

SECTION V.B.

SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY REPORTING FORM

Introduction:

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

Section A: Minimum N-Sizes

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

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

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

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

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

If you answered **YES** to question 2a:

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

If you answered **NO** to question 2a:

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

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

Minimum N-Size Detailed Rationale(s) Required

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

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

If you answered **YES** to question 2b:

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

If you answered **NO** to question 2b:

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

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

Category of Analysis	Minimum N-Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum n-size is more than 30)</i>
All categories of analysis	30	NO CHANGE - Stakeholders (the Special Education Advisory Panel or SEAP) were provided a definition for n-size and were shown how an n-size is applied to calculation methods for disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification, placement or discipline of students with disabilities. Since historical data n-sizes were not available, the SEAP were trained specifically using calculation methods for the risk ratio and the alternate risk ratio while applying different thresholds for risk ratios and different n-sizes. The SEAP were presented with multiple scenarios that also included different cell sizes, and, as a result, recommended that the State apply a minimum n-size of 30. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.

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

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

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

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

Section B: Minimum Cell Sizes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Minimum Cell Size Detailed Rationale(s) Required

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Category of Analysis	Minimum Cell Size	Rationale <i>(detailed rationale required if minimum cell size is more than 10)</i>
All categories of analysis	10	NO CHANGE - Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, including significant disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method and a minimum cell size of 20 to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having significant disproportionality in the identification, placement or discipline of children with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the minimum cell size. The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) were trained and presented with multiple scenarios using the calculation methods for the risk ratio and the alternate risk ratio while applying different risk ratio thresholds and cell sizes. The scenarios also involved using different n-sizes. Thus, the SEAP recommended that the State change the minimum cell size from 20 to 10. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.

Table 4: Minimum Cell Size — Multiple Minimum Cell Sizes

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

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

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

Section C: Risk Ratio Thresholds

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

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

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

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

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

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

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
All categories of analysis		

Table 6: Risk Ratios — Multiple Risk Ratio Thresholds

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
All disabilities	4.0	Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification and placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 4.0 for identification, including identification by disability category. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Autism	4.0	Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification and placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 4.0 for identification, including identification by disability category. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Emotional disturbance	4.0	Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification and placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 4.0 for identification, including identification by disability category. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Intellectual disability	4.0	Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification and placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 4.0 for identification, including identification by disability category. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
Other health impairments	4.0	Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification and placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 4.0 for identification, including identification by disability category. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Specific learning disability	4.0	Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification and placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 4.0 for identification, including identification by disability category. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Speech and language impairments	4.0	Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification and placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 4.0 for identification, including identification by disability category. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Inside a regular classroom less than 40% of day	3.0	NO CHANGE - Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification or placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) were trained and presented with multiple scenarios using the calculation methods for the risk ratio and the alternate risk ratio. The scenarios also involved using different cell sizes and n-sizes. Thus, the SEAP recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 5.0 to 3.0. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Inside separate schools and residential facilities	3.0	NO CHANGE - Since the requirement to analyze disproportionality, Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having disproportionality, including significant disproportionality in the identification or placement of students with disabilities. As a result, historical data were used to determine the risk ratio threshold. The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) were trained and presented with multiple scenarios using the calculation methods for the risk ratio and the alternate risk ratio. The scenarios also involved using different cell sizes and n-sizes. Thus, the SEAP recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 5.0 to 3.0. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Total disciplinary removals	5.0	Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having significant disproportionality for students with disabilities who experience disciplinary actions. Three years of trend data were available to determine the reasonableness of the current risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 5.0 for discipline. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
Out of school suspensions <10 days	5.0	Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having significant disproportionality for students with disabilities who experience disciplinary actions. Three years of trend data were available to determine the reasonableness of the current risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 5.0 for discipline. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.

Category of Analysis	Risk Ratio Threshold	Rationale
Out of school suspensions >10 days	5.0	Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having significant disproportionality for students with disabilities who experience disciplinary actions. Three years of trend data were available to determine the reasonableness of the current risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 5.0 for discipline. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
In school suspensions <10 days	5.0	Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having significant disproportionality for students with disabilities who experience disciplinary actions. Three years of trend data were available to determine the reasonableness of the current risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 5.0 for discipline. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.
In school suspensions >10 days	5.0	Alabama has used the risk ratio method to identify local education agencies (LEAs) as having significant disproportionality for students with disabilities who experience disciplinary actions. Three years of trend data were available to determine the reasonableness of the current risk ratio threshold. The stakeholders (select LEA Special Education Coordinators and Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)) were presented with multiple scenarios of thresholds. Thus, the stakeholders recommended that the State change the risk ratio threshold from 3.0 to 5.0 for discipline. The State accepted their recommendation as reasonable.

Section D: Reasonable Progress

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
All categories of analysis		

Table 8: Reasonable Progress — Multiple Standards

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
All disabilities		
Autism		
Emotional disturbance		
Intellectual disability		
Other health impairments		

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
Specific learning disability		
Speech and language impairments		
Inside a regular classroom less than 40% of day		
Inside separate schools and residential facilities		
Total disciplinary removals		
Out of school suspensions <10 days		
Out of school suspensions >10 days		

Category of Analysis	Standard	Rationale
In school suspensions <10 days		
In school suspensions >10 days		

Section E: Number of Years of Data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name of Individual Preparing the Form: DaLee Chambers

Title of Individual Preparing the Form: State Director of Special Education

Date: 05/20/22

SUBMIT