



Disproportionate Representation

Indicators 9 & 10

Valid & Reliable Data Concerns:

The State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services, but did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2006. (Both Indicators 9 & 10 - 15%)

State Example:

Phase 1: Identification of Disproportionate Representation

For FFY 2006, October enrollment and December child count data were finalized by February 1 of 2007. Weighted and inverted weighted risk ratios were calculated in Phase 1 during the spring of 2007. 81 school districts were identified as having disproportionate representation and advanced to Phase 2 for a determination of whether they had inappropriate identification of racial and ethnic groups for specific disabilities in FFY 2006.

Phase 2: Review of Policies, Procedures, & Practices

The 81 school districts identified in Phase 1 during FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation were reviewed in Phase 2 during FFY 2006 beginning with finalization of their monitoring data in June of 2007. Nine of these districts were determined to have inappropriate identification of racial and ethnic groups for specific disabilities and advanced to Phase 3 for corrective action in FFY 2007. There were a total of 469 school districts during FFY 2006, and the resultant measurement for FFY 2006 is 1.9% ($9 / 469 * 100$).

The State did not describe how it determined that disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification (e.g. monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures) for FFY 2006.

State Examples:

To verify that disproportionate representation in each LEA identified is not the result of inappropriate identification, the Department examined the policies, procedures, and practices (including student tracking logs, referral, and eligibility processes) to ensure that LEAs are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements.

The State did not examine data for the underrepresentation of races and ethnicities in special education and related services. (Indicator 9 - 11%; Indicator 10 - 10%)

The State did not examine data for all races and ethnicities present in the State. (Indicator 9 - 7%; Indicator 10 – 6%)

Other Concerns

Use of significant disproportionality and disproportionate representation interchangeably.

“n” sizes

Timely correction
(Indicator 9 - 17%;
Indicator 10 - 22%)