

OSEP/DAC B4b Webinar

Angela Tanner-Dean and Diana Chang, OSEP
Haidee Bernstein, Julie Bollmer, Tom Munk, DAC
Tuesday, October 11, 2011



Agenda

- ❖ Reporting requirements for FFY 2010 SPP/APR due February 1, 2012
- ❖ Review of questions generated from mega conference presentation
- ❖ Brief walk through of TA guide
- ❖ Q&A

FFY 2010 SPP/APR Reporting Requirements

For 4B, using 2009-10 data, provide the following:

(a) the number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs **MUST BE COMPLETED BY FEBRUARY 1, 2012 USING AN ACCEPTABLE METHOD** and,

(b) the number of districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards **MUST BE COMPLETED BY FEBRUARY 1, 2012, OR BY THE END OF THE FFY 2010 APR CLARIFICATION PERIOD** and,

FFY 2010 SPP/APR Reporting Requirements

If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (a.k.a. results of the review) **CAN BE SUBMITTED FEBRUARY 1, 2012, OR BY END OF THE FFY 2010 APR CLARIFICATION PERIOD, OR IN FFY 2011 APR, DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2013.**

FFY 2010 SPP/APR Reporting Requirements in other words....

- The number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs (part a of B4b) must be submitted **BY FEBRUARY 1, 2012** for a State to meet requirements for this indicator. The data must be calculated using an acceptable methodology as described in OSEP guidance and the calculation must be based on 2009-10 data*, and
- If a State has not completed its policies, procedures or practices review (part b of B4b) because additional districts were identified when the State applied its revised calculation methodology, the State has the option of submitting these data (part b of B4b) either **BY FEBRUARY 1, 2012, OR BY THE END OF THE FFY 2010 APR CLARIFICATION PERIOD**, and

*States are not required to recalculate the 2008-2009 data that was submitted in the FFY 2009 SPP/APR on February 1, 2011

FFY 2010 SPP/APR Reporting Requirements in other words....

- The States description of how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (a.k.a. results of the review) can be submitted **BY FEBRUARY 1, 2012, OR BY THE END OF THE FFY 2010 APR CLARIFICATION PERIOD, OR IN THE FFY 2011 APR, DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2013**

FFY 2010 SPP/APR Reporting Requirements

If your State does not report complete data in the February 1, 2012 submission, please include in the narrative the State's plan/timeline for reporting B4b (part b) data and/or the description of the results of review

FFY 2010 SPP/APR Reporting Requirements

- All States must submit FFY 2010 B4b data on an APR template.
- If a State chooses to revise its calculation methodology (and also reestablish baseline), information should be provided in the APR regarding why the change is taking place.

FFY 2010 SPP/APR Reporting Requirements

- Additionally, any State that changes its B4b calculation methodology must submit a revised SPP to reflect this change with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.

Questions Generated from the Mega Session Presentation

Questions Related to Timelines

- ❖ Please describe how states should proceed if changes are needed, as this feedback was not included in the state's response table, and the data are already lagged by one year. We currently are: (1) receiving feedback on B4B FFY08 data, (2) have worked on FFY09 using our previous method to report on the 2/1/12 SPP/APR, and (3) ready to calculate FFY10. Additionally, The B4B TA guide won't be available until Fall 2011.

Questions Related to Timelines

- ❖ We already started the policies, procedures, and practices (p/p/p) review for 2009-10 and are starting the process for 2010-11. Can we combine 2009-10 and 2010-11 since this poses a logistical problem that we'd like to avoid?

General Methodology Questions

- ❖ How do we know if our methodology for 4B is an acceptable one or not?
- ❖ Will the guidance to states address using multiple years of data?

Questions and Comments Related to the Use of Methods Resembling B9 and B10

- ❖ Which methods for B9/B10 are not appropriate for B4?
- ❖ Why is it OK to use a risk ratio for Indicators 9 and 10, if it's unacceptable or discriminatory for Indicator 4B? What is the difference?
- ❖ If I change my methodology for B4B, do I need to change my methodology for determining significant disproportionality in discipline as it relates to CEIS?

Questions and Comments Related to Small Cell Sizes

- ❖ When a district has only the White group with large enough numbers for analysis (i.e., it has no race comparison group), is it exempt from B4B?
- ❖ If there are districts in my state with zero suspensions/expulsions, should those districts be included in the analysis? Is it ok to have a minimum cell size requirement that is based on the number of children suspended/expelled?

Questions and Comments Related to Comparison Option 1

- When calculating the state rate, should all districts be included, even those that would be excluded from the analyses because they don't meet the minimum cell size?

Questions and Comments Related to Comparison Option 1

- ❖ It seems inherent in the PowerPoint that, using means and variations, significant discrepancies could always exist if there is a comparison to state.
- ❖ Likewise using means and standard deviations would “move” the bar, as state rates vary year to year.
- ❖ In the comparison of one LEA to the “state,” you seem to include the data of the one LEA in the “state” numbers, so effectively you are comparing that LEA to itself, as part of the state numbers/percentages.

Questions and Comments Related to Comparison Option 1

- ❖ Using a “state bar” whether mean, standard deviations, etc. allows the “state bar” to move up each year. This seems to contradict one of the “unacceptable” or “questionable” practices for 4B, which was that the suspension/expulsion rate for African Americans was high, so SD would not be identified. If the state bar continues to rise, doesn't that follow the same problematic logic?

Questions and Comments Related to Comparison Option 1

- ❖ How would we address the concern that districts with very high rates of suspending Black students affect the state's calculation, thereby resulting in not identifying many districts that we would otherwise identify if these outlier districts did not impact the state's rate?

Questions and Comments Related to Comparison Option 1

- ❖ States have districts that are many times more likely to suspend a Black student than a White student. These districts would not be identified using the required calculation since the rate of suspension of Black students is less than the statewide average.

Questions and Comments Related to Comparison Option 2

- ❖ In general, male minority students are disciplined more often than other students, and that holds true for students with disabilities and nondisabled students. The acceptable calculation for B4b Method 2 or any of the calculations that use all races as the comparison group means that special education will be addressing a general education issue. Why?

B4 TA Guide

Can be found at: [ideadata.org](https://www.ideadata.org)

The screenshot shows a Windows Internet Explorer browser window displaying the website <https://www.ideadata.org/Products.asp>. The page header includes the Data Accountability Center logo and the text "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Data". Below the header is a navigation bar with three tabs: "IDEA Data", "TA Materials", and "Data Collection Forms". The "TA Materials" tab is selected and highlighted in orange. The main content area is titled "Products" and contains a description: "Materials developed to assist in data analysis and improve data quality are available by accessing the links on this page." Below this description are several links and sections. The link "B4 - Suspension and Expulsion" is circled in red. Other links include "August 4, 2011 DAC Results Workshop", "Cell Suppression", and "Data Quality".

Due Dates

[618 Data-B](#)
[618 Data-C](#)

New

[MOE & CEIS \(Table 8\) Data Draft Data Notes](#)

[August 4 Results Workshop](#)

[Parent-report scales Two](#)

Products

Materials developed to assist in data analysis and improve data quality are available by accessing the links on this page.

August 4, 2011 DAC Results Workshop

B4 - Suspension and Expulsion
Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide (Version 1.0), September 2011 (PDF / MS-Word)

Cell Suppression
Cell Suppression Policy for IDEA Data, December 22, 2009 (PDF / MS-Word)

Data Quality
Taking Your Data To the Laundry: How to Clean Your Data, Revised December 2008 (PDF / MS-Word)

Q&A

Questions????

We are available:

HaideeBernstein@Westat.com

JulieBollmer@Westat.com

TomMunk@Westat.com

Angela.Tanner-Dean@ed.gov

Diana.Chang@ed.gov