

SECTION V.B.

SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY REPORTING FORM

Introduction:

In accordance with 34 CFR § 300.647 (b)(7), States are required to report to the Secretary risk ratio thresholds, minimum cell sizes, minimum n-sizes, standards for measuring reasonable progress, if appropriate, and rationales for each. In general, these rationales must contain justifications for the choices made, including all relevant data and research relied upon to make an informed choice and how the State included stakeholders in that process. Additionally, pursuant to the authority established in Section 618(a)(3) of the IDEA, the Secretary is also requiring States to report the number of years of data used by your State in making annual determinations of significant disproportionality.

Section A: Minimum N-Sizes

<p>1. Has the State:</p> <p>a. established a minimum n-size of 30 or less in each of the 14 categories of analysis described in § 300.647(b)(3) and (4) and</p> <p>b. verified that the State does not expect to have a comparison group in any of the categories of analysis that meets the minimum n-size?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No</p>
--	--

If you answered YES to question 1, stop. Go to Page 14, enter the name, title and click "Submit".

<p>2. Does your State use a presumptively reasonable minimum n-size of 30 or less for each of the 14 categories of analysis described in § 300.647(b)(3) and (4)?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>
---	--

If you answered YES to question 2 please answer question 2a:

<p>2a. Does your State use the same minimum n-size for all categories of analysis?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>
--	--

If you answered YES to question 2a:

- Fill in *Table 1* below by providing the minimum n-size and rationale.

If you answered NO to question 2a:

- Fill in *Table 2* below by providing the minimum n-sizes and rationales for each category of analysis.

If you answered NO to question 2 please read below and answer question 2b:

Minimum N-Size Detailed Rationale(s) Required

In addition to the justification described in the Introduction, the rationale(s) must include a detailed explanation of why the numbers chosen are reasonable and how they ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant disparities based on race and ethnicity in the identification, placement, or discipline of children with disabilities, as required by § 300.647(b)(7).

<p>2b. Does your State use the same minimum n-size for all categories of analysis?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>
--	---

If you answered YES to question 2b:

- Fill in *Table 1* below by providing the minimum n-size and *detailed* rationale.

If you answered NO to question 2b:

- Fill in *Table 2* below by providing the minimum n-sizes and *detailed* rationales for each category of analysis over 30.

Table 1: Minimum N-Size — Same Minimum N-Size for all Categories of Analysis

Category of Analysis	Minimum N-Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum n-size is more than 30)</i>
All categories of analysis	10	With stakeholders' input, Colorado decided on the minimum N-size of 10 because, we believed it 1) lets the SEA examine as many LEAs and as many racial/ethnic groups within LEAs as possible, 2) prevents inappropriate identification of LEAs as significantly disproportionate due to the risk ratio volatility, and 3) minimizes the use of alternate risk ratio.

Table 2: Minimum N-Size — Multiple Minimum N-Sizes

Category of Analysis	Minimum N-Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum n-size is more than 30)</i>
All disabilities		
Autism		
Emotional disturbance		
Intellectual disability		

Category of Analysis	Minimum N-Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum n-size is more than 30)</i>
Other health impairments		
Specific learning disability		
Speech and language impairments		
Inside a regular classroom less than 40% of day		
Inside separate schools and residential facilities		
Total disciplinary removals		
Out of school suspensions <10 days		

Category of Analysis	Minimum N-Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum n-size is more than 30)</i>
Out of school suspensions >10 days		
In school suspensions <10 days		
In school suspensions >10 days		

Section B: Minimum Cell Sizes

3. Does your State use a presumptively reasonable minimum cell size of 10 or less for each of the 14 categories of analysis described in § 300.647(b)(3) and (4)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
---	---

If you answered YES to question 3 please answer question 3a:

3a. Does your State only use one minimum cell size of 10 or less for all categories of analysis?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
--	---

If you answered YES to question 3a:

- Fill in *Table 3* below by providing the minimum cell size and rationale.

If you answered NO to question 3a:

- Fill in *Table 4* below by providing the minimum cell sizes and rationales for each category of analysis.

If you answered **NO** to question 3 please read below and answer question 3b:

Minimum Cell Size Detailed Rationale(s) Required

In addition to the justification described in the Introduction, the rationales must include a detailed explanation of why the numbers chosen are reasonable and how they ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant disparities, based on race and ethnicity, in the identification, placement, or discipline of children with disabilities, as required by § 300.647(b)(7).

3b. Does your State use the same minimum cell size for all categories of analysis?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
--	---------------------------	--------------------------

If you answered **YES** to question 3b:

- Fill in *Table 3* below by providing the minimum cell size and *detailed* rationale.

If you answered **NO** to question 3b:

- Fill in *Table 4* below by providing the minimum cell size and *detailed* rationales for each category of analysis over 10.

Table 3: Minimum Cell Size — Same Minimum Cell Size for all Categories of Analysis

Category of Analysis	Minimum Cell Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum cell size is more than 10)</i>
All categories of analysis	10	With stakeholders' input, Colorado decided on the minimum N-size of 10 because, we believed it 1) lets the SEA examine as many LEAs and as many racial/ethnic groups within LEAs as possible, 2) prevents inappropriate identification of LEAs as significantly disproportionate due to the risk ratio volatility, and 3) minimizes the use of alternate risk ratio.

Table 4: Minimum Cell Size — Multiple Minimum Cell Sizes

Category of Analysis	Minimum Cell Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum cell size is more than 10)</i>
All disabilities		
Autism		

Category of Analysis	Minimum Cell Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum cell size is more than 10)</i>
Emotional disturbance		
Intellectual disability		
Other health impairments		
Specific learning disability		
Speech and language impairments		
Inside a regular classroom less than 40% of day		
Inside separate schools and residential facilities		

Category of Analysis	Minimum Cell Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum cell size is more than 10)</i>
Total disciplinary removals		
Out of school suspensions <10 days		
Out of school suspensions >10 days		
In school suspensions <10 days		
In school suspensions >10 days		

Section C: Risk Ratio Thresholds

4. Does your State use one risk ratio threshold for each of the 14 categories of analysis described in § 300.647(b)(3) and (4)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
---	---

If you answered **YES** to question 4:

- Fill in *Table 5* below by providing the risk ratio threshold and rationale.

If you answered **NO** to question 4:

- Fill in *Table 6* below by providing the risk ratio thresholds and rationales for each category of analysis.

Table 5: Risk Ratios — Same Risk Ratio Threshold for all Categories of Analysis

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
All categories of analysis		

Table 6: Risk Ratios — Multiple Risk Ratio Thresholds

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
All disabilities	2.08	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado’s median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
Autism	2.98	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado’s median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
Emotional disturbance	3.00	Three median absolute deviations above Colorado’s median for this category exceeded a risk ratio of 3.0. The stakeholders recommended not to set a threshold that exceeded a risk ratio of 3.0. Thus, Colorado decided to cap the risk ratio threshold at 3.0 for any categories.
Intellectual disability	2.66	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado’s median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
Other health impairments	2.77	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
Specific learning disability	2.68	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
Speech and language impairments	2.25	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
Inside a regular classroom less than 40% of day	1.97	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
Inside separate schools and residential facilities	3.00	Three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category exceeded a risk ratio of 3.0. The stakeholders recommended not to set a threshold that exceeded a risk ratio of 3.0. Thus, Colorado decided to cap the risk ratio threshold at 3.0 for any categories.
Total disciplinary removals	2.71	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
Out of school suspensions <10 days	2.12	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
Out of school suspensions >10 days	3.00	Three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category exceeded a risk ratio of 3.0. The stakeholders recommended not to set a threshold that exceeded a risk ratio of 3.0. Thus, Colorado decided to cap the risk ratio threshold at 3.0 for any categories.
In school suspensions <10 days	2.36	The risk ratio corresponds to three median absolute deviations above Colorado's median for this category, which was calculated based on risk ratios for all LEAs observed during SY2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17.
In school suspensions >10 days	3.0	The median absolute deviation could not be reliably calculated for this category due to limited occurrences of in-school suspensions that exceeded 10 days. Given the stakeholder recommendation of not setting a threshold that exceeded a risk ratio of 3.0, Colorado decided to set a threshold for this category at 3.0.

Section D: Reasonable Progress

5. Does your state utilize the reasonable progress flexibility?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
---	---

If you answered **NO** to question 5, proceed to question 6.

5a. Does your state utilize the same reasonable progress flexibility for each of the 14 categories of analysis described in § 300.647(b)(3) and (4)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
--	---

If you answered **YES** to question 5a:

- Fill in *Table 7* below by providing the State's standard for measuring reasonable progress and rationale.

If you answered **NO** to question 5a:

- Fill in *Table 8* below by providing the State's standards for reasonable progress and the rationale for each category of analysis.

Table 7: Reasonable Progress — Same Standard for all Categories of Analysis

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
All categories of analysis		

Table 8: Reasonable Progress — Multiple Standards

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
All disabilities	Reduction of RR0.35 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Autism	Reduction of RR0.63 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Emotional disturbance	Reduction of RR0.74 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Intellectual disability	Reduction of RR0.53 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Other health impairments	Reduction of RR0.56 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
Specific learning disability	Reduction of RRO.55 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Speech and language impairments	Reduction of RRO.41 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Inside a regular classroom less than 40% of day	Reduction of RRO.32 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Inside separate schools and residential facilities	Reduction of RRO.64 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Stakeholders determined that a risk ratio reduction that corresponds to a median absolute deviation should represent a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Total disciplinary removals	Reduction of RRO.54 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Out of school suspensions <10 days	Reduction of RRO.36 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Stakeholders determined that a risk ratio reduction that corresponds to a median absolute deviation should represent a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
Out of school suspensions >10 days	Reduction of RRO.76 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
In school suspensions <10 days	Reduction of RRO.44 or greater in a 2-year period	The amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress corresponds to the median absolute deviation of this category. Colorado determined with Stakeholders' input that a risk ratio reduction that corresponded to a median absolute deviation represented a meaningful benefit to children in the LEA, rather than statistical noise or chance.
In school suspensions >10 days	Reduction of RRO.52 or greater in a 2-year period	The median absolute deviation could not be reliably calculated for this category due to limited occurrences of in-school suspensions that exceeded 10 days. An average of median absolute deviations for all discipline categories was used as the amount of risk ratio reduction necessary to qualify for reasonable progress for this category.

Section E: Number of Years of Data

6. Does your state use the same number of years of data in making annual determinations of significant disproportionality for each of the 14 categories of analysis described in § 300.647(b)(3) and (4)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
---	---

If you answered **YES** to question 6:

- Fill in *Table 9* below by providing the number of years of data the State uses in making annual determinations of significant disproportionality.

If you answered **NO** to question 6:

- Fill in *Table 10* below by providing the number of years of data the State uses in making annual determinations of significant disproportionality for each category of analysis.

Table 9: Years of Data — Same Number of Years Used for all Categories of Analysis

Category of Analysis	Number of Years of Data Used
All categories of analysis	3

Table 10: Years of Data — Multiple Number of Years of Data Used

Category of Analysis	Number of Years of Data Used
All disabilities	
Autism	
Emotional disturbance	
Intellectual disability	
Other health impairments	
Specific learning disability	
Speech and language impairments	
Inside a regular classroom less than 40% of day	
Inside separate schools and residential facilities	
Total disciplinary removals	
Out of school suspensions <10 days	
Out of school suspensions >10 days	
In school suspensions <10 days	
In school suspensions >10 days	

Name of Individual Preparing the Form: Miki Imura

Title of Individual Preparing the Form: Supervisor of Data Accountability & Achievement

Date: 05/11/20

SUBMIT