Disproportionality

Special Education Data Summit
June 26, 2007

Jean Chen, Ph.D.
Statistician/Research Assistant
IDEA Data and Research
University of Arkansas-Little Rock

Mike Crowley, Ph.D.
Administrator
Monitoring/Program Effectiveness
ADE Special Education Unit
In order to demonstrate educational equity, relative to opportunity, services, and decision-making, the racial composition of students receiving special education services in a school district should be proportionally similar to the composition of students in the district.

A significant difference between the percentages may indicate disproportionate representation.

It is important to ensure that these students in a school district are not disproportionately represented in special education in contrast with other students in the district.
This Session Looks at...

• Defining disproportionality
• Determination of “significant disproportionality”
• Data source, analysis, reporting, and relate to Focused Monitoring
• IDEA 2004’s provisions
• Best Practices
• Resources for LEAs
Monitoring Priorities: Disproportionality

Indicator 9 (Eligibility category) (New)
Indicator 10 (Child with a disability) (New)

Disproportionate representation is defined as: “the extent to which membership in a given group affects the probability of being placed in a category.”

- Indicator 9 and 10 are compliance indicators
- Districts have been identified based on data
- For new indicators, baseline data are due Feb. 1, 2007 (2005-06 APR) Collected in 2005-06
Monitoring Priorities: Disproportionality

Indicator 9 (Eligibility category) (New)
Indicator 10 (Child with a disability) (New)

Six specific disability categories:
- Mental retardation
- Specific learning disabilities
- Autism
- Emotional disturbance
- Speech or language impairments
- Other health impairments
Defining “Significant Disproportionality”

State defines for LEAs and for state in general

2006-2007 Arkansas School Districts and Cities

State determines criteria for what level of disproportionality is significant

ADE’s criteria has been the Focused Monitoring criteria
Disproportionate Representation in Special Education & Related Services

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

This new indicator provides a mechanism for identifying disproportionate representation based on race/ethnicity for students with disabilities, age 6-21, that is the result of inappropriate identification, by analyzing state and school district level data using composition and risk ratio formulas.
Formula (Indicator 9)

\[
\text{SpEd Race Rate} - \frac{\text{Black SpED/Black Child Count}}{\text{District Race Rate}} - \frac{\text{Black Enrolment/Enrollment}}{}
\]
Actual Target Data for 2005-2006 (Indicator 9)

- Zero (0) percent of districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
Indicator 9

• When a district is identified as Significant Discrepancy Disproportionality via FM calculation or Risk Ratio

• Monitoring with reviews on LEA policies, procedures, and practices
Focused Monitoring Disproportionality Calculation Triggering Then and Now

**Then**
- If a district is triggered by the Focused Monitoring Disproportionality, this district will be reviewed on its polices, procedures, and practices (3Ps)

**Now**
- Focused Monitoring Disproportionality will no longer include Private Residential in the calculation
- There is a new trigger value for 2007-08 FM Profile (with 2006-07 data)
Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Areas

**Indicator 10:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

This new indicator provides a mechanism for identifying disproportionate representation based on race/ethnicity and disability category for students with disabilities, age 6-21, that is the result of inappropriate identification, by analyzing state and school district level data using composition and risk ratio formulas.
Formula (Indicator 10)

Race Disability Category Rate
Disability Category Black/Child Count

minus

District Disability Category Rate
Disability Category District/Child Count
Actual Target Data for 2005-2006 (Indicator 10)

- Zero (0) percent of districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification.
Statistics on Indicator 10

- African-American children *Twice* as likely as Whites to be identified as having mental retardation (43% vs. 52%).

- African-American children One-third as likely as White students to be classified with emotional disturbance (21% vs. 75%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006-2007 ADE</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Count</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>↑ 43%</td>
<td>↓ 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>↓ 21%</td>
<td>↑ 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Hypotheses on Disproportionality

- Failure of general education to educate children from diverse backgrounds (language, cultural differences)
- Misidentification, misuse of tests
- Lack of access to effective instruction
- Insufficient resources
- Inadequately trained educators or teachers who are less well prepared
- Other variables (poverty, assessment practices, systemic inequities)
Monitoring Priority Indicator: Over-Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Trigger Value (# of districts were triggered)</th>
<th>Disproportionate Minority Representation Risk Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>&gt; 6.71% Indica 9</td>
<td>&gt; 1.50 Indicator 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-yr average Black Child Count = 45.47%
3-yr Black Enrollment = 41.09%
Racial Difference between SpED & District=4.47% with a standard deviation of 2.24%. The trigger value is 6.71%.

The Risk Ratio of 1.50 for Black students indicates that Black students are 50% more likely to be identified for special education (every 10 non-Black, there are 15 Black students)
Focused Monitoring
Special Education 2005-2006 District Data

Risk Ratio (RR) indicate risk of racial disproportionality compared to all other races. The value is **BLUE** if the value is greater than 1.50 on Disproportionality Indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black - Special</td>
<td>28.97%</td>
<td>26.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black SE Students</td>
<td>62/214</td>
<td>53/202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black - District</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
<td>18.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black Students in District</td>
<td>334/1,639</td>
<td>281/1,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \frac{53}{202} = 26.24\% \]

\[ \frac{281}{1556} = 18.06\% \]

\[ 26.24\% - 18.06\% = 8.18\% \]

**Districts with fewer than 10 students in any identifiable Category for SpED or the districts are displayed with zeros.**
### Monitoring Priority Indicator: Over-Representation

#### 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07 FM Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Trigger Value (# of districts were triggered)</th>
<th>Disproportionate Minority Representation Risk Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>&gt; 6.71% (48) Indicator 9</td>
<td>&gt; 1.50 Indicator 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Trigger Value (Private Residential was not included)</th>
<th>Disproportionate Minority Representation Risk Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>&gt; 10.94% (15)</td>
<td>&gt; 1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When Trigger Value Changes …
What has happened to 251 districts

When % Black Child Count - % Black Enrollment =

15 districts
23.47

11 districts
10.90

6 districts
6.83

18 districts
0.00

75 districts
-4.10

158

18

75

10.94 (new Trigger Value)
15 districts triggered (5.98%)

6.71 (old Trigger Value)
48 districts triggered (16.73%)
### Disproportionality Risk Ratios by Disability Category

Risk Ratio (RR) indicate risk of racial disproportionality compared to all other races. The value is **blue** if the value is greater than **1.50** on Disproportionality Indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Category</th>
<th>Autism</th>
<th>Deaf-Blind</th>
<th>Emotional Disturbance</th>
<th>Hearing Impaired</th>
<th>Multiple Disabilities</th>
<th>Mental Retardation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td><strong>2.12</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>1.80</strong></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td><strong>5.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other Health Impairments</th>
<th>Orthopedic Impairments</th>
<th>Specific Learning Disability</th>
<th>Speech/Language Impairments</th>
<th>Traumatic Brain Injury</th>
<th>Visual Impairments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>1.60</strong></td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td><strong>0.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.94</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Elements and Source of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black (also Hispanic, White, etc.) students enrolled on October 1</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment on October 1</td>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Black (also Hispanic, White, etc.) special education students</td>
<td>Cycle 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment of special Education students</td>
<td>Cycle 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant Disproportionality

It is not just the percentage of students of specific race or ethnicity, it is the comparison.

Determining “Significant Disproportionality”

• Is based on collection and examination of data
• and *not* on a district’s policies, procedures, or practices.

What happens if there’s a determination of significant disproportionality?

• If Risk Ratio > 1.5, mentoring will come in to review IEPs in regards which race group
Goal

- Improve the quality of education statewide for all students, including students with disabilities, students of color and students living in poverty
- Increase our internal capacity to address statewide concerns relative to the disproportionate number of students of color referred and placed in special education
- Address disproportionality as an educational issue, not just as a special education issue
The Meaning of Disproportionality
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IDEA & Disproportionality Reporting Requirements

- Section 616 – indicators 9 & 10 of the SPP & APR
- Section 618 – Early Intervening Services
Disproportionality - Contributing Factors

- Invalid assessment & placement
- Low-quality instruction
What to do?
Best Practices

- Early Intervening/pre-referral
- Early intervening preplacement evaluations
- Sociocultural information
- Evaluation for disproportionality
1. Early Intervening/Pre-referral

- Involve support services
- Use multiple, well documented interventions
- Behavioral definition of problem, baseline record, intervention design
- Time frame
- Evaluation effects
2. Early Intervening preplacement evaluations

- Link assessment to referral issue(s)
- Use valid & reliable procedures
- Include data from natural setting
- Link assessment to intervention
- Well-trained & supported personnel
3. Sociocultural Information

- Differences NOT deficits
- Do not classify as deficits
4. Looking at disproportionality in your district

- Racial composition in special education compared to racial composition of total school population
- Racial proportions in judgmental categories
- Racial proportions in nonjudgmental categories
Careful......
Danger Points in Process

1. Early intervening/pre-referral
2. Referral
3. Evaluation
4. Placement
5. Services
1. Early intervening/pre-referral

Ask yourself:
- Do all schools in the district have quality early intervening/pre-referral intervention programs?
2. Referral

- Do racial proportions in evaluation referrals increase, decrease, or stay the same when compared to those found ineligible for special education?
- Compare disproportionate referrals by race & look for consistency and/or possible problem areas
3. Evaluation

- When referrals are disproportionate, does the disproportion decrease, increase or stay the same when compared to students eligible for special education?
- Review your evaluation process for possible problem areas
4. Placement

- Racial differences in evaluation decisions?
- Categorical disproportionate placement issues in which all students are routinely pulled out of all regular academic classes?
5. Services

- Is each student’s educational program individualized?
- Are all students offered a program of services to meet their specific needs?
- Are the needed services being provided?
- Are students making progress in achieving goals?
- Are you reviewing & addressing the appropriateness of each student’s program in a timely manner?
Questions and Comments
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