Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) is a unitary educational system; therefore, the state is reported as a single district.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100.

(0 districts/1) x 100% = 0%

State Definition of Disproportionate Representation (Tier I):

Any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective disability and group size signifies disproportionate representation.

State Definition of Inappropriate Identification (Tier II):

For overidentification, the state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately overidentified by conducting a file review for each student.

HIDOE Methodology:

The first tier is a statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial and ethnic groups by disability category for the following disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disability, emotional disability, speech or language impairment, other health disability, and autism spectrum disorder. In the statistical analysis of disproportionate representation, risk ratios are calculated based on the racial and ethnic group in a specific disability category with respect to all racial/ethnic groups in Hawaii. The risk ratios are then compared against its respective confidence interval based on disability and group size.
For the second tier, HIDOE applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to a sample of student files from the groups that were identified with disproportionate representation on Tier I to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under HIDOE's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's Memo 09-02, *Reporting on correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.*

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

HIDOE Process for Identifying Disproportionality

HIDOE's process for identifying disproportionality involves a two-tier method of analysis applied to 618 data, as reported to U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Child Count) consistent with 34 CFR §300.173. This process of analysis helps to identify

disproportionate representation that may be the result of inappropriate identification.

Beginning with School Year (SY) 2010-11 HIDOE disaggregated race/ethnicity data into the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups: 1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; and for individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino only; 2) American Indian or Alaska Native; 3) Asian; 4) Black or African American; 5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; 6) White and 7) Two (2) or more races. With SY 2012-13 HIDOE collected three (3) years of data with the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups, allowing for three years of data that are needed to recalculate the confidence intervals HIDOE uses for Tier I analysis of Disproportionate Representation.

HIDOE Tier I uses statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial/ethnic group by disability category. Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education (and in the six specific disability categories for Indicator 10) with respect to the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawaii. The risk ratios are then compared against their respective confidence interval based on group size (and by the disability categories for Indicator 10).

The second tier consists of a two (2) prong analysis, a review relating to over-identification. From the racial/ethnic groups (by the six disability categories for indicator 10) identified in Tier I, a representative sample of student files are reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine if students were appropriately identified by 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111 and 300.301 through 300.311. Policies, practices and procedures are reviewed as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under HIDOE's general supervision process.

Tier I: Confidence Interval and Disproportionate Representation

Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education (and in the six specific disability categories for Indicator 10) with respect to the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawaii. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on group size (and by the disability categories for Indicator 10).

Risk Ratio:

The equation for the risk ratio is:

Risk ratio = Risk for racial/ethnic group for disability category/Risk for comparison group for disability category.

For more details see: http://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf

Confidence Interval:

Using the Child Count data from SY 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, the distribution of incidence rates for specific disabilities of concern were statistically modeled with the average incidence rates used as "expected values of risk" for all racial/ethnic groups.

Derived from the incidence rates, HIDOE calculated the confidence intervals for the risk ratio of special education students and the six disability categories for Indicator 10. Hawaii has adopted the 99% confidence intervals as the criteria for disproportionate representation. See table below.

Confidence Intervals for Disability Risk Ratios – Based on 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13 SY Data

Disability	100	500	1,500	5,000	10,000
Intellectual Disabilities	n/a	n/a	0.46 to 2.15	0.65 to 1.53	0.74 to 1.35
Specific Learning Disabilities	n/a	0.61 to 1.61	0.75 to 1.32	0.86 to 1.17	0.90 to 1.12
Emotional Disturbance	n/a	n/a	0.46 to 2.16	0.65 to 1.54	0.74 to 1.36
Speech or Language Impairments	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.54 to 1.85	0.64 to 1.55
Other Health Impairments	n/a	n/a	0.60 to 1.66	0.75 to 1.32	0.82 to 1.22
Autism	n/a	n/a	0.46 to 2.16	0.65 to 1.54	0.74 to 1.36
All Special Education Students	0.47 to 1.99	0.71 to 1.38	0.82 to 1.21	0.90 to 1.11	0.93 to 1.08
n/a = not applicable (The expected numbers of cases for these cells are less than 10. No probability tests are justified.) Calculated using the Wilson Binomial Confidence Interval formulas at a 99% confidence interval.					

By using the 99% confidence interval for risk ratios of particular racial/ethnic groups, groups that occur outside the confidence interval are unlikely to have occurred by chance and are “free” from the effects of random error. Disproportionate overrepresentation is considered to be any race/ethnicity risk ratio that falls outside the upper boundary of the 99% confidence interval.

Note that confidence intervals are not used for groups with cases of ten (10) or less as the incidence rates and risk ratios become questionable due to their small group size.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			