieving the outcome and establish a foundation for elementary school capacity to integrate students with moderate-to-severe disabilities upon which further expansion in later grades may be built.

Finally, the research provides some specific ingredients that should be included in targeted strategies to support schools in changing from a culture of separate education for students with moderate-to-severe disabilities to schools for all children that include these students in integrated instruction in general education environments. This information will inform professional development design, training and implementation of integration support teams, partnering activities with local institutions of higher education, and individual schools embarking on this change process.

The District submits these primary strategies—targeting general education schools with students with disabilities with higher incidence of eligibilities other than SLD and SLI who are in general education 1%-25% less than MCD target and/or have enrollments of 10 or more students with primary eligibilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance and expanding Kindergarten Collaborative modes while expanding capacity for general education and special education teachers to provide integrated instruction for students 40% or more of the school day—as key strategies that will significantly increase LAUSD’s opportunity for achieving Outcome 7. The District’s proposed targeted strategy plan for Outcome 7 follows.

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

Outcome #7: Placement of Students with Disabilities (Ages 6-22) with All Other Eligibilities—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% of 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.

7-1	<p>STRATEGY: Target general education schools with students with disabilities with higher incidence of eligibilities other than SLD and SLI who are in general education 1%-25% less than MCD target and/or have enrollments of 10 or more students with primary eligibilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance for the purposes of providing support from integration support teams and focused professional development for increasing general education placement to 40%.</p> <p>RESOURCE ALLOCATON: Shared resource allocation with 2.1. Integration Support Teams (trained existing staff)</p>
------------	---

7-1.1 *Target general education schools closest to achieving the outcome as measured by Welligent IEP data and and/or enrollments of 10 or more students with primary eligibilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance to provide intensive support through integration support team assistance and professional development on research-based integration strategies and appropriate special education instructional and behavioral supports and services within general education classrooms.*

School Target Criteria: General education schools with students with disabilities with higher incidence of disabilities other than SLD and SLI who are within 1%-25% of achieving the outcome and general education schools with 10 or more students with primary eligibilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance will be targeted for institutionalizing research-based integration strategies and appropriate instructional and behavioral supports and services to increase their percentage of students integrated in general education 40% or more of the school day to at least 52%.

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Identify target general education schools based on students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI with special education placement of 61-85% of the instructional day and/or enrollments of 10 or more students with primary eligibilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance.
- Establish and train integration support teams comprised of central office and support unit personnel with expertise in instructional and behavioral supports for students with moderate-to-severe disabilities, and specifically for the disabilities of autism, mental retardation, other health impairment, or emotional disturbance.
- Develop a school planning process for schools to use that includes (1) a process for identifying students with moderate-to-severe disabilities that may be considered as candidates for increased integration; (2) general and special education teacher preparation activities; (3) general education student preparation; (4) paraprofessional support; (5) IEP

team procedures for consideration of increased time in general education classrooms; (6) procedures for establishing timelines to achieve the target goals; and (7) completion of on-line survey to determine the need for additional support.

- Provide professional development for school teams of administrators and teachers on research-based integration strategies and practices and appropriate instructional and behavioral supports.
- Monitor implementation through a data review of targeted schools.

Local District Superintendents

- Collaborate in strategy implementation.
- Supervise principals in implementation of strategy through progress monitoring and identification of additional school assistance from Support Unit staff as indicated.

Target School Principals

- Work collaboratively with integration support teams in a process to initiate and institutionalize research-based strategies through professional development of school staff and identified in a school planning process for increased integration of students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI that is:
 - Based on research, best practices, and needs assessment (school data);
 - School focused, with emphasis on both individual and organizational development;
 - Directed by a cohesive school-site plan;
 - Embaadded as much as possible within the job of teaching, through participatory learning (coaching, study groups, peer observation);
 - Focused on student outcomes relative to identifying necessary teacher skills; and
 - Planned and facilitated by members of the school community including the involvement of parents impacted by Outcome 7, principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, office staff, and other support personnel.
- Implement school plan to increase integration of students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI.
- Supervise implementation through monthly review of IEP data to determine increase of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities in general education classrooms with appropriate special education supports and services 40% or more of the school day.
- Complete school plan to increase integration of students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI.

Initiation Timeline: November 2006

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
November 2006	Target schools identified. Integration support teams established and trained. School planning process developed. Baseline IEP data for targeted schools established regarding number of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education

Intervals	Indicators
	classroom less than 40% of the school day.
December 15, 2006	List of targeted schools and Outcome 7 baseline data for each of the targeted schools provided to the Independent Monitor.
January 2007	School team training completed. Integration support teams operational. On-line survey completed by schools to determine the need for additional support. Finalized school plans initiated. Site monitoring initiated.
February 10, 2007	Final school plans for all targeted schools compiled and provided to the Office of the Independent Monitor.
March 2007	Review of IEP data for targeted school numbers and percentages of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education classroom less than 40% of the school day completed to determine progress toward outcome target.
March 15, 2007	Updated Outcome 7 report with comparison to baseline data provided to the Independent Monitor.
May 2007	Review of IEP data for targeted schools school numbers and percentages of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education classroom less than 40% of the school day completed to determine progress toward outcome target.
June 2007	Review of IEP data for targeted schools school numbers and percentages of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education classroom less than 40% of the school day completed to determine progress toward outcome target. School plans completed.
June 15, 2007	Updated Outcome 7 report with comparison to baseline data provided to the Independent Monitor.
July 1, 2007	Evidence that school plans have been implemented and the names of the schools and their principals that have not satisfactorily implemented their school plans provided to the Office of the Independent Monitor.

7-2	<p>STRATEGY: Expand Kindergarten collaborative models for students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI while establishing capacity for general education and special education teachers to provide integrated instruction for students 40% or more of the school day.</p> <p>RESOURCE ALLOCATON: Shared resource allocation with 2.1. Integration Support Teams (trained existing staff)</p>
-----	---

7-2.1 *Target home schools in which Kindergarten age students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI attend to build capacity for providing Kindergarten Collaborative model options by providing professional development on research-based integration strategies, learning characteristics typically associated with disabilities, and collaborative delivery of appropriate special education instructional and behavioral supports and services within general education classrooms.*

School Target Criteria: Schools with Kindertarten students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI enrolled in special day programs greater than 61% of the school day.

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Identify target schools and target groups of students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI enrolled in Kindergarten.
- Establish and train integration support teams comprised of central office and support unit personnel with expertise in instructional and behavioral supports for students with moderate-to-severe disabilities.
- Develop a school planning process for schools to use that includes (1) a process for identifying students with moderate-to-severe disabilities that may be considered as candidates for increased integration; (2) general and special education teacher preparation activities; (3) general education student preparation; (4) paraprofessional support; (5) IEP team procedures for consideration of increased time in general education classrooms and attendance at home schools; and (6) procedures for establishing timelines to achieve the target goals.
- Provide professional development for school teams of administrators and teachers on research-based integration strategies and practices and appropriate instructional and behavioral supports.
- Monitor implementation through a data review of targeted schools.

Local District Superintendents

- Collaborate in strategy implementation.
- Supervise principals in implementation of strategy through progress monitoring and identification of additional school assistance from Support Unit staff as indicated.

Target School Principals

- Work collaboratively with integration support teams in a process to initiate and institutionalize research-based strategies identified in a school planning process for increased integration of Kindergarten students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI and increased home school attendance.

- Implement school plan to increase integration of students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI and increased home school attendance.
- Supervise implementation through monthly review of IEP data to determine increase of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities in general education classrooms with appropriate special education supports and services 40% or more of the school day and increased home school attendance.
- Complete school plan to increase integration of Kindergarten students with disabilities other than SLD and SLI and increased home school attendance.

Initiation Timeline: November 2006

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
November 2006	Target schools identified. Integration support teams established and trained. School planning process developed. Baseline IEP data for targeted schools established regarding number of Kindergarten students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education classroom less than 40% of the school day and increased home school attendance.
January 2007	School team training completed. Integration support teams operational. Site monitoring initiated.
March 2007	Review of IEP data for targeted schools numbers and percentages of Kindergarten students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education classroom less than 40% of the school day completed to determine progress toward outcome target and increased home school attendance.
May 2007	Review of IEP data for targeted schools numbers and percentages of Kindergarten students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education classroom less than 40% of the school day completed to determine progress toward outcome target and increased home school attendance.
June 2007	Review of IEP data for targeted schools numbers and percentages of Kindergarten students with moderate-to-severe disabilities per school in general education classroom less than 40% of the school day completed to determine progress toward outcome target and increased home school attendance.

7-2.2 *Collaborate with a consortium of IHE experts to support research and establish school visitation sites to demonstrate best practices for integration of students with moderate-to-severe disabilities for 40% or more of the instructional day.*

Accountable Personnel:

Associate Superintendent, Division of Special Education

- Convene IHE representatives with expertise in least restrictive environment strategies for students with moderate-to-severe disabilities to develop criteria for, and participate in the selection of, schools demonstrating best practices for integration 40% or more of the school day.
- Identify demonstration sites in collaboration with IHE experts, Local District Superintendents, and potential demonstration site principals according to established criteria.
- Establish demonstration school protocols for visiting school teams, including an evaluation component (form) to be used by visiting school teams to assess how beneficial the visits have been, and communicate the availability of demonstration schools and visitation request procedures for potential visiting school teams.
- Collaborate with IHE experts to maximize the capacity of demonstration schools for providing informational materials, demonstrating best practices with minimal interruption to instructional programs, and communicating steps for institutionalizing integrated programs for students with moderate-to-severe disabilities.
- Identify principals from targeted school list for visiting demonstration schools with Support Unit personnel.

Local District Superintendents

- Ensure principals from targeted school list who have been identified to visit demonstration schools complete visits.

Program Evaluation and Research Branch

- Design and conduct a study to determine the factors that contributed to or hindered target schools from successfully meeting Outcome 7.

Demonstration School Principals

- Schedule school team visitations in accordance with established procedures.
- Provide informational materials, demonstrate best practices with minimal interruption to instructional programs, and communicate steps for institutionalizing integrated programs for students with moderate-to-severe disabilities to visiting school teams.

Targeted School Principals Identified for Demonstration School Visits

- Complete scheduled visits to demonstration schools.

Initiation Timeline: November 2006

Progress Monitoring:

Intervals	Indicators
December 2006	Meeting with IHE experts convened. Criteria for selection of demonstration sites established. Demonstration school protocols and visitation request procedures established and communicated. Evaluation form used by visitors to demonstration sites to assess how beneficial the visits were developed and submitted to the Independent Monitor for review.

Intervals	Indicators
February 2007	Demonstration school sites established. Identification of targeted schools for visits to demonstration sites completed.
March 2007	Data regarding school team visitations for each demonstration school reviewed to determine usage by other schools. Data regarding evaluation of visitations reviewed for demonstration school improvement as appropriate.
March 1, 1007	List of demonstration schools provided to the Office of the Independent Monitor.
April 2007	Data regarding school team visitations for each demonstration school reviewed to determine usage by other schools. Data regarding evaluation of visitations reviewed for demonstration school improvement as appropriate.
May 2007	Data regarding school team visitations for each demonstration school reviewed to determine usage by other schools. Data regarding evaluation of visitations reviewed for demonstration school improvement as appropriate.
July 1, 2007	Summary and analysis of the findings of assessment of visits to demonstration sites provided to the Independent Monitor.
July 2007	A study to determine the factors that contributed to or hindered target schools from successfully meeting Outcome 7 designed and conducted by Program Evaluation and Research Branch.

Appendix D: Outcome 7

**A Preliminary Look at Placement of Students Receiving Special Education Services
By Disability Type, Local District, and Grade Level**

Table 1: Number and Percent of Students By Disability Type and Placement for MCD Outcome 7							
	Meet Outcome (< 60% in SE)	61-70% in SE	71-80% in SE	81-90% in SE	91-100% in SE	NPS/CTR	Total
Autism (% within disability category)	1,743 39.1%	307 6.9%	453 10.2%	510 11.4%	454 10.2%	993 22.3%	4,460 100.0%
Deaf/Blindness	2 25.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	2 25.0%	4 50.0%	8 100.0%
Developmentally Delayed	17 34.7%	2 4.1%	6 12.2%	4 8.2%	6 12.2%	14 28.6%	49 100.0%
Deafness	46 12.9%	28 7.8%	32 9.0%	47 13.2%	30 8.4%	174 48.7%	357 100.0%
Emotional Disturbance	584 19.0%	177 5.8%	155 5.0%	155 5.0%	297 9.7%	1,702 55.4%	3,070 100.0%
Established Medical Disability	1 100.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 100.0%
Hard of Hearing	531 84.6%	27 4.3%	21 3.3%	15 2.4%	8 1.3%	26 4.1%	628 100.0%
Multiple Dis.- Hearing	9 8.5%	0 .0%	1 .9%	5 4.7%	9 8.5%	82 77.4%	106 100.0%
Multiple Dis. - Orthopedic	72 5.4%	24 1.8%	50 3.8%	69 5.2%	92 6.9%	1021 76.9%	1,328 100.0%
Multiple Dis. - Visual	11 6.1%	3 1.7%	4 2.2%	4 2.2%	7 3.9%	152 84.0%	181 100.0%
Mental Retardation	570 13.3%	389 9.1%	662 15.4%	777 18.1%	705 16.4%	1195 27.8%	4,298 100.0%
Other Health Impairment	3,310 75.2%	242 5.5%	213 4.8%	254 5.8%	131 3.0%	254 5.8%	4,404 100.0%
Orthopedic Impairment	438 67.7%	48 7.4%	48 7.4%	41 6.3%	52 8.0%	20 3.1%	647 100.0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	80 44.4%	18 10.0%	19 10.6%	19 10.6%	11 6.1%	33 18.3%	180 100.0%
Visual Impairment	188 78.7%	8 3.3%	10 4.2%	7 2.9%	3 1.3%	23 9.6%	239 100.0%
Unknown	17 89.5%	0 .0%	1 5.3%	0 .0%	1 5.3%	0 .0%	19 100.0%
TOTAL	7,619 38.1%	1,273 6.4%	1,675 8.4%	1,907 9.5%	1,808 9.1%	5,693 28.5%	19,975 100.0%

Data source: Welligent, retrieved on 6/12/2006.

- Nearly 30% of special education students that do not have a specific learning disability or impairment (SLD/SLI) are receiving services in non-public schools or special education centers.
- Over 80% of students without an SLD/SLI have one of four disabilities: (1) Autism; (2) Mental Retardation; (3) Other Health Impairment; or (4) Emotional Disturbance (ED). Approximately 6,000 of these students attend a public school and spend more than 60% of their day in a special education setting.
- Nearly two-thirds of non-SLD/SLI students in public schools that spend over 60% of their day in a special education setting have Autism or Mental Retardation.
- Approximately 3,000 students attending a public school spend between 60% and 80% of their day in a special education setting.

Table 2: Number and Percent of Students Attending Public Schools that Do Not Meet Outcome 7 By Local District

Disability Type	District								Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Autism	291 39.0%	241 43.0%	219 50.5%	245 51.4%	191 61.4%	127 62.0%	123 65.1%	242 64.2%	1,679 50.9%
Deafness	39 75.0%	3 50.0%	10 83.3%	10 71.4%	24 88.9%	20 100.0%	12 100.0%	19 59.4%	137 78.3%
Emotional Disturbance	119 48.6%	93 51.1%	121 63.4%	93 60.4%	88 62.9%	34 64.2%	111 66.5%	87 57.6%	746 58.1%
Hard of Hearing	16 12.9%	9 9.9%	7 14.9%	5 5.4%	10 12.8%	1 2.9%	1 3.1%	21 25.3%	70 12.0%
Multiple Disabilities - Orthopedic	23 85.2%	26 68.4%	24 85.7%	17 73.9%	23 76.7%	84 95.5%	17 73.9%	18 72.0%	232 82.3%
Mental Retardation	274 78.7%	357 78.6%	288 86.7%	277 76.1%	377 85.5%	235 87.0%	333 85.8%	373 85.7%	2,514 82.9%
Other Health Impairment	196 16.6%	159 22.3%	148 24.4%	71 21.0%	70 25.1%	38 27.0%	65 22.9%	78 21.0%	825 21.1%
Orthopedic Impairment	24 24.2%	28 26.9%	34 44.7%	24 45.3%	15 19.5%	23 38.3%	18 28.6%	22 33.3%	188 31.4%
Traumatic Brain Injury	13 50.0%	13 41.9%	5 31.3%	8 38.1%	8 53.3%	5 62.5%	10 71.4%	2 18.2%	64 45.1%

Data source: Welligent, retrieved on 6/12/2006.

Note: Counts not reported for disability categories with < 30 students.

- The percentage of students with Autism that spend more than 60% of their day in a special education setting ranges from approximately 40% in Local District 1 to 65% in Local District 7.
- The proportion of students with Emotional Disturbance that spend more than 60% of their day in a special education setting ranges from nearly one-half in Local District 1 to two-thirds in Local District 7.
- The percentage of students with Mental Retardation that spend more than 60% of their day in a special education setting ranges from 76% in Local District 4 to 87% in Local District 6.
- The percentage of students not meeting Outcome 7 is more variable across local districts for students with Autism, in which 26 percentage points separate the districts with the lowest and highest percentages, than for students with Mental Retardation or Emotional Disturbance, in which the gap is 11 and 18 percentage points, respectively.

Table 3: Number and Proportion of Students Attending Public Schools that Do Not Meet Outcome 7 By Grade Level

Disability Type	School Type			Total (Public Schools)	Total (All Schools)
	Elementary	Middle	High		
Autism (N Total)	2,184	647	408	3,239	4,460
(N not meeting Outcome 7)	1,098	322	235	1,655	2,717
(% not meeting Outcome 7)	50.3%	49.8%	57.6%	51.1%	60.9%
Deafness	98	52	23	173	357
	86	33	17	136	311
	87.8%	63.5%	73.9%	78.6%	87.1%
Emotional Disturbance	389	479	414	1,282	3,070
	261	277	208	746	2,486
	67.1%	57.8%	50.2%	58.2%	81.00%
Hard of Hearing	242	164	175	581	628
	31	22	17	70	97
	12.8%	13.4%	9.7%	12.0%	15.4%
Multiple Dis. - Orthopedic	145	59	71	275	1,328
	121	53	55	229	1,256
	83.4%	89.8%	77.5%	83.3%	94.6%
Mental Retardation	1,059	813	1,135	3,007	4,298
	905	689	899	2,493	3,728
	85.5%	84.7%	79.2%	82.9%	86.7%
Other Health Impairment	2205	1024	667	3,896	4,404
	538	169	114	821	1,094
	24.4%	16.5%	17.1%	21.1%	24.8%
Orthopedic Impairment	243	173	169	585	438
	85	61	42	188	209
	35.0%	35.3%	24.9%	32.1%	47.7%
Traumatic Brain Injury	40	37	65	142	180
	15	15	34	64	100
	37.5%	40.5%	52.3%	45.1%	55.6%

Data source: Welligent, retrieved on 6/12/2006.

- For all categories except Autism and Traumatic Brain Injury, a higher percentage of elementary school students than high school students spend over 60% of their time in a special education setting.
- The percentage of students with Autism and Traumatic Brain Injury that spend over 60% of their time in a special education setting is higher among high schools than among elementary schools.
- For most disability categories, the percentage of students that spend over 60% of their day in a special education setting is fairly consistent among elementary and middle schools. However, there are three notable exceptions: the percentage of students with Other Health Impairments, Deafness, and Emotional Disorders that spend over 60% of their day in a special education is substantially lower among middle schools than among elementary schools.

Table 4 (Version 2): Number and Proportion of K-3 Students Attending Public Schools By Disability Type, Grade Level, and Placement for MCD Outcome 7

	Meet Outcome	(< 60% in SE)	61-70% in SE	71-80% in SE	81-90% in SE	91-100% in SE	Total
Autism		770	120	210	249	186	1,535
(% within disability for K-3)		50.2%	7.8%	13.7%	16.2%	12.1%	100.0%
K		37	8	5	4	4	58
(% within grade)		63.8%	13.8%	8.6%	6.9%	6.9%	100.0%
1		250	34	74	95	79	532
		47.0%	6.4%	13.9%	17.9%	14.8%	100.0%
2		229	33	67	87	51	467
		49.0%	7.1%	14.3%	18.6%	10.9%	100.0%
3		254	45	64	63	52	478
		53.1%	9.4%	13.4%	13.2%	10.9%	100.0%
Deafness		6	1	15	16	20	58
		10.3%	1.7%	25.9%	27.6%	34.5%	100.0%
K		1	-	-	-	1	2
		50.0%	-	-	-	50.0%	100.0%
1		1	-	3	6	9	19
		5.3%	-	15.8%	31.6%	47.4%	100.0%
2		1	-	5	8	5	19
		5.3%	-	26.3%	42.1%	26.3%	100.0%
3		3	1	7	2	5	18
		16.7%	5.6%	38.9%	11.1%	27.8%	100.0%
Emotional Disturbance		50	16	19	25	36	146
		34.2%	11.0%	13.0%	17.1%	24.7%	100.0%
K		-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-
1		10	-	2	3	4	19
		52.6%	-	10.5%	15.8%	21.1%	100.0%
2		15	7	5	7	11	45
		33.3%	15.6%	11.1%	15.6%	24.4%	100.0%
3		25	9	12	15	21	82
		30.5%	11.0%	14.6%	18.3%	25.6%	100.0%
Hard of Hearing		107	1	5	6	3	122
		87.7%	0.8%	4.1%	4.9%	2.5%	100.0%
K		-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-
1		26	-	2	5	1	34
		76.5%	-	5.9%	14.7%	2.9%	100.0%
2		34	-	-	-	-	34
		100.0%	-	-	-	-	100.0%
3		47	1	3	1	2	54
		87.0%	1.9%	5.6%	1.9%	3.7%	100.0%

	Meet Outcome	(< 60% in SE)	61-70% in SE	71-80% in SE	81-90% in SE	91-100% in SE	Total
<hr/>							
Multiple Dis. - Orthopedic	19	2	13	21	35	90	
	21.1%	2.2%	14.4%	23.3%	38.9%	100.0%	
K	4	-	1	-	1	6	
	66.7%	-	16.7%	-	16.7%	100.0%	
1	5	-	4	5	13	27	
	18.5%	-	14.8%	18.5%	48.1%	100.0%	
2	5	1	5	9	8	28	
	17.9%	3.6%	17.9%	32.1%	28.6%	100.0%	
3	5	1	3	7	13	29	
	17.2%	3.4%	10.3%	24.1%	44.8%	100.0%	
<hr/>							
Mental Retardation	92	52	139	185	158	626	
	14.7%	8.3%	22.2%	29.6%	25.2%	100.0%	
K	4	2	2	6	6	20	
	20.0%	10.0%	10.0%	30.0%	30.0%	100.0%	
1	28	14	47	59	51	199	
	14.1%	7.0%	23.6%	29.6%	25.6%	100.0%	
2	34	17	35	47	55	188	
	18.1%	9.0%	18.6%	25.0%	29.3%	100.0%	
3	26	19	55	73	46	219	
	11.9%	8.7%	25.1%	33.3%	21.0%	100.0%	
<hr/>							
Other Health Impairment	886	66	86	119	52	1,209	
	73.3%	5.5%	7.1%	9.8%	4.3%	100.0%	
K	17	-	2	2	-	21	
	81.0%	-	9.5%	9.5%	-	100.0%	
1	199	15	16	34	22	286	
	69.6%	5.2%	5.6%	11.9%	7.7%	100.0%	
2	308	24	34	43	13	422	
	73.0%	5.7%	8.1%	10.2%	3.1%	100.0%	
3	362	27	34	40	17	480	
	75.4%	5.6%	7.1%	8.3%	3.5%	100.0%	
<hr/>							
Orthopedic Impairment	100	9	7	10	21	147	
	68.0%	6.1%	4.8%	6.8%	14.3%	100.0%	
K	11	-	-	-	-	11	
	100.0%	-	-	-	-	100.0%	
1	26	3	2	3	5	39	
	66.7%	7.7%	5.1%	7.7%	12.8%	100.0%	
2	31	2	-	3	12	48	
	64.6%	4.2%	-	6.3%	25.0%	100.0%	
3	32	4	5	4	4	49	
	65.3%	8.2%	10.2%	8.2%	8.2%	100.0%	

Traumatic Brain Injury	14	1	4	1	2	22
	63.6%	4.5%	18.2%	4.5%	9.1%	100.0%
K	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	6	0	0	0	0	6
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
2	4	1	0	1	1	7
	57.1%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%
3	4	0	4	0	1	9
	4	0	4	0	1	9

Data source: Welligent, retrieved on 6/12/2006.

* For students with Autism, Mental Retardation, and Other Health Impairments only.

- The percentage of students attending public schools that meet Outcome 7 is higher in kindergarten than in grades 1-3 for Autism, Mental Retardation, and Other Health Impairments, but this may be due to the very small number of students with these disorders in kindergarten.
- For Autism and Other Health Impairments, the percentage of students meeting Outcome 7 increases each year from first grade to third grade.
- For Mental Retardation, the percentage of students meeting Outcome 7 increases from grade one to two, but drops substantially between grades two and three.