IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services for Federal Fiscal Year 2017 / School Year 2017–2018

OSEP Data Documentation

November 2019

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide information necessary to appropriately use the data file on Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the U.S. Department of Education. The accompanying data file provides the following information for every local educational agency (LEA) or educational service agency (ESA) that receives a sub-grant under IDEA Section 611 or 619:

- LEA/ESA Allocations which includes the IDEA 611 and 619 allocation amounts for each LEA/ESA in the State for the reference Federal fiscal year (FFY).

- MOE Reduction which includes the determination under the 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) for each LEA/ESA; how much the LEA/ESA reduced of local and/or State funds taken under Section 613(a)(2)(C) for the reference school year; whether LEAs/ESAs met the MOE compliance standard; and whether funds were returned to the Department of Education for failure to meet MOE compliance standard.

- Provision of CEIS which includes whether each LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality and whether each LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved funds for CEIS; for each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CEIS (required or voluntary), the dollar amount that was reserved during the reference school year; additionally, for each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for required CEIS due to significant disproportionality, the reason for which the LEA/ESA was identified for significant disproportionality.

- Number of Children Receiving CEIS which includes the number of children who received CEIS during the reference school year and the number of children who received CEIS at any time during the reference school year and the two preceding school years and received special education and related services during the reference school year.

1.2 OSEP Background

OSEP, within the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), is dedicated to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities ages birth through 21 by providing leadership and financial support to assist States, local districts and programs.

Section 618 of IDEA requires that each State submit data about the infants and toddlers, birth through age 2, who receive early intervention services under Part C of IDEA and children with disabilities, ages 3 through 21, who receive special education and related services under Part B of IDEA.

There are 12 data collections authorized under Section 618: under Part B: (1) Child Count; (2) Educational Environments; (3) Personnel; (4) Exiting; (5) Discipline; (6) Assessment; (7) Dispute Resolution; and (8) MOE Reduction and CEIS; and under Part C: (9) Child Count; (10) Settings; (11) Exiting; and (12) Dispute Resolution. These data are collected via an ED*Facts* system (i.e., ED*Facts* Submission System (ESS) or the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)). Information related to the Section 618 data collected via ESS can be found in the ED*Facts* Series - ED*Facts* Special Education/IDEA 2011-12 Study in the ED Data Inventory. Information related to the IDEA Section 618 data collected via E*MAPS* can be found in the IDEA Section 618 entry in the ED Data Inventory. This data documentation deals only with the Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection and file.

2.0 IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Data and Metadata

2.1 LEA / ESA Data

States / entities are required to report MOE Reduction and CEIS data under Title 1, Part A, and Subsection 618 of IDEA. States / entities are required to submit data on every LEA or ESA that received a sub-grant under IDEA Section 611 or 619. **NOTE**: A single ESA may include multiple LEAs.

Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Data comes from one file:

- IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS

This information is submitted to OSEP via E*MAPS* by the IDEA Part B data managers in each of the 60 IDEA Part B reporting entities.

States / entities were required to submit FFY 2017/SY 2017-18 data to E*MAPS* no later than May 1, 2019. OSEP reviewed the data for quality issues and provided feedback to States / entities. States / entities were given the opportunity to address the data quality issues by resubmitting the data or providing a data note prior to the data being published. Finalized data were extracted from the E*MAPS* system after 11:59pm ET on August 28, 2019. Please see Appendix A for the specific date each State / entity submitted these data.

2.2 State Supplemental Survey (SSS) – IDEA Metadata

The State Supplemental Survey – IDEA (SSS-IDEA) collects metadata related to the IDEA Section 618 data collections. OSEP uses the States' / entities' SSS-IDEA metadata responses to verify the accuracy of the IDEA Section 618 data and to appropriately understand and analyze the IDEA Section 618 data. This information is submitted to OSEP via E*MAPS* by the IDEA Part B data managers in each of the 60 IDEA Part B reporting entities. States / entities were required to submit initial SY 2017-18 metadata to E*MAPS* no later than February 21, 2018 and finalized metadata no later than January 16, 2019.

States / entities were required to report information on significant disproportionality via the SSS-IDEA, specifically responses to "What is your state's definition of significant disproportionality?". Please see Appendix D for responses submitted by each State / entity as of January 16, 2019.

2.3 Definitions

E*MAPS* – A Web-based tool used to provide State Education Agencies (SEAs) with an easy method of reporting and maintaining data to (1) meet Federal reporting requirements, and (2) provide information on State policies, plans, and metadata in order to aid in the analysis of data collected.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number – The 7-character NCES LEA ID number that is used to uniquely identify a school district. These NCES ID numbers are also used to identify LEAs when entering data into the ESS. LEAs or ESAs receiving a 611 or 619 sub-grant that do not have an NCES ID were provided placeholder ID numbers. These placeholder ID numbers are displayed in the following format in the data file: ##F####.

3.0 Data Quality

3.1 Data Quality Checks

OSEP reviews and evaluates the timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of the data submitted by States / entities to meet the reporting requirements under Section 618 of IDEA. OSEP also conducts year to year change analysis on data submitted by the States / entities.

3.1.1 Timeliness

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as **timely** if the State / entity has submitted the required data to the appropriate data submission system (i.e., ESS or

E*MAPS*) on or before the original due date. The due dates for the IDEA Section 618 data are:

- The first Wednesday in November for Part B Personnel, Part B Exiting, Part B Discipline, Part B Dispute Resolution, Part C Exiting, and Part C Dispute Resolution data collections.

- The first Wednesday in April for Part B Child Count, Part B Educational Environments, Part C Child Count, and Part C Settings data collections.

- During the third week in December for Part B Assessment data collection. This due date is aligned with the due date for the assessment data reported by States for the Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPR).

- The first Wednesday in May for the Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection.

3.1.2 Completeness

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as **complete** if the State / entity has submitted data for all applicable fields, file specifications, category sets, subtotals, and grand totals for a specific Section 618 data collection. Additionally, OSEP evaluates if the data submitted by the State / entity match the information in metadata sources such as the E*MAPS* SSS-IDEA and the E*MAPS* Assessment Metadata Survey.

3.1.3 Accuracy

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as **accurate** if the State / entity has submitted data that meets all the edit checks for the specific data collection. The edit checks for each Section 618 data collection are identified in the Part B Data Edits and Part C Data Edits documents available to States / entities in Office of Management and Budget (OMB) MAX. The majority of these edit checks are incorporated into the business rules in ESS and E*MAPS*. Specific business rules or edit checks are outlined in the ED*Facts* Business Rules Single Inventory (BRSI) and the E*MAPS* user guides available through the ED*Facts* Initiative website.

3.1.4 Year-to-Year Change Analysis

OSEP also conducts **year-to-year change analysis** in order to determine if there has been a large fluctuation in the counts reported by a State / entity from year to year. If large changes are identified, OSEP requests that the State / entity review the data to ensure that the changes are not the result of a data quality issue, and to

provide an explanation for the large change in counts if it was not the result of a data quality issue.

3.1.5 Other Data Quality Concerns

For the MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection, OSEP conducts additional data quality checks that are not currently incorporated into the other aspects of the data quality review noted above. These data quality checks indicate situations in which OSEP would like more information on the data provided. States / entities are asked to provide data notes to explain why their data are triggering these warnings. A list of the data quality checks / warnings for the MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection are provided in Appendix B.

OSEP reviews the data notes and explanations States / entities provide in relation to the submission of the Section 618 data to better understand if and how the State / entity is meeting the reporting instructions and requirements for the specific data collection. Many of these data notes and explanations are published in the Data Notes documents accompanying the IDEA Section 618 data files.

3.2 Coordinated Review

The MOE Reduction and CEIS data were submitted through E*MAPS*. After the original close date, data experts from OSEP's Research to Practice (RTP) Division and fiscal monitoring experts from OSEP's Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP) Division conducted a collaborative review of the MOE Reduction and CEIS data submitted by States / entities. The review included the following areas: timeliness of the data submission, completeness of the data files, accuracy of the data, other data quality concerns, and year to year change analyses. Through the coordinated review, the States / entities received one set of data quality comments or inquiries associated with the MOE Reduction and CEIS data from OSEP. States / entities had the opportunity to provide explanations or data notes to address OSEP's data quality inquiries. For States / entities that had missing or inaccurate data, there were opportunities to resubmit their data files and have them reviewed prior to being published to the public.

3.3 Suppression

OSEP identified data quality concerns and suppressed Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data for the following States / entities:

- Arizona: Data were suppressed for variables C2A, C2A.1, C2A.2, C2A.3, C2A.4, C2B, C2C, C3A, C3B and C3C for 3 LEAs/ESAs due to quality

> concerns. Data was suppressed for variable B8 for one LEA/ESA due to quality concerns.
- Bureau of Indian Education: Data were suppressed for variables D2 and D3 for 2 LEAs/ESAs due to quality concerns.
- New Hampshire: Data were suppressed for variables A3B, A4, A5, C2C and C3C for 175 LEAs/ESAs due to quality concerns.
- New Mexico: Data were suppressed for variables C2B and C2C for 2 LEAs/ESAs due to quality concerns.
- Puerto Rico: Data were suppressed for variables A2B, A4 and A5 for this LEA/ESA due to quality concerns.
- Vermont: Data were suppressed for variables B5 and B6 for one LEA/ESA due to quality concerns.
- Virginia: Data were suppressed for variables B5, B6, B7, and B8 for one LEA/ESA due to quality concerns.

3.4 Data Notes

States / entities have the option to provide additional information to OSEP related to the data quality inquiries or reporting changes. This information has been compiled and accompanies the data files for data users. Please review the MOE Reduction and CEIS Data Notes document when using the public data file.

4.0 File Structure

Changes to Data File: The heading for the "New LEA/ESA" column has been changed to "New/Closed LEA/ESA." This column now identifies both new LEAs/ESAs and closed LEA/ESA with some or all data reported.

The following table provides the layout of the Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS file.

Number of Variables: 31
Extraction Date: The date the data were extracted from E*MAPS*.
Updated: The date changes were made to the text, format or template of the file; if no changes have occurred this line will be blank.
Revised: The date updates were made to the data; if no changes have occurred this line will be blank.

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
	Reporting Year	Reference Year
	StateName	State Name
	LEAName	Name of LEA/ESA
	New/Closed LEA/ESA	New - Indicator of new LEA/ESA

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
		Closed – Indicator of closed LEA/ESA with some or all data reported **NOTE**: Closed LEA/ESAs with no data reported are not included in file
	NCESID	National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number
	Year used to make the LEA/ESA/SEA determinations	Which school year's data was used to make the LEA or ESA determinations that apply to whether the LEA or ESA may, based on FFY 2017 funding, reduce MOE during SY 2017-18[1]
A2A	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2016 ($)	Total FFY 2016 allocation of Section 611 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2016 (i.e., funds available on July 1, 2016 and October 1, 2016)
A2B	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2017 ($)	Total FFY 2017 allocation of Section 611 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2017 (i.e., funds available July 1, 2017 and October 1, 2017)
A2C	Increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017 ($)	Dollar amount increase in the total allocation of Section 611 funds from FFY 2016 to FFY 2017 for each LEA or ESA. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
A3B	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2017 ($)	Total FFY 2017 allocation of Section 619 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2017 (i.e., funds available July 1, 2017).
A4	Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for FFY 2017 ($)	Sum of the total dollar amounts of Section 611 and 619 allocations from FFY 2017 for each LEA or ESA. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
A5	15% of the total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for FFY 2017 ($)	This figure represents 15% of the total (combined) dollar amount of Section 611 and 619 allocations from FFY 2017 for each LEA or ESA. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
B2	Determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE during SY 2017-18	Determination under 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able, based on FFY 2017 funding, to reduce MOE during SY 2017-18. Determinations should be specified as one of the following: meets the requirements and purposes of Part B; needs assistance in

---

[1] For SEAs that have only 1 LEA/ESA, the determination year and determination reported in this data file reflect their SEA determination.

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
		implementing the requirements of Part B; needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B; or needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B.[1]
B3	Reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA during SY 2017-18 ($)	Dollar ($) amount that each LEA or ESA reduced local, or State and local, expenditures under the IDEA MOE provision in IDEA §613(a) (2) (C) during SY 2017-18.
B4	Percent of the available reduction taken by LEA /ESA during SY 2017-18 (%)	This figure represents the percent of the available MOE reduction that the LEA or ESA took during SY 2017-18. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
B5	Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18? (Y/N)	Whether the State determined whether the LEA or ESA met the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18.
B6	Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA met the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18.
B7	By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18? (Y/N)	Whether the State returned non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18 by the date of the State's data submission.
B8	What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18? ($)	Dollar ($) amount that the State returned to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2017/SY 2017-18.
C2A	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2017-18? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA was required to use 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2017-18.
C2A.1	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability'? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability' in SY 2017-18.
C2A.2	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
	disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category'? (Y/N)	significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category' in SY 2017-18.
C2A.3	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting'? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting' in SY 2017-18.
C2A.4	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action'? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action' in SY 2017-18.
C2B	Required CEIS Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in SY 2017-18 ($)	Dollar ($) amount that was reserved for CEIS in each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2017-18
C2C	Required CEIS Percent taken for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in SY 2017-18 (%)	The figure represents the percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA was required to reserve for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2017-18. This figure was calculated using the dollar amounts from Column C2B, Column A2B, and Column A3B. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
C3A	Voluntary CEIS Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS in SY 2017-18? (Y/N)	Whether the LEA or ESA voluntarily used up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in SY 2017-18
C3B	Voluntary CEIS Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS in SY 2017-18 ($)	Dollar ($) amount of funds reserved for voluntary CEIS during SY 2017-18
C3C	Voluntary CEIS Percent taken for voluntary CEIS during SY 2017-18 (%)	The figure represents the percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA used for voluntary CEIS during SY 2017-18. This figure was calculated using dollar amounts from Column C3B, Column A2B, and Column A3B. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
D2	Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA during SY 2017-18	Total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA at any point during the course of the reporting year.
D3	Total number of children who received CEIS under the IDEA	Total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA anytime in the past two school

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
	anytime in the past two school years (including SY 2015-16, SY 2016-17 and SY 2017-18) and received special education and related services in SY 2017-18	years (including SY 2015-16, 2016-17, and SY 2017-18) and received special education and related services in 2017-18.

5.0 Guidance for Using these Data - FAQs

What is the primary use of this information?

The IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Collection provides the following information for every LEA or ESA that receives an IDEA Section 611 or 619 sub-grant:

- LEA/ESA Allocations which includes the IDEA 611 and 619 allocation amounts for each LEA/ESA in the State for the reference FFY.

- MOE Reduction which includes the determination under the 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) for each LEA/ESA; how much the LEA/ESA reduced of local and/or State funds taken under Section 613(a)(2)(C) for the reference school year; whether LEAs/ESAs met the MOE compliance standard; and whether funds were returned to the Department of Education for failure to meet MOE compliance standard.

- Provision of CEIS which includes whether each LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality during the reference school year and whether each LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved for funds for CEIS. For each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CEIS (required or voluntary), the dollar amount that was reserved during the reference school year; additionally, for each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for required CEIS due to significant disproportionality, the reason for which the LEA/ESA was identified for significant disproportionality.

- Number of Children Receiving CEIS which includes the number of children who received CEIS during the reference school year and the number of children who received CEIS at any time during the reference school year and the two preceding school years and received special education and related services during the reference school year.

The data collected using this survey is authorized by the IDEA, Section 618.

These data were previously reported in Table 8, "Report on IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort Reduction (34 CFR §300.205(a)) and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (34 CFR §300.226)."

The data are also used for monitoring the programs and activities under IDEA, reported in OSEP's Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of IDEA, and used to respond to ad hoc requests for internal and external stakeholders.

Are all States required to submit the IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Report via E*MAPS* for FFY 2017/SY 2017-18?

Yes. This data file includes all 50 States plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Bureau of Indian Education, outlying areas and freely associated States (American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas and Palau).

What reporting year will this data collection cover?

The LEA/ESA allocations reported in the IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Report represent both FFY 2016 and FFY 2017. FFY 2016 includes Section 611 funds available on July 1, 2016 and October 1, 2016. FFY 2017 includes Section 611 funds available on July 1, 2017 and October 1, 2017 and Section 619 funds available on July 1, 2017. The other data elements represent SY 2017-18. The count of children receiving CEIS should cover an entire year.

6.0 Privacy Protections Used

Beginning in August 2012, the U.S. Department of Education established a Disclosure Review Board (DRB) to review proposed data releases by the Department's program offices (e.g., OSERS/OSEP) through a collaborative technical assistance process so that the Department releases as much useful data as possible, while protecting the privacy of individuals and the confidentiality of their data, as required by law.

The DRB worked with OSEP to develop appropriate disclosure avoidance plans for the purposes of the Section 618 data releases that are derived from data protected by The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and IDEA and to help prevent the unauthorized disclosure of personally identifiable information in OSEP's public IDEA Section 618 data file releases.

The DRB applied the FERPA standard for de-identification to assess whether a "reasonable person in the school community who does not have personal knowledge of the relevant circumstances" could identify individual students in tables with small size cells (34 CFR §99.3 and §99.31(b) (1)). The "reasonable person" standard was

used to determine whether the data have been sufficiently redacted prior to release such that a "reasonable person" (i.e., a hypothetical, rational, prudent, average individual) in the school community would not be able to identify a student with any reasonable certainty. School officials, including teachers, administrators, coaches, and volunteers, are not considered in making the reasonable person determination since they are presumed to have inside knowledge of the relevant circumstances and of the identity of the students.

For each LEA/ESA that receives an IDEA 611 or 619 sub-grant from the State, the following data elements are reported:
1. IDEA section 611 allocation amount (in $)
2. IDEA section 619 allocation amount (in $)
3. the LEA determination (i.e., meets the requirements and purposes of Part B; needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B; needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B; or needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B)
4. the amount of local and/or State funds reduced under Section 613(a)(2)(C) (i.e., MOE reduction) (in $)
5. Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (responses - Yes/No)
   a. If yes, did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (responses - Yes/No)
      i. If no, by the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (responses - Yes/No)
         1. If yes, what amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (in $)
6. whether the LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for CEIS (responses – Yes/No)
   o If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability' (Yes/No)
   o If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category' (Yes/No)
   o If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting' (Yes/No)
   o If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action' (Yes/No)
   o If yes, the amount reserved (in $)
7. Whether the LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved funds for CEIS (responses – Yes/ No)
   o If yes, the amount reserved (in $)

8. Total number of children receiving CEIS under IDEA within the school year
9. Total number of children who received CEIS anytime in the past two school years and received special education and related services in this school year

The DRB has determined that the fiscal data from which data elements 1-7 are derived are not subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g, or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1417(c). Further, none of the data were collected under a "pledge of confidentiality," which could trigger privacy protections under other Federal laws including the provisions of the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. 3501 note, and that none of the data were collected by the Institute of Education Sciences, which could subject the data to Section 183 of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, 20 U.S.C. § 9573.

The data from which data elements 8-9 are derived are "education records" within the meaning of The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. § 1417c; 34 CFR § 300.610 & 34 CFR § 300.611) and are therefore protected by FERPA and IDEA.

Data elements 1-7:

Because these data elements are not protected by any confidentiality or privacy statutes, no privacy protections are required.

CEIS Child Count (data element 8):

CEIS funds can be used (1) to provide services to individual students, a classroom or multiple classrooms of students, or an entire school; and/or (2) to provide professional development to teachers. In the case of providing professional development, all the students working with that teacher would be counted as "receiving CEIS" (regardless of the students' need for special education or related services).

Because the definition of this data element includes all students of those teachers receiving professional development under CEIS, this child count represents an estimate and may not directly correspond to either the actual number of students who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services and who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment (i.e., students in need of receiving CEIS services) nor to the number of students in special education in the LEA. Consequently, because of the

broad definition and the fact that these data are presented at the LEA level without being disaggregated by any other characteristics (i.e., they are not broken down by race, sex, or type of disability), the DRB has determined that the risk of disclosure is negligible and that no additional privacy protections are required for this data element.

<u>2-year cumulative CEIS and Special Education Child Count</u> (data element 9):

The definition of this data element includes students with disabilities who received CEIS in the past 2 years and were identified for special education and related services during the reference year. This number could be higher or lower than the count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, for the reference year. The Child Count data are snapshot counts taken on the State-designated child count date. The total count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, could be **higher** than this count because there could be students with disabilities receiving special education and related services that did not receive CEIS. The total count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, could be **lower** than this count because this count is a cumulative count which is collected throughout the school year. Consequently, because this count does not directly correspond to the number of students with disabilities and the fact that these data are presented at the LEA level without being disaggregated by any other characteristics (i.e., they are not broken down by race, sex, or type of disability), the DRB has determined that the risk of disclosure is negligible and that no additional privacy protections are required for this data element.

Appendix A

Date of the Last State Level Submission to E*MAPS*

State	Submission Date for the FFY 2017/SY 2017-18 MOE Reduction & CEIS Data
Alabama	5/1/2019
Alaska	8/27/2019
American Samoa	4/22/2019
Arizona	8/28/2019
Arkansas	7/30/2019
Bureau of Indian Education	4/26/2019
California	8/9/2019
Colorado	4/29/2019
Connecticut	4/23/2019
Delaware	8/21/2019
District of Columbia	8/1/2019
Federated States of Micronesia	4/3/2019
Florida	4/19/2019
Georgia	4/29/2019
Guam	4/16/2019
Hawaii	8/6/2019
Idaho	8/20/2019
Illinois	8/20/2019
Indiana	4/29/2019
Iowa	4/18/2019
Kansas	4/29/2019
Kentucky	8/28/2019
Louisiana	8/27/2019
Maine	8/22/2019
Maryland	8/14/2019
Massachusetts	8/27/2019
Michigan	4/23/2019
Minnesota	5/1/2019
Mississippi	5/1/2019
Missouri	4/9/2019
Montana	7/31/2019
Nebraska	8/27/2019
Nevada	4/28/2019
New Hampshire	5/1/2019
New Jersey	7/29/2019
New Mexico	8/28/2019
New York	4/25/2019
North Carolina	4/1/2019
North Dakota	4/18/2019
Northern Marianas	4/1/2019
Ohio	8/28/2019

State	Submission Date for the FFY 2017/SY 2017-18 MOE Reduction & CEIS Data
Oklahoma	8/26/2019
Oregon	4/24/2019
Pennsylvania	8/21/2019
Puerto Rico	8/28/2019
Republic of Palau	4/24/2019
Republic of the Marshall Islands	4/29/2019
Rhode Island	4/30/2019
South Carolina	8/27/2019
South Dakota	4/30/2019
Tennessee	4/30/2019
Texas	8/26/2019
Utah	4/30/2019
Vermont	8/26/2019
Virgin Islands	7/30/2019
Virginia	4/30/2019
Washington	8/22/2019
West Virginia	4/25/2019
Wisconsin	8/27/2019
Wyoming	8/28/2019

- Data not submitted

Appendix B

Warning Messages

Column	Warning Message
A2A A2B A3B[2]	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2A, A2B, or A3B contain either a zero or 'NA'.
A2A A2B A3B[2]	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2A, A2B, or A3B contain an M.
A2C B3	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2C (increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 of IDEA) is less than or equal to 0 and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than 0.
B2	A warning will be written to the final report when 'NA' is the value for column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR§300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE).
B2	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR§300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE).
B2 B3	A warning will be written to the final report when column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR §300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE) not equal '1' and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than 0.
B3	A warning shall be written to the final report when M is the value for column B3 (Reduction of local and/or State funds pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA).
B3 C3B	A warning shall be written to the final report when column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than zero and C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) is greater than zero.
B4	A warning will be written to the final report when the percent available reduction taken by the LEA/ESA (B4) is greater than 100%.
B5	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B5 (Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?).
B5 B6	A warning will be written to the final report when column B5 (Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is Yes and column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is 'M' or 'NA'.
B5	A warning will be written to the final report when column B5 (Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in [the

---

[2] The Warnings "A3B = 0 or NA" and "A3B = M" are applicable only to the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Column	Warning Message
B6 B7 B8	reference year]?) is No, 'M' or 'NA' and columns B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?), B7 (By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) and B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) are not all 'M' or 'NA'
B6	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?).
B6 B7 B8	A warning will be written to the final report when column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is Yes, 'M' or 'NA' and columns B7 (By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) and B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) are not both 'M' or 'NA'
B6 B7	A warning will be written to the final report when column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is No and column B7 (By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is 'M' or 'NA'
B7	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B7 (By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?).
B7 B8	A warning will be written to the final report when column B7 (By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is Yes and column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is 'M' or 'NA'
B7 B8	A warning will be written to the final report when column B7 (By the date of this data submission, did the State return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is No and column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is not 'NA'
B8	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?).
B8 A4	A warning will be written to the final report when column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is greater than column A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of

Column	Warning Message
	IDEA for [the reference year] ($))
C2A	A warning shall be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column C2A (Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality).
C2A A5 C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) is YES and the absolute value of the difference between column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619 for [the reference year]) and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) is >= $10.
C2A B3	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than 0.
C2A	A warning shall be written to the final report when C2A is YES, and none of the following are YES: C2A.1; C2A.2; C2A.3; and C2A.4.
C2A C3A	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "Yes".
C2A C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) was zero, NA, or M.
C2A D2	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column D2 (Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA) was zero, M, or NA.
C2A C2A1 C2A2 C2A3 C2A4	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was 'No', 'NA' or 'M' and C2A.1 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability'?), C2A.2 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category'?), C2A.3 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting'?) and/or C2A.4 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action'?) was "Yes".
C2A C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was No, NA, or M and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) was greater than zero.
C2A C2B A5	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was No, NA, or M, column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) was greater than zero and the absolute value of the difference between column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA

Column	Warning Message
	allocation for Sections 611 and 619) and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) is >= $10.
C2A C3A D2	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "No", "M" or "NA" and Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "No" or "M" and column D2 (total number of children who received CEIS during reference period) is greater than zero.
C2A.1 C2A.2 C2A.3 C2A.4 C2B C3A C3B D2 D3	A warning will be written to the final report when column C2A.1, C2A.2, C2A.3, C2A.4, C2B, C3A, C3B, D2 or D3 contain an 'M'.
C2B C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2B (Required CEIS Amount reserved for required CEIS) was greater than zero, and column C3B (Voluntary CEIS Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) was greater than zero.
C3A C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "Yes" and column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) was zero, M or NA.
C3A A5 C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS) is YES and column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) minus column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619) is >=$10.
C3A D2	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "Yes" and column D2 (Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA) was zero, M, or NA.
C3A C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was No, M or NA and column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) was greater than zero.

Appendix C

Auto-Calculations Performed by the EMAPS System

Column	Calculation
A2C	The value for column A2C (Increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 from [previous year] to [reference year] ($)) is calculated by subtracting column A2A (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [previous year] ($)) from column A2B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [reference year] ($)).
A4	The value for column A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] ($)) is calculated by adding the total dollar values of columns A2B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [reference year] ($)) and A3B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA [reference year] ($)).
A5	The value for column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] ($)) is calculated by taking the total dollar amount for column A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] ($)), multiplying by .15 and rounding the result to two decimal places.
B4	The value for column B4 (Percent of the available reduction taken by LEA/ESA during [reference year] (%)) is calculated by subtracting column A2A (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [previous year] ($)) from A2B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [reference year] ($)) and multiplying the difference by 50%. Divide column B3 (Reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA during [reference year] ($)) by the product obtained, multiply by 100 and round the result to two decimal places. If A2B minus A2A is a negative value, "†" will appear in the data file for B4.
C2C	The value for column C2C (Required CEIS Percent taken for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in [reference year] ($))) is calculated by taking the value in column C2B (Required CEIS Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in [reference year] ($)) and dividing it by the value in A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] ($)), multiplying by 100 and rounding the result to two decimal places.
C3C	The value for column C3C (Voluntary CEIS Percent taken for voluntary CEIS during [reference year] (%)) is calculated by taking the value in column C3B (Voluntary CEIS Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS in [reference year] ($)) and dividing it by the value in A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] ($)), multiplying by 100 and rounding the result to two decimal places.

NOTE: Values reported as "M" (i.e., missing) and NA (i.e., not applicable) are considered 0 in auto-calculations.

Appendix D

State Definition of Significant Disproportionality in SY 2017-2018

States submitted these definitions of significant disproportionality via the E*MAPS* SSS-IDEA.

State	Note
Alabama	LEAs identified as having significant disproportionality must use the maximum amount of funds allowable for CEIS for children in the LEA, particularly, but not exclusively, for children in those racial or ethnic groups that were significantly over-identified. The definition for Alabama includes: A. Determining an LEA as having significant disproportionality after exceeding the threshold for up to three prior consecutive years. B. Determining an LEA as having significant disproportionality based on the following analysis categories : 1) Identification of Children with Disabilities, Ages 6 through 21 Method – Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio Threshold – Over 4.0 Cell size - Less than or equal to 15 N-size – N/A 2) Identification of Children with Disabilities, Ages 6 through 21 in Specific Disability Categories Method - Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio Threshold – Over 5.0 Cell size – Less than or equal to 20 N-size – N/A 3) Placement of Children with Disabilities, Ages 6 through 21 inside the General Educational Setting Less than 40% of the day Method - Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio Threshold – Over 4.0 Cell size – Less than or equal to 15 N-size – N/A 4) Placement of Children with Disabilities, Ages 6 through 21 inside Separate schools and residential facilities, not including homebound or hospital settings, correctional facilities or private schools Method - Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio Threshold – Over 4.0 Cell size – Less than or equal to 15 N-size – N/A 5) Disciplinary Actions for Children with Disabilities, Ages 3 through 21 – Out of school suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days Method – Composition Index Threshold – Greater than 5.0% of overall special education enrollment Cell size – Less than or equal to 15 N-size – N/A 6) Disciplinary Actions for Children with Disabilities, Ages 3 through 21 – Out of school suspensions or expulsions less than 10 days for children with disabilities ages 3-21: Method – Composition Index Threshold – Greater than 40.0% of overall special education enrollment Cell size – Less than or equal to 15 N-size – N/A
Alaska	Alaska determines that a district has significant disproportionality when there is a risk ratio of greater than 3.5 for three consecutive years.
American Samoa	Significant disproportionality does not apply to American Samoa.
Arizona	Arizona defines significant disproportionality with respect to identification, placement, and discipline according to the following measurements (applies to students with disabilities aged 6-21): For identification of students (3 through 21) with disabilities, disciplinary actions (3 through 21) and placement (6 through 21) in particular educational settings, AZ uses a risk ratio (no longer weighted) of > or

State	Note
	= 3.0 and minimum cell size of 10 (> or = 10) and a minimum N size of 30 for the target racial/ethnic group and for other racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services.
Arkansas	Identification (all disabilities), identification specific Disabilities, and LRE all use a RR > 4 after secondary criteria is applied. They are identified for CEIS if RR > 4 for three (3) consecutive years. Discipline uses a difference in composition with a difference > 4 after secondary criteria is applied. They are identified for CEIS if difference is > 4 for three (3) consecutive years. A full explanation of the CEIS Calculation can be found at https://arksped.k12.ar.us/DataAndResearch/PublicReporting.html
Bureau of Indian Education	Significant Disproportional does not apply to BIE. Maintenance of Effort does not apply to BIE (34 CFR 300.716). BIE uses CEIS as a voluntary program (34 CFR 300.711).
California	The California Department of Education (CDE) measures disproportionality and significant disproportionality using two measures: (1) the E-formula and (2) the Alternate Risk Ratio. There are several reasons why the CDE uses joint measures rather than a single measure. First, a joint measures approach incorporates the best elements of both measures. In this approach, the measures combine individual strengths in the disproportionality determination process and compensate each for limitations. Second, the two measures in this analysis are the top two measures based on expert ratings and also represent the two broad categories of disproportionality measures: composition and risk. Since each category defines racial/ethnic disproportionality differently, a joint measures approach brings both definitions together. Finally, if a district is disproportionate in both measures—not just in one—then the district is identified as having true disproportionality. The detailed calculations for each measure are described below. Significant Disproportionality To be identified as significantly disproportionate a district must meet both of the following criteria: 1) Identified disproportionate by both measures (E-formula and Alternate Risk Ratio) defined as: • More than three standard errors for the E-formula, and • More than five on the Alternate Risk Ratio 2) Identified disproportionate in the same cell (disability by ethnicity) a. In the current year, and b. In at least two of the previous three years
Colorado	When an LEA's risk ratios or alternate risk ratios exceed the set thresholds (different for each significant disproportionality category) for 3 consecutive years, the LEA is determined as having a significant disproportionality. The State does not calculate the risk ratio or alternate risk ratio unless the target group (i.e., number of Asian students with IEPs in the LEA when examining disproportionality in IEP identification) includes 5 or more students and the comparison group (i.e., number of total Asian enrollment in the LEA when examining disproportionality in IEP identification) includes 10 or more students.
Connecticut	The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) utilizes a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation:

State	Note
	the use of a confidence interval to adjust for the effect of sample size and the calculation and interpretation of a relative risk index (RRI). The formula +/- 1.96 {sqrt [(P x Q) / n]}for the standard error of the sample proportion is used to calculate the 95 percent confidence interval. (Where P = composition of the subgroup being assessed, Q = 100-P, and n = the number of students in the subgroup being assessed for overrepresentation.) For areas indicating possible overrepresentation using the 95 percent confidence interval test, an RRI is calculated to aid in the interpretation of the identified overrepresentation. The following criteria have been adopted by the CSDE as flexible guidelines regarding the identification of disproportionate representation based on race and ethnicity with respect to: the identification of children with disabilities within specific disability categories; the placement of children in particular educational settings; and the incidence, duration and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions. 0.25 < RRI < 2.0: RRI is not significant; disproportionate representation not indicated; district receives data. 0.25 > RRI > 2.0: RRI of concern; district receives correspondence from the CSDE; district submits self assessment of data, policies, procedures and practices regarding identification of students for special education to the Department; if individual student or systemic noncompliance is found, the CSDE issues, monitors and verifies corrective actions.
Delaware	States have a responsibility, under the IDEA, to collect and examine data from the LEA to determine whether significant disproportionality, based on race and ethnicity, is occurring in the LEA and throughout the State with respect to: (a) the identification of children as children with disabilities, including identification in certain disability classifications – Indicator 9 and Indicator 10; (b) the placement of these children in particular educational settings– Indicator 5; and (c) the incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions, Indicator 4. The DOE applies a formula to calculate significant disproportionality using December 1st child count data across two years of data. A further explanation and example of how the DOE calculates both disproportionate representation and significant discrepancy can be found in the State's Annual Performance Report submitted to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs. Delaware DOE and its stakeholder are in the process of redefining significant disproportionality based on the new regulations.
District of Columbia	For suspensions, significant disproportionality is calculated only for suspensions greater than 10 days. An LEA has to have at least 40 children with disabilities in order to be included in the report. Within LEAs of 40 or more students with disabilities, at least five students of a single race/ethnicity are required for weighted risk ratio analysis. District charters shall be counted with DCPS as one LEA. Only Special Education students in the age group of 3-21 shall be included in the dataset. Any WRR above 5.0 is considered to be significant disproportionate. For educational environments and

State	Note
	identification of disabilities, the same business rules and WRR applies.
Federated States of Micronesia	Not applicable to Federated States of Micronesia
Florida	Significant disproportionality for CEIS is defined as a risk ratio of 3.5 or greater for a given race when compared to all other races combined for: • Identification of children with disabilities • Identification of children as children with a particular disability • Placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings • Incidents of removal of children with disabilities through in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, or expulsion. Florida uses a single year of data for the calculations with a minimum cell size of 30.
Georgia	Significant Disproportionality for Special education and related services is determined by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio (FFY2016) = or >3.0 and Risk Ratio (FFY2017) = or > 3.0 (2 consecutive years) and (2) SWD Subgroup = or >15. [(District SWD Identification Risk for Focus Subgroup)/(State Identification Risk for All Other Subgroups)]. Disability Specific by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio (FFY2016) = or > 3.0 and Risk Ratio (FFY2017) = or > 3.0 (2 consecutive years) and (2) SWD Subgroup = or > 15. [(District SWD Identification Risk for Focus Subgroup)/(State Identification Risk for All Other Subgroups)]. Significant Disproportionality for Special Education Placement by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio (FFY2016) = or > 3.0 and Risk Ratio (FFY2017) = or >3.0 (2 consecutive years) and (2) SWD Subgroup = or>15 [(District SWD Placement Risk for focus Subgroup)/(State Placement Risk for All Other Subgroups)]. Significant Disproportionality Discipline is determined for Total Disciplinary Removals and Removals by Duration (10 or fewer days, greater than 10 days) and Type (ISS or OSS) by using the following criteria: Total Disciplinary Removals:(1) Events Per Student Ratio for two consecutive years {FFY 2015, = or>3.0 and FFY 2016, = or > 3.0} and (2) Event Count (cell size) = or > 5 and Subgroup (n size) = or > 15 [(District SWD Subgroup Risk for Disciplinary Removal)/(District SWD Risk for All Other Subgroups for Disciplinary Removal)]. Duration and Type:(1) Exclusion Risk by Duration and Type for two consecutive years {Risk Ratio for FFY 2015 = or > 3.0 and Risk Ratio for FFY 2016, = or > 3.0} and (2) Event Count (cell size) = or > 5 and subgroup (n size) = or > 15. For Duration and Type weighted values are assigned to events in the following manner: ISS = or < 10 days = 1, OSS = or < 10 days = 2, ISS > 10 days = 3, OSS >10 days = 4. [(District SWD Subgroup Risk for Disciplinary Removal by Value Added Duration and Type)/(District SWD Risk for All Other Subgroup for Disciplinary Removal by Value added Duration and Type)]
Guam	NOT APPLICABLE
Hawaii	Hawaii is a single unitary system. Under Indicators 9 and 10 of the SPP/APR, disproportionality is defined in two tiers: (1) Tier 1 is any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its

State	Note
	respective disability and group size signifies disproportionate representation and (2) Tier 2, for over identification, Special Education Section analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over identified through a file review for each student.
Idaho	ARR = DLR/SLR Where: ARR = Alternate Risk Ratio DLR = District-level risk for racial/ethnic group for disability identification SLR = State-level risk for comparison group for disability identification Threshold: Idaho has established a threshold of 3.0. The ARR would have to equal or be greater than 3.0 to flag significant disproportionality. Minimum Cell Size: Idaho has established 40 students with disabilities in a district as a minimum 'n' size for calculation. By applying the Alternate Risk Ratio-Formula to district data, SDE identifies districts with ARR equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, as having significant disproportionality. Idaho conducted data analysis and sought stakeholder input in defining the areas of flexibility and processes as required to meet the July 1, 2018, deadline. Idaho stands ready to implement changes to calculation and processes as needed to meet the new significant disproportionality regulations 20 U.S.C. 1418(d) and 34 CFR §§300.646 and 300.647.
Illinois	Illinois defines "significant disproportionality' by using a weighted or alternate risk ratio method to calculate and determine whether significant disproportionality is present in the identification of students who are eligible for special education overall and by disability category for each of the seven racial/ethnic groups. The weighted risk ratio is used for districts that 10 or more students in the racial/ethnic group in questions and at least 10 students in the comparison group. An alternate risk ratio is used for districts that have at least 10 students in the racial/ethnic group in question but fewer than 10 students in the comparison group. Illinois criterion for determining significant disproportionality for identification in special education based on race/ethnicity is a weighted or alternate risk ratio of 4.0 or higher for a particular racial/ethnic group for three consecutive years.
Indiana	Indiana defines Significant Disproportionality of racial/ethnic groups in: (a) special education identification (b) eligibility categories (c) settings/placements and (d) discipline (suspensions/expulsions) when a risk ratio for a given racial/ethnic group that is greater than 2.5 in special education and related services for the identified group for three consecutive years. Districts can also void a finding if reasonable progress has been made: Indiana's definition of 'reasonable progress' (a 3-pronged approach): LEA must have a decrease in the Risk Index of the target group for the last 2 years of data LEA must have a decrease in the overall risk ratio for the last 2 years of data The LEA's overall risk ratio must be below 3.5 for at least the 3rd year.

State	Note
Iowa	In accordance with 34 CFR § 300.600 (d) (3), the SEA defines occurrence of significant disproportionality when the risk ratio or alternate risk ratio is, at a minimum, greater than 3.50.
Kansas	The following criteria will determine if a district is identified with significant disproportionality; the district must meet the criteria for two consecutive years: 1. Racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services - the district must have: • at least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group; • at least 30 students of a specific racial and ethnic group in special education and related services; • at least 30 students in the comparison group; and • a weighted risk ratio (WRR) >4.00. 2. Racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories - the district must have: • at least 30 students of a racial and ethnic group; • at least 30 students of a specific racial and ethnic group in special education and related services, and in specific disability categories; • at least 30 students in the comparison group; and • a weighted risk ratio (WRR) >4.00. 3. Placement of children with disabilities in particular educational setting - the district must have: • At least 30 students with a disability of a racial/ethnic group; • at least 30 students of a specific race/ethnicity in special education and related services who were suspended/expelled; • at least 30 students in the comparison group who were suspended/expelled; • and a weighted risk ratio (WRR) >4.00 4. Incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions - the district must have: • At least 30 students with a disability of a racial/ethnic group; • at least 30 students of a specific race/ethnicity in special education and related services who were suspended/expelled; • at least 30 students in the comparison group who were suspended/expelled; • and a weighted risk ratio (WRR) >4.00.
Kentucky	To have a significant disproportionality a district has to identify a student of a particular race category at a rate that is 3 times the rate it identifies students not of that race. This is true for all disabilities, specific disabilities, LRE Settings and various discipline removals in or out of school. We do have a minimum cell size of 10 students or n-size of 50 students in general population of the race category.
Louisiana	Our state's definition of significant disproportionality is a risk ratio of 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100 based on one year of data.
Maine	Significant disproportionality is defined as a significant difference in the proportionate representation of a target population in a target category (e.g., identification for special ed services) when compared to the proportionate representation of a comparison population in the target category. A significant difference is defined as a target population's proportionate representation in a target category that is greater than 3 times that of the comparison population's

State	Note
	proportionate representation in the category (i.e., risk ratios and alternate risk ratios greater than 3).
Maryland	Disproportionate representation is defined as having students in a particular racial/ethnic group (i.e., American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic, or Two or More Races) category being at a considerably greater risk of being identified for special education and related services, placed in more restrictive educational settings, or suspended or expelled from school for more than 10 days than all other racial/ethnic groups enrolled in the local school system.
Massachusetts	Massachusetts defines "disproportionate representation" as any district with a weighted risk ratio or alternative risk ratio for special education identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, exceeding 5.0 for four consecutive years, and whose risk ratio or alternative risk ratio is growing more disproportionate (i.e. becoming more and more over-represented) in each of those four years, and during those four years, initially evaluated and found students eligible for services at a rate higher than the state median.
Michigan	Regulation §300.646 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that each state that receives assistance under Part B of the IDEA provide for the collection and examination of data to determine if significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in the local education agencies of the state with respect to: a. identification of children with disabilities b. identification of children with disabilities in a particular impairment category c. placement of children in particular education settings d. incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions Michigan defines Significant Disproportionality as: a. Over-Identification of children with disabilities: districts with a risk ratio > 3.0 for two consecutive years b. Over-Identification of children with disabilities in a particular impairment category: districts with a risk ratio > 3.0 for two consecutive years c. placement of children in particular education settings: districts with a risk ratio > 3.0 for two consecutive years d. Discipline (incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions): districts with a risk ratio > 3.0 for one year
Minnesota	A local education agency (LEA) is identified as having significant disproportionality if it meets any one of the following criteria for three consecutive years: 1. For students in any one federal category of race or ethnicity in special education, a risk ratio (RR) greater than or equal to 4.0 and a weighted risk ratio (WRR) greater than or equal to 4.0 in that same category. If the RR and WRR cannot be calculated, an alternate risk ratio (ARR) will be used instead. 2. For students in any one federal category of race or ethnicity within a category of disability, a WRR greater than or equal to 4.0 and a RR greater than or equal to 4.0 in that same category. If the RR and WRR cannot be calculated, an ARR will be used instead. 3. For students with disabilities in any one federal category of race or ethnicity served in any of the federally defined settings in which students are removed

State	Note
	from regular class 21% or more of the day, a RR greater than or equal to 4.0 and a WRR greater than or equal to 4.0 in that same category. If the RR and WRR cannot be calculated, an ARR will be used instead. 4. For students with disabilities suspended or expelled from more than ten days in the year, including both in-school and out-of-school suspensions, in any one federal category of race or ethnicity, a greater than or equal to 4.0 and a WRR greater than or equal to 4.0 in that same category. If the RR and WRR cannot be calculated, an ARR will be used instead. The ARR is used under the following conditions: when an LEA has at least 10 students of a specific racial or ethnic group enrolled in the specific area under consideration, but fewer than 10 students of other racial and ethnic groups in the same area under consideration, an ARR will be calculated in lieu of the RR and the WRR.
Mississippi	Definitions of significant disproportionality differ for Discipline, LRE, and Identification. Each category's criteria is listed below. Minimum n-counts apply in all categories. Discipline - Exists when the rate for students with disabilities of a certain race suspended/expelled for more than 10 days is more than 5 percentage points higher than all non-disabled students in the same LEA. LRE - Exists when the rate for students with disabilities of a certain race in a placement is more than 2 times the State rate of all students with disabilities in that placement. Identification (General and Specific Disabilities) - Exists when the alternate risk ratio for students with disabilities of a certain race is 4.0 or greater.
Missouri	Identification, identification in specific disability categories and placements: Three consecutive years of risk ratio > 3.5; cell size of at least 30 for both the racial/ethnic/disability group being examined and the comparison group. Discipline: Three consecutive years of risk ratio > 5.0; cell size of at least 20 discipline incidents for the racial/ethnic group being examined; an average number of incidents per 100 students greater than 2.0 for students with disabilities and 1.0 for nondisabled students
Montana	An LEA is determined to have significant disproportionality if, given a minimum N of 30, an LEA demonstrates a higher weighted risk ratio than the target ratio of 3.0, within a 99 percent confidence interval.
Nebraska	Disproportionate representation is defined as a weighted risk ratio of 4.00 and above. A weighted risk ratio is calculated only if there are 30 or more students in the group of interest and if there are also 30 or more students in the comparison group. This minimum of 30 "n" corresponds to the minimum "n" size Nebraska uses for ESEA Reporting. Significant disproportionality exists when over-representation occurs in two successive years.
Nevada	Nevada defines significant disproportionality as students in a particular race/ethnic group (Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, or Two or More Races) being at a significantly greater risk than all other race/ethnic groups of (1) being identified as eligible for special education overall or in a

State	Note
	specific category (Autism, Speech/Language Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impairment, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability) , (2) being placed inside the regular classroom 40-79 % of the school day, inside the regular classroom 0-39% of the school day, or in separate schools and residential facilities, and (3) being suspended or expelled. There must be at least 25 students in the racial/ethnic group in question who are eligible for special education overall or within a particular disability category (for identification) , within the particular placement category (for placement), and within the particular discipline category (for discipline), and at least 25 students in the comparison group for both identification and placement. Significant disproportionality in identification and placement is measured by a weighted risk ratio of 4.0 or higher for a particular racial/ethnic group for three consecutive years. Significant disproportionality in discipline is measured by a race/ethnic group exceeding a "statewide bar" for three consecutive years. The statewide bar is the total number of students with disabilities subjected to various categories of suspension and expulsion plus five percentage points.
New Hampshire	A stakeholder group representative of state agencies, parent organizations and school districts in NH met in the summer of 2016 and determined that the following threshold would define when a district has elevated levels in NH: Weighted Risk Ratio equal to or greater than 3.5 Significant Disproportionality is defined as having an elevated weighted risk ratio in the same category in the same area for the same sub-group for two consecutive years.
New Jersey	New Jersey defines SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY as meeting or exceeding an established risk ratio for three consecutive years. a. The identification of children as children with disabilities, b. The identification of children with a particular disability, c. The placement of children in particular educational settings or d. The incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions.
New Mexico	In New Mexico, a Local Education Agency (LEA) is considered to have Significant Disproportionality based on race and ethnicity if the LEA has a Westat Risk Ratio and an Alternate Risk Ratio of 5.0 or above with a sample size of greater than 10 and is reviewed annually. 1. The identification of children as children with disabilities, including the identification of children in accordance with a particular impairment (Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability (Mental Retardation), Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disabilities, Speech Language Impairment) (Section 618 OSEP Table One); or 2. The placement in particular educational settings of these children (Section 618 OSEP Table 3); or 3. The incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions (Section 618 OSEP Table 5).
New York	NYS uses the relative risk and weighted relative risk ratios, with minimum "n" sizes to identify school districts whose data indicate disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special

State	Note
	education. The minimum "n" size requirement used to compute disproportionate representation does not exclude school districts from the denominator when calculating results, but only districts that meet the minimum "n" size are included in the numerator. Disproportionate Representation in Special Education:.http://www.p12.nysed.gov/specialed/spp/2013/ind9.htm Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories: http://www.p12.nysed.gov/specialed/spp/2013/ind10.htm Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Special Education Placements: At least 75 SWDs were enrolled on first Wednesday in Oct; at least 10 SWDs of particular race/ethnicity in specific setting; at least 20 SWDsof all other race/ethnicities enrolled in district; SWDs in a particular placement category are from only one minority group regardless of the size of risk ratios. Disproportionate Suspension and Expulsion: minimum of 75 SWDs enrolled on the first Wednesday in Oct; At least 10 SWDsf the particular race suspended in the suspension category (suspended in school up to 10 days, over 10 days, suspended out of school up to 10 days and over 10 days); At least 20 SWDs of all other race/ethnicities were enrolled; and Both risk ratios for any minority group in any suspension category is 2.0 or higher
North Carolina	Definitions for Significant Disproportionality: Identification - For the overall population of students with IEPs or disability category being considered, disproportionate representation (= 3.0 risk ratio) for a given race/ethnicity for three (3) consecutive years and its current risk ratio is > 5.0. Note: If an LEA's disproportionate representation/risk ratio = 3.0 to = <5.0, the LEA receives a warning for the current year Placement - For the placement option by overall population or disability category being considered, disproportionate representation (= 3.0 risk ratio) for a given race/ethnicity for three (3) consecutive years and its current risk ratio is > 5.0. Note: If an LEA's disproportionate representation/risk ratio = 3.0 to = <5.0, the LEA receives a warning for the current year Discipline – A significant discrepancy (> twice state average rate for types of disciplinary action and for incidence and duration) for a given race/ethnicity, in 3 of 3 > 10 day disciplinary actions* in 1 year; 2 of 3 > 10 day disciplinary actions* in 2 consecutive years; or 1 of 3 > 10 day disciplinary actions* for 3 consecutive years. *long-term suspension/expulsion; short-term suspensions that accumulate to > 10 days in a school year; in-school suspensions > 10 days Note: If an LEA has a significant discrepancy in any of the disciplinary actions reviewed and has not been determined to have significant disproportionality as described, the LEA receives a warning for the current year
North Dakota	ND defines significant disproportionality of racial/ethnic groups with regards to identification in special education, identification in specific disability categories, placement, and discipline through the calculation of a weighted risk ratio (WRR) of 4.0
Northern Marianas	Not applicable for our state.

State	Note
Ohio	Ohio uses the same risk ratio for determining significant disproportionality as for disproportionate representation. Disproportionate representation of students in ethnic or racial groups is determined using risk ratio calculation formulae. The risk ratio represents the likelihood that a child in one racial group will be identified compared to the likelihood that a student in any other racial group will be identified. • The risk ratio is calculated as the percentage of students identified as needing special education in a specified racial group divided by the percentage of students identified as needing special education NOT in the specified racial group. For example, the percent of all Asian students in an LEA who are identified as needing special education divided by the percent of all NON-Asian students who are identified as needing special education. • OEC calculates risk ratios for disproportionate representation for the following student groups: African-American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Multi-racial (More than One), and White. • ODE uses a 3.5 risk ratio, based on a group-size rule (n=30) that aligns with the calculation of AMOs for racial and ethnic subgroups, to determine overrepresentation. • This is likely to change, pending clarification of timelines for implementation of related regulations.
Oklahoma	In accordance with the new rule in 34 CFR 300.647, Oklahoma has defined Significant Disproportionality as follows: Oklahoma has set: Minimum cell-size as 10; Minimum n-size as 10. Risk Ratio Thresholds have been set at: 2.25 for the 5 Discipline categories; 2.6 for the 7 Identification categories; and 2.5 for the 2 Placement categories. Oklahoma has chosen to implement a "reasonable progress" measure. To meet the "reasonable progress" standard, an LEA must: - Reduce overall risk ratio by 15% annually until the threshold for significant disproportionality is met. - Additionally, an LEA must have met a "secondary risk ratio threshold" of 4.5 by year three of any three year cycle. An LEA will be identified as significantly disproportionate when it exceeds the risk ratio threshold in a particular racial/ethnic group and category pair for three consecutive years and fails to meet the requirements for "reasonable progress."
Oregon	Oregon has developed the following criteria for each of the four areas required for review to determine significant disproportionality: 1. Identification for SpEd by race/ethnicity: • =10 students in special education by race/ethnicity category, and • =10 students in special education across other race/ethnicity categories, and • +20% difference in the identified special education population from the overall district population by race/ethnicity category, and • Weighted risk ratio of >4.0 by race/ethnicity category 2. Identification by race/ethnicity across 6 disability types • =10 students in disability category by race/ethnicity, and • =10 students in disability category across other race/ethnicity categories, and • +20% difference in the disability category from the overall district population by race/ethnicity category, and • Weighted risk ratio of >4.0 by race/ethnicity category

State	Note
	3. Federal Placement distribution (LRE) by setting and reace/ethnicity • =10 students in setting by race/ethnicity, and • =10 students in setting across other race/ethnicity categories, and • +20% difference in the special education setting from the overall district special education population by race/ethnicity category, and • Weighted risk ratio of >4.0 by race/ethnicity category 4. Long-term discipline including incidence, duration and type by race/ethnicity • =10 students in special education by race/ethnicity category who received long-term discipline, and • +20% difference in the special education race/ethnicity population who received long-term discipline from the overall district population by race/ethnicity category • Weighted risk ratio of >4.0 by race/ethnicity category ODE considers any district meeting all of the criteria in one or more of the four areas reason for requiring preventative measures including the required use of 15% of IDEA funds for coordinated early intervening services.
Pennsylvania	For Identification, Placement and Discipline: Method - Weighted Risk Ratio Minimum N - 40 Threshold Value - Weighted Risk Ration>4.0 Years Theshold Must Be Exceded for Identification of Significant Disproportionality - 3 Consecutive
Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico has a relatively homogeneous racial and ethnic population, and as such, there is no reasonable method to measure disproportionality by the Federal racial or ethnic groups or environment. This has been recognized by OSEP, and as such, Indicators B-9 and B-10 of the IDEA Annual Performance Report do not apply to Puerto Rico. PRDE continues to collect data on race/ethnicity categories as part of the Section 618 data collection; however, PRDE does not employ a current definition of significant disproportionality as it would not provide any meaningful measure.
Republic of Palau	This is not applicable to Palau.
Republic of the Marshall Islands	Not applicable to the Republic of the Marshall Islands.
Rhode Island	Risk ratio of 2.5 or greater for 3 consecutive years with a minimum cell size of 5 in the category/race in question. Where the comparison group is 0 or too small for validity, an alternate rate risk will be applied.
South Carolina	Per IDEA requirements, South Carolina defines "significant disproportionality" as any local education agency (LEA) that meets the following criteria: A weighted risk ratio exceeding 4.0, with an at-risk group size of more than twenty-five and comparison group size of more than twenty-five, for any race/ethnicity, in (1) the identification of children as children with disabilities; (2) the identification of children as children with a particular disability; and (3) the placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings; and A relative risk ratio exceeding 4.0, with an at-risk group size of more than twenty-five and comparison group size of more than twenty-five, for any race/ethnicity, in two or more categories of (4) the incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions. See http://ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/173/documents/11-CEIS-RevisedGuidance.pdf.

State	Note
South Dakota	Significant Disproportionality- Significant Disproportionality is a statistically significant level of disproportionality between students based on race or ethnicity being served on Individual Education Plans compared to other racial or ethnic groups. The criteria for South Dakota's significant disproportionality include a minimum N size of 20 in each of the target and other group and a weighted risk ratio of 3.5.
Tennessee	This definition will be revised under the new changes related to state definitions of significant disproportionality. Currently, the state is revisiting and modifying some of the "n" size requirements and processes around significant disproportionality and will be soliciting stakeholder feedback prior to the the 2018-19 SY in which the definitions will take effect. In the interim, Tennessee defines significant disproportionality through a four-step approach that entails annually analyzing the race/ethnicity data relating to discipline, environment/placement, and identification of students with disabilities (SWDs). The State employs a "composition index" to identify LEAs as being significantly disproportionate. In the framework of this index, districts are flagged based on the criteria of the four steps delineated below. If an LEA is flagged in a specific step they get one point with a total of four points being possible (four areas analyzed). If an LEA accumulates two or more points in one year they are found significantly disproportionate. For a detailed breakdown of this process please consult the data provided to the EdFacts partner support center (PSC) on 1/31/2014.
Texas	For SY 2017-18 data used in analysis and reported in SY 2018-19 to districts regarding significant disproportionality, risk ratio thresholds determined based on stakeholder input and state established standards for all districts are applied. LEAs that do not meet minimum "n" and "cell" size requirements set by the state at "10" and "30" respectively are evaluated with an alternate risk ratio formula against state ratios in a particular area. For an LEA to be considered disproportionate in identification, placement or disciplinary actions of students with disabilities by race or ethnicity, a district would need to be above the positive threshold for two consecutive years. LEAs that exceed the positive thresholds for two consecutive years in respect to identification, placement, or disciplinary actions are identified as having significant disproportionality. The state is engaged with stakeholders for input on additional flexibilities offered through the amended federal regulations at 34 CFR §300.646-647, that may be applied during SY 2018-19 and beyond.
Utah	Significant disproportionality (SD) means significant overrepresentation of certain racial and ethnic groups in special education in proportion to the representation of other racial and ethnic groups based on the State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators 9 and 10 and other IDEA data only (not related to identification procedures) with respect to: Area 1: The data must relate to one of seven categories of race/ethnicity (Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Hawiian/Pacific Islander,

State	Note
	White, and Two or More Races) and show significant disproportionality when one or more of these groups is overrepresented in special education. Area 2: The data must relate to one of seven categories of race/ethnicity and show significant disproportionality of one or more of those racial/ethnic groups in one or more of six categories of disability under the IDEA: autism, emotional disturbance, intellectual disability, other health impairment, specific learning disabilities, or speech/language impairment. Area 3: The data must relate to one of seven categories of race/ethnicity and show significant disproportionality of one or more of those racial/ethnic groups in the placement of those students with disabilities in particular educational settings. Area 4: The data must relate to one of seven categories of race/ethnicity and show significant disproportionality of one or more of those racial/ethnic groups in the incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions with those students with disabilities, including suspensions and expulsions.
Vermont	Significant disproportionality is a measurement of whether the population of IEP students in Supervisory Unions is statistically different than that of the total student population in terms of race or ethnicity. The analysis is done by comparing the proportion of each race or ethnicity in the IEP population with the same group on the total student population, using techniques which prevent false identification due to small counts. The analysis is conducted two ways. In the first, the total populations are compared. In the second, a similar comparison is done for each disability category. Details of how the analysis is performed can be found in Vermont's Annual Performance Report.
Virgin Islands	The VIDE defines disproportionate representation as a relative difference in composition of 20% or more. The VIDE uses a relative difference in composition calculation, which compares children with disabilities in each racial and ethnic group to the total population of students in that same racial and ethnic group within that same district.
Virginia	To determine if significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is occurring, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) conducts data analysis in the four areas specified in Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA): Identification for both special education and disability, placement, and discipline. For the identification and placement analysis, VDOE uses data from the most recent December 1 special education child count. For the discipline analysis, VDOE uses data from the Discipline/Crime & Violence collection. The VDOE uses a risk ratio calculation in determining if significant disproportionality is occurring in the district across ages 6-21 and the seven racial or ethnicity categories. A minimum cell size of 10 (numerator) and minimum n-size of 10 (denominator) is applied to control very small populations. An alternate risk ratio is calculated in cases where the comparison group (all other racial or ethnic groups within the district) does not meet the

State	Note
	established minimum cell size/minimum n-size. The alternate risk ratio is calculated by dividing the risk of a particular outcome for children in one racial or ethnic group within a district by the risk of that outcome for children in all other racial or ethnic groups in the State. Districts with racial and ethnic group(s) that met the minimum cell size/n-size with risk ratios thresholds of 3.0 or greater for three consecutive years are considered to have significant disproportionality. School divisions identified with significant disproportionality are required to reserve 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds to be used for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS). School divisions not identified with significant disproportionality can also voluntarily reserve 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS.
Washington	Washington's Definition of Significant Disproportionality (WAC 392-172A-07040) Washington defines SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY as a weighted risk ratio of 4.0 or greater for three consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in any of the following areas: The identification of children as children with disabilities (all Students with disabilities), The identification of children with a particular disability (Autism, Emotionally/Behaviorally Disabled, Specific Learning Disability, Communication Disorders, Other Health Impairment,Intellectual Disability) The placement of children in particular educational settings (Residential Facility and Separate School combined and Less than 40% of the day in the general education class), or The incidence, duration, and type of disciplinary actions, including suspensions and expulsions (Inschool and Out of School Suspensions greater than 10 days and 10 days or less and all removals). A minimum "n" size of 10 is used for both target and comparison groups over 3 consecutive years. This definition does not reflect the changes in the federal significant disproportionality regulations.
West Virginia	West Virginia's definition is found at the following link http://wvde.state.wv.us/osp/SignificantDisproportionality-CEIS.html by clicking WVDE / OSP Memo: Changes in CEIS and Significant Disproportionality. The definition and procedures are outlined in a Memo issued December 2009.
Wisconsin	Identification of LEAs for children with disabilities/children in specific disability categories 1. At least 10 students with disabilities in the disability category for the racial group 2. At least 100 students enrolled for the racial group 3. A weighted risk ratio of 4.0 or greater for the racial group 4. Risk for the racial group that is at least 1% greater than the statewide white risk in the disability category 5. Must meet the criteria for three consecutive years Identification of LEAs for children placed in particular educational settings 1. At least 10 students with disabilities in the educational setting for the racial group 2. At least 40 students with disabilities enrolled for the racial group 3. A weighted risk ratio of 4.0 or greater for the racial group 4. A risk for the racial group that is at least 1% greater than the statewide white risk in the educational setting 5. Must meet the

State	Note
	criteria for three consecutive years Identification of LEAs for discipline actions 1. At least 10 students with disabilities in the discipline category for the racial group 2. At least 40 students with disabilities enrolled for the racial group 3. A weighted risk ratio of 4.0 or greater for the racial group 4. Risk for the racial group that is at least 1% greater than the statewide white risk in the discipline category 5. Must meet the criteria for three consecutive years
Wyoming	The WDE defines disproportionate representation as an Alternate Risk Ratio of 3.00 or above.

- No information was provided by SEA