

REVISED
3-7-11

Capistrano Unified School District



Significant Disproportionality Coordinated Early Intervening Services (SD-CEIS) Plan

2010-11

Addressing Disproportionality in Capistrano Unified School District – Timeline

Date	Actions
September 14, 2010	Candy Miller, Interim Executive Director, SELPA/Special Ed. Operations shared Significant Disproportionality Overview of Requirements with administrators from Education Services including: Julie Hatchel, Assistant Superintendent, Education Kim Bailey, Director Kathy Bari, Director Mike Beekman, Executive Director Amy Bryant, Director Gail Richards, Executive Director Pam Watkins, Executive Director Stacy Yogi, Executive Director Roz Bellante, Executive Director Sharla Pitzen, Executive Director
October 14, 2010	Planning Group Convened: Candy Miller, Julie Hatchel, Amy Bryant, and Stacy Yogi met to review general guidance. Effective internal leaders of stakeholder groups identified: Jill O’Connell-Bogle Carole Browne Self-assessment was selected and will be distributed to all school site leaders. Root cause and pathway option was selected.
October 15, 2010	Amy Bryant and Stacy Yogi met with Carole Browne to share Significant Disproportionality overview.
October 25, 2010	Julie Hatchel distributed Equity in Special Education Placement: A School Self-Assessment to Principals at Principals’ meeting with a completion deadline of December 1, 2010.
November 12, 2010	Julie Hatchel updates Superintendent
November 16, 2010	Candy Miller, Julie Hatchel, and Amy Bryant met to discuss progress and discuss upcoming SELPA meeting.
December 1, 2010	Received a total of 57 surveys from elementary, middle, and high schools, and alternative programs.
December 2-3, 2010	Candy Miller and Pam Watkins attended the SELPA Administrators of CA meeting. Pam attended the Significant Disproportionality session.
December 10, 2011	Julie Hatchel updated Superintendent
December 15, 2010	Amy Bryant and Stacy Yogi held a meeting to go over the LEA Plan Addendum, which is the basis for the Significant Disproportionality

	<p>plan. The issues of significant disproportionality were discussed and feedback from the group was taken into consideration. The meeting included parents from Special Education and EL groups, site administrators, PTA representation, Special Education administration, teachers, and regular education administrators and teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fran Sdao, CUCPTSA • Sharla Pitzen, Executive Director, Special Education • Tim Hornig, Assistant Principal, Dana Hills High School • Julie Redmond, Parent, Special Education • Kim Beauchaine –TOSA, Special Education • Laura Evans – TOSA, Regular Education • Faith Morris – Principal, Malcom Elementary School • Kristen Schertzer – Assistant Principal, Shorecliffs Middle School
January 3, 2011	Amy Bryant and Stacy Yogi met to review surveys and determine plan for summarizing and sharing data.
January 4, 2011	Pam Watkins shared summary of Significant Disproportionality session with members of Education Services Leadership Team.
January 5, 2011	Amy Bryant and Stacy Yogi analyzed data from survey and CA Department of Education (CDE) and composed first draft of plan.
January 14, 2011	Julie Hatchel updated Superintendent
January 31, 2011	Response To Intervention Task Force met and discussed Significant Disproportionality and brainstormed academic and behavioral RTI pyramid contents.
January 31, 2011	Business and Education Services staff met to discuss SD-CEIS Plan Budget.
February 1, 2011	Amy Bryant and Stacy Yogi updated Education Services Leadership with information about the contents of the SD-CEIS Plan.
February 8, 2011	Education Services Leadership Team reviewed SD-CEIS Plan for omissions and/or inaccuracies and provided additional feedback regarding the report narrative and plan.
February 9, 2011	Amy Bryant and Stacy Yogi met to incorporate suggested revisions from Education Services Leadership Team into the plan.
February 11, 2011	Amy Bryant and Stacy Yogi met with Candy Miller to finalize budget and plan.
February 11, 2011	Julie Hatchel provided an update to the Superintendent and the CUSD Board of Trustees.
March 8, 2011	CUSD Board of Trustees approved SD-CEIS Plan.
March 9, 2011	SD-CEIS Plan was submitted to CDE.

Section A – General Information

Over the last thirty years, disproportionality of culturally and linguistically diverse students has existed throughout the country (Klingner, Artiles, Kozleski, Harry, Zion, Tate, Duran & Riley, 2005) and has surfaced locally for Capistrano Unified School District (CUSD) in the 2009-2010 school year. Upon notification of the district having disproportionality issues in September 2010, the CUSD Leadership Team began to investigate the existence of and the areas of significant disproportionality. The findings brought about deep thought and consideration as to how and why teachers, administrators, and parents assess and recommend students for special education. Specifically, the **“concern about disproportionate representation is focused on the ‘judgmental’ categories of special education – those disabilities usually identified after the child starts school and by school personnel rather than a medical professional”** brought about a great discussion for the group (Klinger, et. al, 2005). The realization that there is a difference between disabilities that are diagnosed by medical professionals and those that are subjectively done by school personnel, which ends up causing disproportionality, has provided insight into the complicated nature of the problem. The idea that as professionals our level of knowledge and understanding can dictate whether disproportionality exists was an indicator of where the work needed to begin.

The other area of profound insight is the trend for considering **“prevention and intervention strategies at the general education level as a viable means of addressing disproportionality representation”** (Klingner, et. al., 2005). The quote highlights the need to enhance intervention programs across the district. Intervention programs have been primarily created due to supplemental state funding and/or in collaboration with special education staff. It is clear that intervention programs need to be a part of the Tier 1 program and prior to special education involvement.

The leadership team of CUSD is committed to addressing the issue of significant disproportionality and is optimistic that progress can be made in this area. The staff recognizes that although there are definite steps that can be taken to remedy the situation, it is a layered and complicated issue to rectify and will require commitment and involvement from all stakeholders.

A1. Summary of Programmatic Self-Review Findings

Initial Findings and Survey Results

Capistrano Unified School District Department of Education Services Leadership Team comprised of Assistant Superintendent Julie Hatchel, Regular Education Directors, Pam Watkins, Gail Richards, Kim Bailey, Michelle Benham, Mike Beekman, Stacy Yogi, Kathy Bari, and Amy Bryant, and Special Education Directors Candy Miller, Sharla Pitzen, and Roz Bellante met on September 14, 2010 to learn about significant disproportionality in the district and the requirements of the report due to the State. In October, a planning group including Julie Hatchel, Candy Miller, Stacy Yogi and Amy Bryant, met to review general guidance for the report and the requirements for the plan. In December, Stacy Yogi and Amy Bryant invited parents, teachers, and administrators from both special and regular education to discuss the improvement plans for

the district (LEA Plan Addendum, Title III IPA Plan, and Significant Disproportionality). Buy in was obtained from stakeholders and feedback was integrated into the improvement plans.

After the October meeting, the planning group expressed a desire to solicit additional feedback from school sites. To obtain this information, *The Equity in Special Education Placement: A School Self-Assessment Guide for Culturally Responsive Practice* survey was distributed to all Principals and their site leadership teams for completion. Principals and school staff from 57 sites completed the survey which assessed teacher, staff, and parent perceptions of the schools' cultural responsiveness in various categories. The survey, developed by the National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems, revealed strengths as well as concerns regarding current practices as shown in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1. *Perceived Strengths of Culturally Responsive Education Systems*

Strengths: (80% or more of respondents selected Almost Always)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The administration works collaboratively with all members of the school community to ensure equitable treatment for all students. • The administration ensures that the special education assessment process is conducted fairly and appropriately. • The administration instills an ethic of care, respect, and responsibility. • The administration exemplifies a positive attitude toward the school, teachers, students, and families. • The school accepts the responsibility for the achievement of all students. • The school informs staff members that disrespectful responses to any child or family member regardless of cultural background, ethnicity, and/or socioeconomic status will not be tolerated on the school campus including teachers' lounge, office, or other area. • The school has developed an effective on-going communication system with families. • Teachers have high expectations for all students regardless of their background or differences. • Participants in child-study teams are knowledgeable about and able to facilitate a range of meaningful pre-referral strategies. • Parents/Caregivers should be involved as respected, valued partners at every stage of the process.

Summary of Strengths

Survey participants perceived their overwhelming strength as the belief that the “administration and organization of the school provides the structure for delivering instruction and programming that meets the needs of students through distributed leadership” (Richards, Artiles, Klingner & Brown, 2005). The communication system the school uses to keep families informed is another strength highlighted in the analysis. Next, the teachers have high expectations for their students regardless of their cultural or linguistic background. Finally, pre-referral and referral procedures was a particular strength for CUSD (in this section there were no areas of concern) which is due to yearly professional development, parental involvement and a consistent system that is used district wide.

Table 2. *Perceived Concerns of Culturally Responsive Education Systems*

Concerns: (50% or less of respondents selected Almost Always)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The administration provides opportunities for professional development of faculty and support personnel on issues of cultural, language and ethnic groups. • The school ensures that all policies and reforms are explained to parents in their language through written communication and various meetings held at times convenient to parents (with childcare and translators provided and parents involved in the planning). • The school obtains materials from professional organizations and makes them available to faculty and support personnel. • The school surveys families from diverse backgrounds to gather suggestions on ways to involve parents in their children's education. • The school assists families in accessing medical and community resources as well as other support services by directing the families to the appropriate agencies. • The school utilizes parent liaisons or resources to help parents and students navigate the school system. • The school provides childcare/times, transportation or alternate meeting days and times if needed. • Teachers are knowledgeable about the history and cultures of diverse ethnic, racial, and cultural groups. • Teachers are knowledgeable about the second language acquisition process and how to support students who are English language learners. • Teachers help to organize activities and projects that enable students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups to work together. • Teachers inform students about stereotyping and other related biases that have negative effects on racial and ethnic relations. • Teachers are knowledgeable about and skilled in using strategies for teaching English language learners (including sheltered English techniques). • Teachers use a range of assessment strategies that provide students from diverse backgrounds opportunities to demonstrate their mastery and skills including the opportunity to share what they know in their native language if they wish. • Students are made aware of behaviors that might be culturally specific so they can learn

how to interact appropriately with students from cultures other than their own.

Summary of Concerns

In the survey, respondents perceived that schools need more support to involve parents from diverse backgrounds in the education process. Other concerns specifically mentioned by participants included assisting parents with understanding policies and procedures in their home language, providing childcare and translators at meetings, employing community liaisons to assist parents in accessing community resources and surveying families from diverse backgrounds for information on how to better involve them in their children’s education. Another area of concern from the survey was improving training for teachers to better understand the second language acquisition process, how to use best practices for working with English Learners and how to utilize assessment to better monitor students from diverse backgrounds. Finally, participants perceived there to be a need for additional professional development for students and teachers in the areas of culturally specific behaviors and how culture, language, and ethnicity affect student achievement.

Additional Data Analysis

In addition to engaging in discussion and participating in surveys, district demographic information and special education enrollment data was analyzed. Disproportionality indices were calculated to determine if true disproportionality existed in CUSD using the Donovan and Cross method (2002). The method looks at the complex issue by determining three indices to assess the composition index, the risk index and the ratio of the risk of disproportionality. In addition, the demographics are presented in this section. Table 3 presents the total population of the district and the percentage of Hispanic, Asian and White students, as well as the English Learner population. Table 4 breaks down the types of English Learners that exist in the district.

Table 3. *District Population of Hispanic, Non-Hispanic Students and English Learners*

Population Total	Students	Percent of the Total Population
ADA	53,381	N/A
Hispanic	13,087	25%
Asian	2,790	6%
White	32,617	62%
Declined to State	445	.007%
Total English Learner	5,865	10%

Source: Dataquest. CDE. *Enrollment by Ethnicity*. 2009

Table 4. *District Demographics of English Learners*

Language	Percent of Population
Spanish	84.4%
Farsi	3.9%
Other non-English Language	1.5%
Korean	1.3%
Filipino	1.2%
Arabic	1.0%
Vietnamese	0.9%
Mandarin	0.8%
Russian	0.8%
Japanese	0.7%
French	0.4%
Cantonese	0.4%
Hindi	0.3%
German	0.3%
Gujarati	0.2%
Portuguese	0.2%
Thai	0.2%
Turkish	0.2%
Urdu	0.1%
Rumanian	0.1%
Polish	0.1%
Punjabi	0.1%
Armenian	0.1%
Hebrew	0.1%
Serbo-Croatian	0.1%
Bengali	0.1%
Dutch	0.1%
Indonesian	0.1%
Khmer – Cambodian	0.1%
Hungarian	0.1%

Source: Dataquest. *District English Learners by Language and Grade*. CDE 2011

The demographics of CUSD show that while there are a variety of different ethnic groups represented in the district, the White population is clearly the largest with 62 percent of the Average Daily Attendance (ADA). Next, the Hispanic population is 25 percent and the Asian population combined equals 6 percent. Within those groups, the English learner (EL) numbers are 10 percent of the students. Clearly, the Spanish speaking ELs dominate the group with 84 percent of the population. The combined Asian group is roughly 5 percent. Even though there are many other languages spoken in the district, the report will focus on the White, Hispanic, and Asian ethnicities and their respective languages.

Special Education Data

The Special Education data analyzed shows a total of 4,756 students in district programs. At first glance, the populations identified as Special Education are close to the percentages listed above in the demographics. Therefore, it was vital that the leadership team analyzed the specific

disabilities, grade level populations, age, and subgroups to determine where the significant disproportionality occurred. Table 5 shows the basic enrollment information. Table 6 presents the number of students with disabilities at each grade level.

Table 5. *Special Education Population*

Group	Population	Percent to the Total Special Education Population
Total Special Education Students	4,756	N/A
White	2,803	59%
Hispanic	1,380	29%
Asian	172	4%

Source: Dataquest. CDE: *Special Education Enrollment by Age and Grade*. 2009

Table 6. *Special Education Enrollment by Grade Level*

Age/Grade	Number of Students with Disability	Total District Enrollment	Percent of Special Education Enrollment
0/Infant	3	N/A	N/A
1/Infant	7	N/A	N/A
2/Infant	9	N/A	N/A
3/Preschool	228	N/A	N/A
4 & 5/Preschool	281	N/A	N/A
K	259	3,656	7%
1 st	262	4,017	6%
2 nd	249	3,927	6%
3 rd	313	4,063	8%
4 th	383	4,123	9%
5 th	396	4,133	10%
6 th	343	4,133	8%
7 th	370	4,289	9%
8 th	310	4,113	8%
9 th	310	4,269	7%
10 th	271	4,164	7%
11 th	308	4,359	7%
12 th	311	4,045	7%
All Others	143	101	N/A
Total Students	4,756	53,381	N/A

Source: Dataquest. CDE: *Special Education Enrollment by Age and Grade*. 2009

Special Education enrollment data reveals that there is a trend for identification prior to kindergarten. Another noted trend is the pattern of increased identification that occurs between the 3rd and 8th grades which peaks in 5th grade. Then, the numbers decrease slightly in high school. Factors that could have contributed to the increased numbers of identification in 3rd through 8th grade includes the culmination of class size reduction, the need to read for learning content versus learning how to read and the potential that special education was used as an intervention for students who may not have shown signs of readiness for middle school.

Table 7 presents the data further broken down by ethnicities and learning related disabilities including Specific Learning Disability (SLD) and Mental Retardation (MR). The definition of

SLD is “one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell or to do mathematical calculations.” (34 CFR Part 300.5 as cited in Glossary of Special Education, CDE, 2011). The CDE Special Education Glossary (2011) defines MR as, “significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning existing with deficits in adaptive behavior, and manifested during the developmental period, which adversely affects a child’s educational performance” (34 CFR Part 300.5).

Table 7. *Special Education Enrollment by Age and Major Ethnic Group & SLD and MR*

Age	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total of All Ethnicities (including those that were not listed)	Total MR	Total SLD
0	0	0	2	3	0	0
1	0	0	6	7	0	0
2	0	0	6	9	0	0
3	10	29	129	228	6	0
4	18	33	162	250	7	0
5	17	47	159	235	11	3
6	17	65	147	245	7	11
7	6	56	157	236	6	20
8	16	81	179	295	12	57
9	14	89	240	356	15	104
10	8	115	233	383	10	135
11	11	112	215	360	10	149
12	10	125	195	358	8	168
13	7	118	177	323	17	152
14	8	115	161	306	7	156
15	9	106	153	297	13	178
16	5	109	160	297	13	161
17	8	97	169	296	16	159
18	3	57	88	168	12	94
19	1	17	25	49	16	13
20	0	3	21	25	6	2
21	4	6	18	29	11	3
22	0	0	1	1	0	0
Total	172	1,380	2,803	4,756	203	1,565

Source: Dataquest. CDE: *Special Education Enrollment by Age and Grade*. 2009; CDE: *Special Education Enrollment by Age and Disability*. 2009

The Special Education data in Table 7 shows the numbers of students enrolled by their age and ethnicity for all disabilities and then specifically for SLD and MR. The data shows that starting at age 3, students who are Hispanic and White begin to be identified with disabilities. Since the numbers for MR and SLD are low, it is important to mention that these students are in other categories such as Autism and Speech and Language according to the California Department of Education report titled, *Special Education Enrollment by Age and Disability* (2009). As students get older, the diagnoses for SLD increase along with the numbers of students in the Hispanic and White categories. The numbers of students in both categories drops off significantly at the age of 17. Similarly as in the grade levels, the ages show that the largest numbers of students in special education are ages 11 and 12. The Asian population remains low in their enrollment in the program with the numbers beginning to decrease at a younger age than the Hispanic and White

populations. Table 8 is the first table to display the data that is used to determine disproportionality. It shows the Composition Index (CI) for the three groups as their percentages pertain to total enrollment and the two largest groups: SLD and MR. Table 9 breaks the data down further by looking at the Hispanic population in terms of how many are ELs in Special Education and how many are EL males in Special Education.

Table 8. Composition Index (CI): *Total Enrollment and Corresponding Percentage Compared with Special Education Enrollment and Selected Disability Categories by Ethnicity.*

Group	Total Enrollment and Percentage	SWD as % of Special Education Enrollment	Specific Learning Disability (SLD)	Mental Retardation (MR)
Hispanic	13,087 (25%)	1,380 (29%)	673 (43%)	73 (36%)
White	32,617 (61%)	2,803 (59%)	757 (48%)	110 (54%)
Asian	2,790 (5%)	172 (4%)	21 (1%)	8 (4%)
Total	53,381	4,756	1,565	203

Source: Dataquest. CDE. *Special Education Enrollment by Ethnicity and Disability*. 2009. SWD = Students with disabilities. CI is determined by dividing the number of students in the disability by the total students enrolled in the disability.

Table 9. *Special Education Students by Ethnicity, Gender and Language Fluency*

Special Education Group and Corresponding Number	Number of Hispanic SWD	Percent of the Total Hispanic EL Population in Special Ed.
Hispanic EL 608	1,380	44%
Hispanic EL Males 415	1,380	30%

Source: Aeries. *Query for Hispanic, EL, Special Ed and Male population*. 2011

The analysis reveals that within the special education population, the Hispanic population is specifically over identified in the diagnosis of *Specific Learning Disability*. Forty-three percent of the SLD diagnoses are Hispanic students. Considering that 25 percent of the population of students is Hispanic, the data reveals **significant disproportionality in the area of SLD**. The data in Table 9 shows that the percent of ELs who are **Hispanic and males are also disproportionate** to the total population.

In addition to the over identification for SLD, the Hispanic population is over diagnosed with 36 percent of students in the category of Mental Retardation. Again, with 25 percent of the population labeled as Hispanic, which equates to 11 percent more Hispanic students identified with MR than normally represented in the population. Therefore, **MR in the Hispanic population is another area of significant disproportionality**. Table 10 presents the risk of a group in being identified as having the particular disability. Table 11 presents the risk ratio, which shows the comparison of one ethnic group over another for identification.

Table 10. Risk Index (RI): *Percent of the Population That Has the Risk to be Identified with the Disability Specific Learning Disability (SLD) or Mental Retardation (MR)*

Group	SLD	Risk Index of SLD	MR	Risk Index of MR
Hispanic	673/13,087	5%	73/13,087	1%
Asian	21/2,790	1%	8/2,790	0%
White	757/32,617	2%	110/32,617	0%

Source: Dataquest. CDE. *Special Education Enrollment by Ethnicity and Disability*. 2009. RI is determined by dividing the number of students in the disability by the total students in the population.

Table 11. Risk Ratio (RR): *The Amount of Times a Group is More Likely to be Identified Within a Special Education Population*

Group	Risk Index of SLD	Risk Ratio of Hispanic to Asian and White	Risk Index of MR	Risk Ratio of Hispanic to Asian and White
Hispanic	5%	5 times more likely than Asians to be SLD and 2 ½ times more likely than Whites to be SLD	1%	1 time more likely to be MR than White and Asian
Asian	1%		0%	
White	2%	2 times more likely than Asians to be SLD	0%	

Source: Dataquest. CDE. *Special Education Enrollment by Ethnicity and Disability*. 2009. RR is determined by dividing the risk index of one group by the another group.

The final two parts of the determinants for disproportionality are the Risk Index and the Risk Ratio (Donovan & Cross, 2002). The Risk Index tells the percent of the population that is at risk of being identified according to the current numbers of students. In the case of the Hispanic students, 5 percent of the Hispanic population has the risk of being identified for a SLD and a 1 percent risk of being identified as MR. Comparatively, the Asian demographic has a 1 percent risk of identification for SLD and 0 percent risk for MR. The White population also has low risk (2 percent for SLD and 0 percent for MR). **When analyzing the risk ratio, the Hispanic student is five times more likely than an Asian student and two times more likely than a White student to be identified with a SLD.** Again, the Hispanic student is disproportionately at risk for Special Education and much more likely than any other ethnic group in the district to be identified as having a SLD or being MR.

Nature of Disproportionality

According to researchers Klingner, Artiles, Kozleski, Harry, Zion, Tate, Duran and Riley (2005), there are specific areas that should be considered when analyzing the causes of disproportionality. Once a cause has been identified, the plan can target the specific needs of the district to avoid future over identification of students. Both areas of disproportionality are disabilities that involve language and the ability to articulate in a manner that is negotiable depending on who is doing the evaluation. In order to narrow in on the causes for the problem, the following areas were considered and are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. *Causes of Disproportionality*

Name of Cause	Nature of Cause
Intrinsic Deficit	The belief that <i>a child has less ability than another after</i> ruling out factors such as poverty, low birth weight, exposure to alcohol in pregnancy, malnourishment and exposure to lead.
Contextual Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Decision making process for selecting students for Special Education b) Placement in programs with uneven levels of restrictedness c) Administrative decisions regarding staffing and funding allocation d) Connection between school location, ethnicity, poverty and density of culturally and linguistically diverse populations e) The lack of availability of alternative programs f) The presence of subtle forms of bias at various stages of the referral process
Power and Hegemony	Basic assumptions about race, worldviews, beliefs and epistemologies perpetuate the problem. “Mainstream educators generally interpret culturally diverse students’ performance through white middle-class normative parameters of competence” (p. 6).
Assumptions about Intelligence	Deeply held assumptions about an ethnic group’s ability <i>or</i> lack of ability for certain programs.
Assumptions about Behavior	Norms for what is considered to be acceptable behavior vary in each culture. “School personnel tend to judge students’ actions through a narrow, white, mainstream lens” (p. 7).
Wait to Fail Model	The assumption that failure must be documented <i>first</i> to secure assistance for students who are struggling due to the fact that there is no mechanism in place to truly help a child unless they are in a specialized program.
Research to Practice Gap	The gap between what teachers <i>know</i> that works and is necessary and what is actually <i>implemented</i> to solve the problem.

Source: Klingner, J.K., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., Duran, G. Z., & Riley, D. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Education Policy Archives*, 13 (38). Retrieved October 15, 2010 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n38/>

After considering all the data and the above causes for disproportionality, there is the possibility that *all* of the causes listed above are present at various levels of concentrations in the district. Therefore, it is vital that the district plan contain professional development to address the problems specifically and provide additional education for teachers and staff in the areas above. Staff and teachers want to help students achieve and want to hold high expectations for success. Perhaps the disproportionality is a reflection of the desire to *secure additional help* for the students. Therefore, in order to change the current course of disproportionality, what could be considered is changing the idea that using one set of expectations serves all students. In fact, what could be done is to first share the data and resources to help build capacity for teachers and staff and then widen the criteria for what “high expectations” are, to include other performance indicators than those attributed to the White middle-class population.

Disproportionality in Gifted Identification

As the district examines the practice for referral for the special education process for low performance from students, it is wise to look at the referral process for high performance as well. Students qualify to participate in the Gifted and Talented Education Program (GATE) in CUSD based on high test scores on the STAR English Language Arts and Mathematics California

Standards Tests as well as a high test score on either the *Otis Lennon School Abilities Test* or *Naglieri Non-Verbal Abilities Test*. Students who do not meet qualifying scores to be screened are able to participate through a fee-based process. There is a fee-waiver process for those who qualify. Teachers can recommend students who are close to meeting qualifying criteria, but do not quite make it through a Multiple Measures Portfolio process.

Further investigation shows a very low number of students are admitted into the GATE program who are Hispanic, English learners and Hispanic English learners. Table 13 represents the composition index of the GATE demographics in the district. Table 14 represents the breakdown of the reclassified students in the GATE program.

Table 13. Composition Index: *GATE Demographics in Capistrano Unified*

Group	Population	Percent of the Total GATE Population
Total GATE students	5,672	N/A
White	4,519	80%
Hispanic	525	9%
Asian	1,001	18%
English Learner	4	0.0%
Reclassified - (Former English Learner)	523	9%

Source: Aeries. *Query for GATE Population*. 2011.

The data reveals trends and aligns with the root causes of significant disproportionality of Hispanic special education students found in the data analysis. As stated earlier in the report, the root causes of the disproportionality center around Hispanic students and the lack of understanding of best instructional practices for students who are from different cultures, those who speak a second language and a lack of parent outreach and involvement. The root cause for significant disproportionality in special education has manifested itself into other areas of the Hispanic student education – classification as gifted.

The percentage of Hispanic students in the GATE program is 9 percent and 29 percent students represented in Special Education. While the percentage of Hispanic students in the gifted category is slightly below the percentage of the total population (9 percent), there are two Hispanic English learners classified as gifted, which is 0.0 percent of the GATE population. Within the category of reclassified students (former English learners), Spanish speaking ELs only represent 28 percent of the population. Spanish speaking ELs represent 84 percent of the EL population. The data reveals that, at the very least, there are problems with student identification on both ends of the spectrum, those who need help and those who need to be challenged. The conclusion for the Hispanic student is that since there is *over two times more* (in terms of percentage) students in special education than in the GATE program, a Hispanic student is more likely to be labeled as special education than as gifted.

Table 14. Risk Index: *Percent of Group that has the Likelihood of Being Identified as GATE*

Group	GATE population over Total Population of Group	Risk Index
Hispanic	525/13, 087	4%
Asian	1,001/2,790	36%
White	4,519/32,617	14%

Source: Aeries Query for GATE population and ethnicity (2011). RI is determined by dividing the number of students in the disability by the total students in the population.

While the Hispanic student has been underrepresented in the gifted population, the White and Asian populations are overrepresented. The White population represents 62 percent of the total students enrolled including 6 percent who are English learners and 24 percent who are reclassified, but has 80 percent of the GATE population. The Asian population breaks down to only 6 percent of the total enrollment with 5 percent of them being English learners. However, 18 percent of the GATE population is Asian and 48 percent of reclassified students come from the Asian demographic. The end result with the White and Asian groups is that it is far more likely for a student in these categories to be labeled as *gifted* than as a special education student.

Reclassified GATE Students

Former ELs, known as reclassified students make up another demographic that required analysis. Table 15 focuses on the reclassified population, Table 16 presents the CI for reclassified students in the district and Table 17 looks at the likelihood that a certain portion of the reclassified population will be identified as gifted (the RI).

Table 15. *Demographics of Reclassified Students*

Group	Population	Percent of the Total Reclassified Population
Total Reclassified Students	3,560	N/A
Hispanic	2,256	63%
White	626	18%
Asian	592	17%

Source: Aeries. *Query for GATE Population and Reclassified Students*. 2011.

Table 16. Composition Index: *Reclassified GATE Demographics*

Group	Population	Percent of the Total GATE Reclassified Population
Total GATE Reclassified Students	523	N/A
Hispanic	149	28%
White	128	24%
Asian	245	47%

Source: Aeries. *Query for GATE Population and Reclassified Students*. 2011.

Table 17. Risk Index: *Percent of Group that has the Likelihood of Being Identified as GATE*

Group	Number of Reclassified Students by Ethnicity	GATE population over Total Population of Group	Risk Index
Hispanic Reclassified	2,256	149/2,256	7%
Asian Reclassified	592	245/592	41%
White Reclassified	626	245/626	39%

Source: Aeries Query for GATE population, ethnicity, and reclassification. 2011. RI is determined by dividing the number of students in the disability by the total students in the population.

After analyzing the reclassified population, it is clear that even though the Hispanic population makes up 63 percent of the total reclassified demographic, the disproportionality continues in this category as well. The CI shows that 28 percent of the population is represented as GATE. Conversely, the Asian and White populations are both over represented. Even though the Asian reclassified group is 18 percent of the total, they have 47 percent of the GATE portion of the population. For the White group, who is 17 percent of the reclassified demographic, are 24 percent of the GATE reclassified populace. The conclusions for the data for this group are consistent with the other data sets that were analyzed. The Hispanic group is significantly underrepresented in identification as gifted while the White and Asian populations in the reclassified demographic are over identified.

Variance of Gifted and Talented Performance Indicators

While a student may have a gap in achievement, it may be due to normal language acquisition and *not* because of a learning disability. In fact, a student who displays language development delays can still show gifted attributes that could be misunderstood for a SLD. The testing results on their own cannot discern why a gap exists, but people *can* from understanding the student's background. The need for further education is clear; those who refer students for special education must understand the difference and refer only those who display specific learning disability characteristics. Table 18 compares the traditional gifted characteristics to that of an EL and special education student. Table 19 shows the attributes of a student who has a SLD and the stages of second language acquisition.

Table 18. *The Variance of Gifted and Talented Students*

Type of Learning	Traditional Gifted	Gifted and EL	Gifted and Special Education
Use of Language	Uses complex sentences effectively	May use inventive vocabulary combining both languages	May use language in inappropriate ways and at inappropriate times
Critical Thinking	Can manipulate semantic, symbolic and figural systems	May reflect complex thoughts through art	May appear to think slowly because of auditory or visual processing problems
Curiosity and Questioning Attitude	Asks penetrating questions	May be culturally conditioned NOT to question	May appear disrespectful when questioning information and facts presented by the teacher
Rate of Acquisition	Demonstrates extensive memory	May require more repetition	Often has a focused well developed area of interest, but not related to school subjects or topics
Perspective	Displays an ability to incorporate different points of view through oral language, writing, manipulatives and/or art	Takes a group perspective	Blames others for their problems
Preferences	Abstract and sometimes random connections	Thinks visually	Spatial and mechanical skills

Source: Texas Education Agency. *Equity in Gifted Education Task Force Members*. 2006.

Table 19. *Specific Learning Disability Attributes and Second Language Acquisition*

SLD	Second Language Acquisition	Phase of SLA
Trouble learning the alphabet, rhyming words or connecting letter to sounds	Begin to sound out stories phonetically	Stage 3: Speech Emergence
May make many mistakes when reading aloud, repeat and pause often	Need to have a lot of repetition from peers. Parroting what they hear from reading and speaking	Stage 1: Pre-Production
May have trouble remembering sounds that letters make and have spelling errors	Many grammatical and spelling errors in student writing samples	Stage 3: Speech Emergence Stage 4: Intermediate Fluency
May struggle to express themselves in writing and have a limited vocabulary	Require a sentence frame in order to write due to limited vocabulary	Stage 2: Early Production
May have trouble organizing what to say or unable to think of the word needed for writing or conversation	Begin to write in journals about topics that interest them	Stage 3: Speech Emergence

Source: Combined from the following sources: Hearne, D. *Teaching Second Language Learners with Learning Disabilities* (2000); Everything ESL. *Stages of Second Language Acquisition* (2011).

Further investigation into the process for referral into the special education and gifted programs reveal that there is an element of unconscious personal or structural bias which could be contributing to the low numbers of English learners and/or Hispanic students who are referred for testing for the gifted program or are over referred for testing for the special education program. Capistrano Unified School District is committed to implementing more effective practices for referrals that are grounded in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that provide for equal and appropriate educational opportunities.

A2. Pathway Identification and Implementation

As defined by the California Department of Education (CDE), a pathway is a core topic area that is aligned with the State Performance Plan that outlines a variety of professional development, resources and ideas that addresses the issue of significant disproportionality in the district. In addition, it was derived from collaboration and multiple data sets that build upon existing work and avoid reinventing content materials. Lastly, it has multiple points of intersection with other plans in the district. Pathway two was selected by CUSD since it focuses on building awareness of cultural differences, adapting programs and interventions and monitoring the interventions for the students who have been historically marginalized.

California Department of Education recommends that the district utilize existing programs and plans for this work. The focus will be on how to build capacity while implementing the Local Education Agency Plan Addendum and Title III Improvement Plan Addendum (IPA) Year Three. In particular, pathway two training topics will focus on:

- *Laying the foundation for culturally responsive education:* Professional development on the topic of the differences between second language acquisition and SLD and MR.
- *Principles of culturally responsive school environments:* Professional development on the topic of the variations of gifted in the classroom.
- *Programmatic strategies for language development and literacy for ELs in the mainstream classroom:* Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) professional development training and peer coaching to sustain the programmatic changes at the school sites.
- *Getting parents involved:* Increasing parent involvement at selected school sites by hiring additional Bilingual Community Liaisons (BCL).
- *Research-based interventions:* Monitoring intervention program curriculum for effectiveness and establishing a framework for intervention for struggling students that is not related to special education.
- *Pre-referral process and data driven decision making:* Implement the Preschool Pre-Referral Intervention Process with fidelity which is based on collecting data and monitoring progress about each student.

Culturally Responsive Educational Systems

In 2010, CUSD began implementation of a three-year plan to address issues that surfaced with English learners (not achieving AMAO 3) that was documented in the Title III IPA for Year Two (the district is now Year Three). In addition, the district has begun to implement the LEA Plan Addendum that was approved by the CUSD School Board of Trustees as a result of being identified as Program Improvement (LEA PI Year One). **Both plans seek to improve student achievement by refining teacher practice in working with ELs, SWDs and increasing parent involvement.** The following are the highlights of what has been implemented thus far:

- District level Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) have been trained in the SIOP methodology and the peer coaching model.
- District administrators worked with a consultant (GEMAS) to create the plan has begun implementation (referred to as “ADD Initiative”).
- 19 of the 57 schools have participated in year one of the roll out of the ADD Initiative.
- School administrators identified teacher leaders to learn the SIOP method and how to be a peer coach at their school sites.
- Administrators at the site and district level participated in the training for SIOP and peer coaching.
- District level TOSAs provide support to sites as the ADD Initiative is implemented.
- The district has begun to hire Bilingual Community Liaisons for 20 school sites that are impacted by EL populations. So far, approximately 15 have begun working as of January 2011.
- District administrators and a district level liaison have planned training for the Bilingual Community Services Liaisons to learn how to work with parents and assist them in getting involved at school that will take place in February 2011.
- The district began a TOSA network to bridge the gap between regular education and special education TOSAs and create a professional learning community.

Significant Disproportionality Plan

The Leadership Team recommends that the district continue to invest in the professional development and peer coaching model that has begun this year. In addition, it is recommended that the BCLs hired at selected sites begin additional professional development programs to provide better services to parents and families. To follow are the details of how the district will address significant disproportionality.

Laying the Foundation for Culturally Responsive Education and School Environments

One of the discoveries from the self-study and data analysis was that many of the causes of disproportionality can be avoided with teacher and staff education about cultural and linguistic differences. In particular, training could be provided to teachers and staff on topics such as second language acquisition, gifted characteristics of many types of students, and culturally responsive education. The following activities will be integrated into the ADD Initiative - a district initiative to help teachers organize best practices so that lesson delivery is effective, especially for English learners and students with disabilities (SWD). Teachers and administrators work with a district level Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) and a consultant in how to peer coach in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). The initiative is a multi-year

plan that will affect all teachers and administrators in the district. Since SIOP focuses on utilizing research-based best practices for working with ELs and SWD, it is the perfect vehicle for laying the foundation for culturally responsive education. The specifics of the plan include the following activities (listed in no particular order):

1. Create a presentation on second language acquisition, gifted characteristics of many types of students, and culturally responsive education (CRE) as well as materials for the TOSAs in regular and special education to present to teachers, administrators and parents at their school sites.
2. Consult with the GATE TOSA to ensure that gifted characteristics are well documented in the presentation.
3. Weave the presentation into the SIOP coaching and training so that teachers and administrators understand *why* and *how* their practice needs be adjusted for SWD, Hispanic students and ELs.
4. TOSAs and principals will present additional workshops during professional learning community meetings at the school sites.
5. Provide the CRE training for the School Psychologists, Speech and Language Pathologists and Bilingual Community Services Liaisons.
6. Create culturally responsive assessments for School Psychologists that include appropriate professional development and support.
7. Provide the CRE training to all Early Childhood and Pre-school Teachers and Supervisors.

Programmatic Strategies for Language Development and Literacy for ELs in the Mainstream Classroom

Capistrano Unified is committed to implementing the ADD Initiative and is part-way through the first year of the multi-year plan. As mentioned above, a large component of the initiative is to teach the SIOP protocol to teachers and administrators and provide support as the teachers and administrators peer coach each other. **SIOP** is based on a research-study that focused on best practices for subgroup populations of students in the **mainstream content area classroom**. In order to provide better service to teachers, administrators and staff in the coaching and training, it is recommended that the coaching support be expanded by adding more TOSAs, as well as release teachers from school sites to provide support at the site level.

Increasing the number of TOSAs would allow the existing TOSAs to continue with the sites from the first year without being required to pick up additional, new schools in the rollout. Initially, the original plan for the ADD Initiative would have required the TOSAs to pick up additional schools in the second year of the rollout. Then, the TOSAs would have repeated the process with the new schools while continuing to support the first set of schools in SIOP. Benefits of adding more TOSA support include the ability to introduce culturally responsive education, second language acquisition and GATE characteristics training to teachers, administrators and parents, building on existing relationships developed in year one of the rollout and differentiating the pace of the SIOP training based on the needs of the site. The following are the recommendations for programmatic changes in language development and literacy for ELs in the mainstream classroom:

1. Utilize an existing TOSA currently assigned to other areas in the district and reassign her to the ADD Initiative.
2. Hire three additional TOSAs for 2011-2012 (two elementary and one middle school) and one TOSA for K-8 schools for 2012-2013.
3. Provide one middle school and four high schools with a two section release for a teacher leader at the site for the purpose of supporting the initiative at the site level and to assist with peer coaching.
4. Each TOSA will have approximately 7 schools.
5. All TOSA support and section release will be funded with categoricals (Title I and EIA) and CEIS funds; no general funds will be used.
6. GATE TOSA funding source will be changed to EIA 100 percent.
7. Add a clerk to assist with GATE paperwork funded by the fees collected from GATE testing.

Table 20. *Estimated TOSA Distribution for the ADD Initiative*

TOSA 1 (existing)	TOSA 2 (existing)	TOSA 3 (existing)	TOSA 4 (reassigned)	TOSA 5 (Open)	TOSA 6 (Open)	TOSA 7 (Open)	TOSA 8 (existing)	TOSA 9
TWI & K-8, Title 1	Elem.	Elem.	Elem. & GATE	Elem.	Elem.	Middle	High 60%	
San Juan ES	Kinoshita	Del Obispo	Bathgate	Ladera Ranch ES	Crown Valley	AVMS	*CVHS	
Las Palmas	Hidden Hills	Wood Canyon	Oso Grande	Malcom	Castille	SMS	*ANHS	
Viejo	Barcelona Hills	Ambuehl	GATE Program	Bergeson	Reilly	Newhart	*SCHS	
Marco	Palisades	Hankey ES		Concordia	Laguna Niguel	Niguel Hills MS	*SJHHS	
BAMS	Lobo	Oak Grove		Benedict	Canyon Vista	Ladera Ranch MS	DHHS	2012-2013 K-8 (Open)
TWI program	Moulton	Marblehead					SERRA	Las Flores ES & MS
2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013	Don Juan Avila ES & MS
	RH Dana			George White	Wagon Wheel		THS	Vista Del Mar ES & MS
				Chaparral	Tijeras Creek			Arroyo Vista ES & MS

*Denotes additional sections release for site level lead coach (2 sections per site with *). TWI = Two Way Immersion program, TOSA = Teacher on Special Assignment, Open= indicates the new positions requested, existing=TOSA from year one of ADD, reassigned=TOSA who will take on new assignment in ADD in 2011-2012

Getting Parents Involved

The results from the self-study indicated that school sites would like resources to assist them in reaching out to parents. As part of the LEA Plan Addendum and the Title III IPA, the district outlined a strategy to increase parent education, involvement and advocacy by working with community groups for particular trainings and hiring BCLs at specific school sites. The purpose for the liaisons is to increase parental awareness of the school system in the United States, especially for laws that pertain to California, increase awareness of how to help a child succeed in school, how to access higher education information and to provide community resources to help families assimilate into the school community. Welcoming families, providing workshops for parents, providing translations at meetings or IEPs, and having childcare and a point person who speaks Spanish are goals for the BCL at each school site. While the district has made strides by hiring BCLs at approximately 20 of the 57 sites, the need to provide professional development and to create a network for the liaisons to learn and expand their practice is necessary. The process of working with families and helping them feel welcome evolves over time. The plan is to build on what is in place now by increasing the capacity of the liaisons so they are prepared to help families get involved in their child's education. Activities will include:

1. Create a BCL Network and hold bi-monthly meetings for all liaisons to gather and share resources.
2. Provide professional development for liaisons in the areas of culturally responsive education, working with parents to be their child's first and most important teacher, setting high expectations for achievement and strategies for school and college success.
3. Train liaisons in assessment, special education translation and interpretation.
4. Identify quality BCL training programs and collaborate to provide the training for CUSD staff.

Research-based Interventions

During the last year, CUSD formed a Response to Intervention (RTI) Task Force to investigate the best way to provide intervention at all levels in the district. So far, the group has surveyed sites in an effort to learn more about what types of intervention programs exist in the district and is in the process of designing a district RTI Pyramid that includes behavioral and academic interventions. Survey results showed that some intervention is occurring at school sites, but it is not consistent and systematic across all schools. One of the causes for disproportionality is the "wait to fail model" (Klingner, Artiles, Kozleski, Harry, Zio, Tate, Duran & Riley, 2005), which exists due to an inability to provide assistance to a struggling student unless the student is failing and a potential special education referral. Once completed, the RTI Task Force Pyramid of RTI Model will allow teachers to consistently and systematically help a child when there is a small problem versus waiting until a gap exists. It is a district core belief that quality first instruction is the best remedy for a struggling student. Since there are students who need additional help, the following will take place to ensure that research-based interventions are provided to at risk students:

1. Implement the recommendations provided by the RTI Task Force in June 2011.
2. Investigate the best models for intervention programs in Tier 1 of an RTI model.

3. Investigate various master scheduling models that can facilitate a Tier 1 intervention program.
4. Investigate curriculum that can support Tier 1 of an ELA program that is seamless and connects to a stand-alone intervention program for Tier 2.
5. Investigate universal screening methods, progress monitoring tools and other assessments that could be used easily, economically and consistently in the district for the purpose of determining if students require intervention.
6. Create a system to collect data from the assessments in #5 for the purpose of discussion of student progress, planning and monitoring of programs.
7. Provide professional development to School Psychologists, Speech and Language Pathologists and Bilingual Community Liaisons on the RTI model.
8. Plan and implement a summer intensive program for ELs and students who are not diagnosed for special education but show articulation problems. The program would be taught by a Speech and Language Pathologist who is funded from General Fund.

Pre-referral Process and Data Driven Decision-making

In 2007, the School Readiness, Early Childhood Education and Special Education Departments created a pre-referral intervention process for assistance to students prior to Special Education referral for children in CUSD preschools. It included instructions for preschool teachers on how to complete a data analysis of student background, ability, language needs and social needs for an at-risk student. The system was intended to assist preschool teachers in making judgments about student ability and potential for learning disabilities. Currently, the district needs to evaluate if teachers are implementing the process with fidelity and/or if the process needs revision. In addition, there is a need to ensure that decisions regarding students who are at-risk are data driven and well documented. Therefore, in order to address significant disproportionality, the district will investigate the pre-referral intervention process and encourage data driven decision making at all levels, not just for preschool-aged students by doing the following:

1. Determine the level of implementation of the pre-referral intervention process by surveying the preschool teachers.
2. Investigate the data gathering systems for students who are at-risk and being considered for interventions.
3. Investigate potential data gathering systems to track the number of students who are at-risk, receiving interventions and/or being considered for referral to special education.

A3 – Academic Area of Focus

The area of focus for the report is the academic progress of Hispanic students including ELs who are Spanish-speaking. Success will be measured by subgroup AYP improvement in STAR testing. In particular, the focus will be on the instructional practice of teachers in the content area classes. In the self-study, the section with the most concerns was titled, “Organization of Learning” from the survey *The Equity in Special Education Placement: A School Self-Assessment Guide for Culturally Responsive Practice*. The section addressed questions regarding the belief that what occurs in the classroom is crucial to the academic success of students. The teacher is the facilitator in the classroom and is expected to provide an

environment of mutual respect and build an awareness of and a tolerance for cultural and linguistic differences. The teacher models high expectations for all. Monitoring progress of each student is a daily event, as well as organizing the class so to make transitions from activity to activity seamless and efficient. Key areas of academic focus are:

Curriculum and Instruction

- Teachers are the key component to effectively teach English Learners.
- Teachers teach students about stereotypes and related biases.
- Teachers understand second language acquisition and use the understanding to make judgments about student academic progress.
- Teachers understand how culture, race, language and ethnicity influence student behavior.

Student Engagement

- Lesson design and delivery is made interesting and challenging for all students (not focused on rote learning activities).

Data Analysis and Monitoring

- Teachers use a variety of assessment strategies daily throughout their lessons.
- Teachers explain rules, procedures and expectations so all students understand what the lesson is about and what it takes to be successful.

Policies, Practices and Procedures of RTI

- Determine what types of intervention programs can be sustained district-wide.
- Determine what types of programs can be used in Tier 1 of a core ELA program.

Funding will be used to expand the ADD Initiative, which includes SIOP and peer-coaching. The areas listed above as concerns will be addressed as a part of SIOP training and culturally responsive education, mentioned earlier in section A2. The intervention program is currently under consideration as the key task for the district level RTI Task Force, who will recommend *how* the programs will be put into place. All students will benefit from being in a classroom with a teacher who uses SIOP, not just those in the significant disproportionality subgroups. The assurance of success comes from years of research into what is best practice for teachers and what are the best ways for students to learn. The following components are the focus of the ADD Initiative and the academic area of focus for students based on the SIOP Model (*Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2008*).

Overview of SIOP Model

1. *Lesson Preparation.* Language and content objectives that are clearly articulated to the students so they understand the expectations and goals of the lesson.
2. *Building Background.* Connecting the objectives of the lesson to the student's background, prior experience and knowledge.
3. *Comprehensible Input.* Making the concepts understandable for the student by modeling, demonstrating, providing pictures, realia and hands on activities.

4. *Strategies.* Explicit instruction and practice in how to learn the concepts by using learning strategies.
5. *Interaction.* Students learn by using language and content in activities where they are required to discuss, create and explain ideas.
6. *Practice and Application.* Allowing students to practice a concept in small chunks over and over in different situations.
7. *Lesson Delivery.* Content and language objectives were met, pacing was appropriate and students were engaged at least 90 percent of the lesson.
8. *Review and Assessment.* Reviewing key vocabulary and concepts throughout the lesson, not just at the end or when a test is given.

The expectation is that the SIOP protocol, which includes all the eight components listed above, will be used when teaching content area courses on a daily basis. Expanding the program increases the likelihood that students will receive instruction from a teacher who is prepared to provide best first instruction *while* practicing an understanding of culturally responsive education. Researchers of the SIOP model, Echevarria, Short and Vogt (2008), articulate the reasons why SIOP provides teachers and students with the best practice and application in the report titled, *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. The key areas that will be incorporated into the significant disproportionality plan for teachers and administrators are as follows:

Theoretical Knowledge: Provide teachers with an understanding of culturally responsive education, second language acquisition and unique needs of an EL or gifted student.

Specific Strategies: Provide professional development and support in areas that are deficits. CUSD teachers will receive training and support in SIOP, as well as culturally responsive education.

Collaborative Lesson Planning: Utilize a team approach to planning lessons that include using specific data to inform instruction. Practice improves by having an opportunity to share ideas, refine strategies and consider different points of view.

Modeling: Watching another teacher use a concept that was discussed in training provides a visual for the teacher to immediately put into context how the component should be done. CUSD teachers will have the opportunity to observe the district level TOSA in demonstration lessons and their peers during the coaching cadre/peer coaching piece of the plan.

Practice: After training, it is vital that the teacher and administrator have the opportunity to practice what was learned. Then, that person will have the ability to know what questions to ask or what support is needed. Peer coaches can watch their teacher peers practice a component of SIOP and provide feedback on what was witnessed during the observation.

Feedback and In-class Coaching: In addition to a peer coach watching a lesson and providing feedback, the site administrator, district level TOSA and the consultant will observe lessons and provide feedback. It is always a positive experience and meant to be *non-evaluative*. The purpose is to improve instructional practice and all participants can learn from one another.

Independent Application and Analysis: Using the PLC model as the vehicle for discussion, teachers can share how the SIOP was used and what successes they achieved. Peers can assist in the data analysis necessary to participate in reflective practice.

Program Coherence: The ADD Initiative is a multi-year program that will eventually have all 57 schools in the district using the same language and process for instruction. Consistency is the key to success and effectiveness of the model.

A4 – Number of Students

The numbers of students who will benefit from the plan are outlined in the table below. The significant disproportionality plan centers on improving education for students by providing teachers and administrators training in culturally responsive education and gifted characteristics of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Progress will be measured by utilizing AYP subgroup data each fall. The numbers listed below are approximate and will vary year to year as enrollment changes. Note that the queries for the students listed here are from January 2011 whereas the previous data listed in the report was from 2009-2010.

Table 21. *Targeted Student Groups for Significant Disproportionality Plan*

Student Group	Number of Students
Hispanic students in Year 1 of ADD Initiative	7, 263
Hispanic students by Year 2 of ADD Initiative	10, 621
Hispanic students by Year 3 of ADD Initiative	12, 586 Total
ELs in Year 1 of ADD Initiative	3, 489
ELs by Year 2 of ADD Initiative	4, 869
ELs by Year 3 of ADD Initiative	5, 542 Total

Source: Aeries. *Query for ethnicity and language fluency*. 2011; CRE= Culturally responsive education presentation developed by the district

Table 22. Year 1 Targeted Students

Name of School	Number of Hispanic Students	Number of ELs
San Juan ES	497	407
Kinoshita	623	522
Ambuehl	166	91
Del Obispo	209	123
Marco Forster MS	849	391
San Juan Hills HS	552	179
Wood Canyon	161	101
Oak Grove	175	81
Moulton	134	54
Aliso Niguel HS	375	86
Hankey K-8	216	107
Barcelona Hills	115	46
Viejo	299	200
Newhart	288	76
Capistrano Valley HS	781	205
Palisades	179	67
Lobo	170	96
Las Palmas	437	344
Shorecliffs MS	284	112
San Clemente HS	753	201

Source: Aeries. Query for ethnicity and language fluency. 2011

Table 23. Year 2 Targeted Students

Name of School	Number of Hispanic Students	Number of ELs
Hidden Hills	229	184
Malcom	71	14
Crown Valley	96	62
Niguel Hills MS	280	97
Oso Grande	102	22
Ladera Ranch ES	132	73
Ladera Ranch MS	174	22
Concordia	111	61
Bernice Ayer MS	226	49
Benedict	97	13
Marblehead	188	129
Dana Hills HS	692	176
Aliso Viejo MS	216	68
Bergeson	110	61
Crown Valley	96	62
Laguna Niguel	121	91
Canyon Vista	108	40
Bathgate	60	39
Castille	103	45
Reilly	55	22
Serra HS	91	50

Source: Aeries. Query for ethnicity and language fluency. 2011

Table 24. *Year 3 Targeted Students*

Name of School	Number of Hispanic Students	Number of ELs
Tijeras Creek	71	17
Las Flores ES	116	37
Chaparral	111	46
Wagon Wheel	70	11
Las Flores MS	107	21
Arroyo Vista K-8	182	40
Tesoro HS	349	28
George White	129	74
RH Dana	291	215
Don Juan Avila ES	110	85
Don Juan Avila MS	151	37
Vista del Mar ES	159	45
Vista del Mar MS	89	17

Source: Aeries. *Query for ethnicity and language fluency*. 2011

Section B – Services and Supports Provided to Students

B1 - Screening Method

There are a variety of screening tools utilized; however, at this time, there is not one district-wide universal screening tool for each grade level. The RTI Task Force plans to investigate various screening methods. Once a recommendation has been made, the plan will be updated with further screening methods. Students who are considered at-risk in CUSD are currently identified with the following data-based methods:

1. DIBELS: Early intervention screening method used across the district for grades K-2. The measure shows areas of potential problems for students in the areas of literacy.
2. STAR Testing results: Students who score in the Far Below Basic (FBB) and Below Basic (BB) categories in grades 2-12 are considered at-risk.
3. Multiple-measure screening: For students who score at FBB, BB and Basic on the CST and are ELs, the CELDT is used to determine which ELs are at-risk. Intervention is provided for these students at the secondary level by enrolling them in special courses that utilize Keystone or Read 180 curriculum.
4. CAHSEE results: Students who do not pass the CAHSEE are enrolled in CAHSEE prep sections.
5. 8th Grade Reading Test: Test is given to all 8th graders to determine qualification for the 9th grade Reading Workshop class.
6. Various Placement Tests: Students are provided computer and paper/pencil based placement tests to determine individual levels for supplementary programs listed below.
7. Standards Based Report Card: Students who consistently score at level 1 or 2 (out of 4) are provided interventions.

B2 - Types of Services and Supports

After a student is screened and considered at-risk, students are provided the following interventions by licensed staff. After the RTI Task Force provides recommendations for additional interventions, or changes to the interventions listed below, this report will be updated to reflect the changes. Students who are at the elementary level are currently provided various interventions such as:

- Language for Learning
- SRA Corrective Reading (decoding and comprehension)
- Step up to Writing
- Fast Math
- Fraction Nation
- Early Reading Intervention
- Early Interventions in Reading

Students who are considered at-risk at the secondary level are provided the following interventions:

- Reading workshop classes –intensive reading course that is designed to improve fluency and comprehension.
- Basic ELA and ELD classes – designed to be level specific and develop academic vocabulary while accelerating progress to return to the mainstream core class as soon as possible. The course is available for ELs and SWD and uses Keystone curriculum.
- CAHSEE intervention classes – course designed to focus on remediation and preparation for the CAHSEE exam.
- APEX computer-based courses – computer-based courses that are designed for students who are credit deficient.

B3-B6 – Progress Monitoring

Table 26 contains information about progress monitoring. On a daily basis, teachers are monitoring the academic progress of students in their classes. While there is not a district mandated set of tools to use at this time, the district is in the process of beginning to create common assessments and benchmarking tools for teachers. Teachers are responsible for monitoring students and making instructional decisions for their students. Some sites have instructional assistants who provide intervention to students but the teachers are leading the effort. The tools that are currently used to collect data for targeted students, how often the data will be collected, how the results will be used and who will be responsible for doing it are outlined below.

Table 26. *Progress Monitoring in CUSD*

Data Collection Tools	Schedule	Use of Results	Who Will Do It
Curriculum Unit Tests	Every 4-6 weeks	To determine reteaching needs, to plan for future instruction and to determine student progress	Teacher
ALS Benchmark Tests at selected sites	3 times per year	To predict CST performance	Teacher
Daily SIOP Review and Assessment (also known as “checking for understanding”)	Daily – several times per lesson	To determine if content and language objectives were met and to see if students understood concepts	Teacher

The following are changes or plans for future progress monitoring in the district:

- District-wide benchmarking in ELA and Math at the HS level
- District-wide common assessments
- Aligning assessments to the Common Core Standards

Section C – Professional Development

As a part of the SD-CEIS plan, teachers and administrators will receive professional development (PD) in **culturally responsive education, second language acquisition and gifted characteristics of students**. As mentioned in section A, a presentation will be developed that addresses these three areas. The district will investigate various ways to present the professional development to teachers and administrators such as using PLC time already set aside and using technology to share ideas. The professional development plan begins with a discussion with GEMAS consultant, TOSAs and principals to create a presentation for staff that includes the following resources:

- Scholarly Journal Review: *Addressing the Disproportionate Representation of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students in Special Education through Culturally Responsive Education Systems* (Klingner, Artiles, Kozleski, Harry, Zion, Tate, Duran & Riley, 2005).
- Research Study Review: *Equity in Gifted Education: A State Initiative* (Slocumb & Olenchak, 2006).
- Research Based Approaches Study: *Improving Education for English Learners* (California Department of Education, 2010).

Key points that will be included:

1. Define what culturally responsive education, second language acquisition and gifted characteristics are, what they look like and what they will do for students.
2. Follow a two-pronged approach: Implement instructional practices that are valid for promoting the objectives of the PD and to develop attributes of culturally responsive teachers.
3. Include experiences that focus on the central role of culture in teaching and encourage educators to reflect and become self-aware of them in this role. The intention is not to lay blame, but to become aware of how beliefs affect actions, especially when they are deep seeded within experiences.
4. Create a supportive teaching community that is ready for change. The PD will be more successful if it is incorporated into the SIOP Model and peer coaching structure that is being built up in the district. Peer coaching encourages discussion about practice so adding the layer of culturally responsive education will improve the chances of sustaining change.
5. Use student outcome data in discussions. A change to the culture of the schools in the district will be to begin to use demographic and academic achievement data together to determine instructional effectiveness.
6. School administrators are required to be a part of the discussions on culture. Setting the expectation from leadership will be vital to the success of the PD.
7. Build in long term support. Using the model for TOSA support in the ADD Initiative, teacher leaders will be trained to peer coach other teachers. Sharing knowledge, discussing how it affects practice and learning from each other help to sustain the program and the teachers, TOSAs and administrators.

8. Take ownership of changes. After having the opportunity to become more self-aware, a commitment to continue to advocate for culturally responsive education will result.

Section D – IDEA Funds Used for SD-CEIS

SD-CEIS Budget Information

The LEA must provide its contact information and indicate the fiscal year (FY) 2008-09 IDEA 611 and IDEA 619 allocation received from the SELPA and fiscal year 2009-10 IDEA 611 and IDEA 619 (including IDEA ARRA) allocations.

Contact Information

LEA CDS Code	Name	Address	Telephone
30-66464	Capistrano Unified School District	33122 Valle Road San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675	949-234-9200

SELPA Name	Address	Telephone
Capistrano Unified School District	33122 Valle Road San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675	949-234-9200

Prior Year Allocation for Special Education Services

What is the allocation that SELPA provided to the LEA in FY 2008-09 from IDEA 611 and IDEA 619 resources (3310, 3315, and 3320)?

Resource 3310 Allotment	Resource 3315 Allotment	Resource 3320 Allotment	Total FY 2008-09 IDEA Allotment
\$7,369,015	\$212,431	\$454,504	\$8,035,950

Current Year Allocation for Special Education Services

What is the allocation that the SELPA provided to the LEA in FY 2009-10 from IDEA 611, IDEA 619, ARRA IDEA 611, and ARRA IDEA 619 resources (3310, 3315, 3320, 3313, 3319, and 3324)?

Resource 3310 Allotment	Resource 3315 Allotment	Resource 3320 Allotment	Total FY 2009-10 IDEA Allotment
\$7,862,824	\$200,113	\$484,961	\$8,547,898
Resource 3313 Allotment	Resource 3319 Allotment	Resource 3324 Allotment	Total ARRA IDEA Allotment
\$9,407,537	\$336,867	\$580,235	\$10,324,639

The SD-CEIS budget is 15% of the sum of the total FY 2009-10 IDEA and total ARRA IDEA allotments.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, this report is true and correct and is in compliance with federal and state law.

949-234-9203

Print Superintendent Name _____

Telephone Number _____

Budget Detail Worksheet

**Coordinated Early Intervening Services Work Plan of Improvement for Student Services
(See Section B1-B6)**

Priority Area -	Number of Students in CEIS (See A4)	Services and Support for Kids (See B1)	Methods Progress Monitoring (See B3-B6)	Person Responsible (See B2)	Target Date	Estimated IDEA Funds Used (See D1)
Academic for Students by focusing on <u>Instructional Practice</u> for Teachers	7, 263	RTI Task Force Findings for District-wide program. Others that are in use: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DIBELS 2. STAR Testing – FBB and BB 3. CELDT Testing results 4. CAHSEE results 5. 8th Grade Reading Test 6. Standards Based Report Card 7. Placement tests for supplemental programs 8. Reading Workshop classes 9. Keystone and Read 180 curriculum 10. CAHSEE interventi 	SIOP – Review and Assessment In place DAILY in each lesson to check for understanding Curricular Unit Tests Benchmark Tests (at selected sites) Standards based report card	TOSAs Teacher Consultant School Psychologist	2/2011-6/2011	424,000 N/A 10,000 600,000
Pathway 2 – <i>Culturally Responsive Education Systems</i>						

		principals to present to teachers during PLC time	Hispanic students by 75 students			
		<u>Step 4</u> Peer coach to sustain change				

**Significant Disproportionality and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (SD-CEIS)
Plan Program Resources and Budget Summary for Fiscal Years (2010-2011)**

Purpose: An estimate of the expenditures for the SD-CEIS program. Summarize program resources in line item budgets.

Note: Indicate the amount of funds allocated to each budget item for program expenditures. Refer to the California State Accounting Manual for specifics of each category. Budget totals should match the sum of estimated IDEA funds in the budget detail worksheet and 15 percent of the total allotments on page 19 (Current Year Allocation for Special Education Services)

LEA Name: CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT **CDS CODE:** 30-66464

PROGRAM RESOURCES	CEIS IDEA FUNDS (Section 611, 619 & ARRA) Est. Expenditures List Specific Line Items	COST	TOTAL
1000-Certificated Salaries	Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA)	5.3 FTE	\$424,000
	Elementary Teaching Assistant Principals (ETAP's)	3.0 FTE	\$240,000
	Special Ed. Administrator Support	.5 FTE	\$50,000
	Speech Pathologists	40 @ .2 FTE = 8.0 FTE	\$640,000
	Speech Pathologists – Language Builders /Artic. Summer Class	40 hrs. @ \$35/hr.	\$1,400
	School Psychologists	30 @ .2 FTE = 6.0 FTE	\$480,000
	Student Study Team Site Coordinators	1 day release x 6 times per yr. x 54 sites @ \$210/day	\$68,040
	Substitutes for SST Meetings	2 subs per school, 6 times per yr. x 54 sites @ \$90/day	\$58,320
2000- Classified Salaries	Director, Early Childhood Education	.2 FTE	\$20,000
	Supervisors, Early Childhood Education	3 @ .2 FTE = .6 FTE	\$36,000
	Preschool Teachers	20 @ .2 FTE = 4.0 FTE	\$152,000
3000-Employee Benefits	Health and welfare benefits		\$552,000
4000-Materials and Supplies	Keystone Curriculum		\$536
	Fraction Nation software		\$500
	Fast Math software		\$500
	Computers	2 @ \$1,100	\$2,200
	iTouch Carts	2 @ \$10,000	\$20,000
5000-Service and other operating costs			\$0
Total Direct Costs			\$2,745,496
7300-Indirect Costs (at CDE approved rate)		CDE Approved rate of 3.11%	\$85,385
Total Program Budget (sum of direct costs plus indirect costs)			\$2,830,881
Authorized Agent Signature		Date of Report	
Authorized Agent Name		Authorized Agent Title	
CDE USE ONLY			

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Section E – Program Evaluation

Through the implementation of the SD-CEIS plan, which integrates culturally responsive education into the ADD Initiative, Capistrano Unified School District intends to resolve the disproportionate representation of Hispanic students and ELs in special education and GATE. In order to determine if the plan is successful, the following measurable outcomes will be analyzed and adjustments will be made as needed.

Goals and Outcomes

- ❖ **Goal:** A presentation will be created based on the information listed in Section C.
 - **Outcome:** A PowerPoint presentation will be created that can be presented by the TOSAs or principals.
 - **Measure:** The completed presentation on culturally responsive education.

- ❖ **Goal:** Teachers and administrators participating in the ADD Initiative will receive training in culturally responsive education, which includes second language acquisition and characteristics of gifted students.
 - **Outcome:** With support from TOSA, teachers will implement the attributes of culturally responsive teachers.
 - **Measure:** Survey results from an anonymous survey.

- ❖ **Goal:** Student achievement for the Hispanic subgroup and the EL subgroup will increase yearly.
 - **Outcome:** Hispanic and EL students will achieve more when teachers use SIOP infused with culturally responsive education.
 - **Measure:** Hispanic and EL students' subgroup scores will increase by two percentile points in the AYP report.

- ❖ **Goal:** Identification for Hispanic and EL students in the gifted program will increase yearly.
 - **Outcome:** Teachers will begin to widen their view of what culturally and linguistically diverse students can achieve.
 - **Measure:** Increase in eligibility for screening of Hispanic students.
 - **Measure:** Parent education workshop for parents of Hispanic and English Learner students on GATE program, criteria, and fee-based program.

**LEA AND SELPA Assurance of Compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities
Education Act (IDEA) of 2004**

Regarding Implementation of Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)

As a special condition for receipt of the regular FY 2009 IDEA and IDEA American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds, the LEA must meet the following:

Part 1: The LEA shall comply with 34 *CFR* Section 300.646 that requires an LEA to:

- a) Reserve the maximum amount (15 percent) of the Part B IDEA sections 611 and 619, and ARRA IDEA sections 611 and 619 funds received for comprehensive CEIS. In accordance with these regulations, the LEA agrees that it cannot reduce its state and local and/or local expenditures for its maintenance of effort by the allowable 50 percent adjustment of the new funds received in the 2010-2011 fiscal year.
- b) Provide for the review and, if appropriate, revision of the policies, procedures, practices used for the identification or placement of students into special education that complies with IDEA requirements.
- c) Publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices discussed in Part 1(b).

Part 2: The LEA shall comply with the provisions of IDEA (20 *United States Code [U.S.C.]* Section 1413[f] and the regulations in 34 *CFR* 300.226 that define and describe CEIS. Specifically, IDEA CEIS funds may be used to supplement, but not supplant, activities funded with and carried out under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA; 34 *CFR* 300.266[e]).

Part 3: The LEA shall report to the Special Education Division the FY 2009-2010 Part B IDEA sections 611 and 619 grant amounts that the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) allocated to it. Similar, the LEA agrees to provide the FY 2010-2011 Part B IDEA sections 611 and 619, and ARRA IDEA sections 611 and 619 amounts the SELPA has allocated to it and/or the methodology used by the SELPA to determine the estimated amount of special education funds the LEA will be allocated for FY 2010-2011.

Part 4: For FY 2010-2011, the LEA shall provide a budget to the Special Education Division for the 15 percent set-aside for CEIS. This budget shall provide how and on whom these funds will be spent to implement and/or improve the LEA's comprehensive CEIS plan. **The LEA shall report quarterly expenditures on the SD-CEIS budget detail worksheet.**

Part 5: The LEA shall implement CEIS as described in the guidance contained in the ED Memorandum entitled, "Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)". See section CEIS questions 1-8 on pages 2 to 5.

Part 6: The LEA shall comply with the guidance and monitoring provided by CDE, Special Education Division, including making records, data and reports available through a knowledgeable and accountable contact person.

The signatures to follow convey agreement with the above six parts.

LEA Superintendent	SELPA Director
LEA Special Education Director	School Board Chairperson

--	--

Appendix

Significant Disproportionality

Coordinated Early Intervening Services Plan Review (SD-CEIS)

Capistrano Unified School District

2010-2011/3021, Capistrano USD

District Name

Review Year/SD-CEIS Plan #

Preparation					
Requirement	Yes	No	Identify in Quarterly Report?	Page # in Plan	Comments
Timely Submission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Notified in 2009
Extension Requested	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Program Status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Proposed Plan Submission Date	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		March 9, 2011
COMPONENTS OF SD-CEIS PLAN					
1. Convened a planning group	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 4	
Identify members, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal & external • Parents • SELPA 	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 4	
Define LEA leadership team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider general v. special education • Frequency of updates to superintendent • Breadth of LEA buy-in 	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
2. Policies, procedures and practices reviewed with CDE staff (compliance portion of the review)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
3. Complete one programmatic self-assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data-driven root cause ID • Pathway identification • Significant disproportionality monitoring/adjustment 	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5-19	Included special education review and GATE review; Pathway 2

Requirement	Yes	No	Identify in quarterly report?	Page # in plan	Comments
Review other current LEA improvement activities to address CEIS needs	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2-3, 21	
Select pathway(s) to implement	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	20	
4. SD-CEIS Plan (Narrative)	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2-42	
A1. Summary of findings from self-review, including root causes	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4-19	
A2. Identify pathway selected & describe implementation	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	20	
A3. List of academic or behavioral area	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	25	
A4. Number of students expected to receive academic support/services	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	28	
B1. Description of screening method	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	30	
B2. Lists current and future services and supports	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	30, 32	
B3. Lists tools used to collect data for each type of service	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	26	All included in Table 26
B4. Specifies how often progress will be measured	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	26	All included in Table 26
B5. Describes how data will be used	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	26	All included in Table 26
B6. List type of positions who are responsible for implementing interventions/supports	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	26	All included in Table 26
C1. If providing PD, list pathway: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD topics • Types of staff participating in PD 	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	33	
D1. Services & supports for students and the PD activities for current fiscal year (see budget)	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	34	
E1. List of measurable outcomes/goals expected to achieve	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	38	

Requirement	Yes	No	Identify in quarterly report?	Page # in plan	Comments
5. Budget <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15% of Federal fund allocated will be used by September 2011 • Funds are appropriate to coordinated activities • 15% of IDEA funds to be spent on significant disproportionality 	√	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	34	
Revised Budget based on CDE input	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Signed Assurances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	39	
SELPA review/certification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	39	

APPROVALS

Consultant: _____ **Date:** ____/____/____
Signature Printed Name

Administrator: _____ **Date:** ____/____/____
Signature Printed Name

Quarterly Periodic Reporting	Yes	No	Comments
Date	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Date	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	