



NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SPED
SPECIAL EDUCATION

Office of Special Education Disproportionality Guidance

February 2025



What is significant disproportionality?

Significant disproportionality occurs when children from a particular racial or ethnic group in an LEA are found to be at significantly greater risk of being identified for special education services, identified for special education services in a particular category, or once in special education, placed separately from their peers or removed from their least restrictive environment for disciplinary reasons.

Has the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) issued guidance around significant disproportionality?

Per [34 CFR §300.646-647](#), all states are required to annually identify local educational agencies (LEAs) with significant disproportionality. The analytic methods are prescribed by the regulations and involve risk ratios and alternate risk ratios. OSEP has created a [document](#) that answers many common questions about the regulations. These policies have been implemented in Nebraska according to the following information.

Photos are for illustrative purposes only. Any person depicted in the photo is a model.



For which racial/ethnic groups is significant disproportionality calculated?



Significant disproportionality must be calculated for seven racial/ethnic groups, when there are a sufficient number of students in the group to allow for reliable calculations. The groups are:

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native,
2. Asian,
3. Black or African American,
4. Hispanic/Latino,
5. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,
6. White, and
7. Two or More Races.

What is Nebraska's definition of significant disproportionality?

Nebraska considers an LEA to have significant disproportionality when the risk ratio for any racial/ethnic group in any of the required identification, placement, or discipline categories exceeds 4.0 for three consecutive years. The required categories as well as exceptions for small numbers are described below. There are 14 required categories and 7 required racial/ethnic groups; therefore, there are $14 \times 7 = 98$ required calculations per LEA.



How does Nebraska calculate significant disproportionality for identification?

Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when children ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group are at a significantly greater risk than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups of being:

1. identified as a child with a disability,
2. identified as a child with a specific learning disability,
3. identified as a child with an intellectual disability,
4. identified as a child with a speech and language impairment,
5. identified as a child with other health impairment,
6. identified as a child with autism, or
7. identified as a child with an emotional disturbance.

OSEP does not require disproportionality calculations for the remaining disability categories because they typically have very small numbers of children.

The risk for children from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be identified in a category is calculated by dividing the number of children from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) being identified in that category by the total number of children from that racial or ethnic group or groups enrolled in the LEA. For example, if an LEA has 100 Asian children enrolled and 10 of them are identified as children with disabilities,

10 Asian children with disabilities

100 Asian children enrolled

then the risk for an Asian child to be identified as a child with a disability in that LEA is 10/100 or 10 percent.

Risk for Asian children = 10%

If, in the same LEA, there are 200 non-Asian children enrolled and 10 of them are identified as children with disabilities,

10 non-Asian children with disabilities

200 non-Asian children enrolled

then the risk for a non-Asian child to be identified as a child with a disability is 10/200 or 5 percent.

Risk for non-Asian children = 5%

The risk ratio for children from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be identified in a category is the ratio of the risk for children from that group to the risk for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the risk ratio for Asian children and special education identification in that LEA would be 10/5 or 2.0.

Risk ratio = 10/5 = 2.0

We could say that Asian children in the LEA are twice as likely as non-Asian children to be identified for special education. Since this risk ratio is below the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would not be considered significantly disproportionate for Asian children and disability identification.

A LEA is considered to have significant disproportionality when it is significantly disproportionate for a particular racial/ethnic group and disability category for three consecutive years.

What is disproportionate representation (SPP/APR Indicators 9 and 10) and how is it related to significant disproportionality for identification?

In Nebraska, LEAs that have an identification risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 for children ages 5 (in kindergarten) through 21 for the current year are considered to have disproportionate representation. LEAs with disproportionate representation are encouraged to take steps to identify and address factors contributing to their disproportionalities before they are found to have a significant disproportionality.

Nebraska is required to report counts and percentages of LEAs with disproportionate representation in the category of identification as a child with a disability for the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicator 9, and counts and percentages of LEAs with disproportionate representation in the six specific

identification categories for SPP/APR Indicator 10. Nebraska is also required to determine whether each instance of disproportionate representation it identified was the result of inappropriate identification and report in Indicators 9 and 10 counts of LEAs for which it was. To this end, Nebraska requires LEAs with disproportionate representation to complete and return a policy, procedure, and practice review (i.e., checklist and student record reviews) and send supporting documentation, including student files as requested by NDE.



What is Nebraska's significant disproportionality definition for placement?

Significant disproportionality in placement occurs when children with disabilities ages 5 (in kindergarten) through 21 in a particular racial/ethnic group are at a significantly greater risk than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups of being:

1. inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day
2. inside separate schools and residential facilities (not including homebound or hospital settings, correctional facilities, or private schools).

The risk for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be placed in a particular environment is calculated by dividing the number of children with disabilities from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) being placed in that environment by the total number of children with disabilities from that racial or ethnic group or groups in the LEA. For example, if an LEA has 50 Black children with disabilities and 30 of them are placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day,

30 Black children with disabilities placed inside the regular class for less than 40% of the day

50 Black children with disabilities

then the risk for a Black child with a disability to be placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day is 30/50 or 60 percent.

Risk for Black children with disabilities = 60%

If, in the same LEA, there are 100 non-Black children with disabilities and 10 of them are placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day,

10 non-Black children with disabilities placed inside the regular class for less than 40% of the day

100 non-Black children with disabilities

then the risk for a non-Black child to be placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day is 10/100 or 10 percent.

Risk for non-Black children with disabilities = 10%

The risk ratio for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be placed in a particular environment is the ratio of the risk for children from that group to the risk for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the risk ratio for Black children with disabilities and placement inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day would be 60/10 or 6.0.

Risk ratio = 60/10 = 6.0

We could say that Black children with disabilities in the LEA are six times as likely as non-Black children with disabilities to be placed inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day. Since this risk ratio is above the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would be considered significantly disproportionate for Black children with disabilities and placement inside a regular class for less than 40 percent of the day.

An LEA is considered to have significant disproportionality when it is significantly disproportionate for a particular racial/ethnic group and disability category for three consecutive years.

What is Nebraska's significant disproportionality definition for discipline?

Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when children with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group are at a significantly greater risk than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups of being:

1. suspended out-of-school or expelled for 10 days or fewer, $OSS \leq 10$
2. suspended out-of-school or expelled for more than 10 days, $OSS > 10$
3. suspended in-school for 10 days or fewer, $ISS \leq 10$
4. suspended in-school for more than 10 days, $ISS > 10$

The risk for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be disciplined in a particular way is calculated by dividing the number of children with disabilities from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) being disciplined in that way by the total number of children with disabilities from that racial or ethnic group or groups in the LEA.

For example, if an LEA has 1,000 White children with disabilities and 50 of them are suspended in-school for more than 10 days,

50 *White children with disabilities suspended in-school for more than 10 days*

1,000 *White children with disabilities*

then the risk for a White child with a disability to be suspended in-school for more than 10 days is 50/1,000 or 5 percent.

Risk for White children with disabilities = 5%

If, in the same LEA, there are 100 non-White children with disabilities and 10 of them are suspended in-school for more than 10 days,

10 *non-White children with disabilities suspended in-school for more than 10 days*

100 *non-White children with disabilities*

then the risk for a non-White child to be suspended in-school for more than 10 days is 10/100 or 10 percent.

Risk for non-white children with disabilities = 10%

The risk ratio for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) to be disciplined in a particular way is the ratio of the risk for children from that group to the risk for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the risk ratio for White children with disabilities and in-school suspension for more than 10 days would be 5/10 or 0.5.

Risk ratio = 5/10 = 0.5

We could say that White children with disabilities in the LEA are half as likely as non-White children with disabilities to be suspended in-school for more than 10 days. Since this risk ratio is below the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would not be considered significantly disproportionate for White children with disabilities in the category of suspended in-school for more than 10 days.

5. Total Removals. Significant disproportionality in discipline also occurs when children with disabilities ages 3-21 in a particular racial/ethnic group experience a significantly greater average number of disciplinary removals than their peers in other racial/ethnic groups. The total number of removals includes in-school and out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, removals by school personnel to an interim alternative educational setting, and removals by a hearing officer.

The total removals per child (TRPC) for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) is calculated by dividing the total number of removals for children ages 3-21 from the specified racial or ethnic group (or groups) by the total number of children with disabilities from that racial or ethnic group or groups in the LEA.

For example, if an LEA has 100 Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities and 120 total removals between them,

120 *total removals for Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities*

100 *Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities*

then the TRPC for Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities is 120/100 or 1.2.

Total Removals Per Hispanic or Latino Child =
120/100 = 1.2

If, in the same LEA, there are 100 children with disabilities who are not Hispanic or Latino and these children experience 60 total removals,

60 *total removals for non-Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities*

100 *non-Hispanic or Latino children with disabilities*

then the TRPC for children who are not Hispanic or Latino is 60/100 or 0.6.

Total Removals Per non-Hispanic or Latino Child =
60/100 = 0.6

The TRPC ratio for children with disabilities from a specified racial/ethnic group (or groups) is the ratio of the TRPC for children from that group to the TRPC for children not in that group. Continuing the prior example, the TRPC ratio for Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities would be 1.2 / 0.6 or 2.0.

Total Removals Per Child Ratio = 1.2/0.6 = 2.0

We could say that Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities in the LEA receive twice as many disciplinary removals as children who are not Hispanic/Latino. Since this TRPC ratio is below the threshold of 4.0, the LEA would not be considered significantly disproportionate for Hispanic/Latino children with disabilities in the total removals category.

Indicator 4: What is significant discrepancy (SPP/APR Indicator 4) and how is it related to significant disproportionality for discipline?

SPP/APR Indicator 4 focuses on significant discrepancy. The data comes from a single discipline category: being suspended out-of-school or expelled for more than 10 days. Federal regulations allow states many options for performing significant discrepancy calculations, but none of them match the calculation allowed for significant disproportionality. In particular, significant disproportionality requires a direct comparison of racial/ethnic groups with each other within each LEA, while significant discrepancy prohibits such a comparison.

In Nebraska, significant discrepancy calculations use risk as the basic calculation. LEAs in which children with disabilities ages 3-21 have a risk of greater than 3 percent are considered to have a significant discrepancy. Nebraska is required to report a count of its LEAs with a significant discrepancy for SPP/APR Indicator 4A.

LEAs in which children with disabilities ages 3-21 from any particular racial or ethnic group have a risk of greater than 3 percent are also considered to have a significant discrepancy.

Nebraska is required to report a count of its LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity for SPP/APR Indicator 4B. The state must also report a count and percentage of its LEAs that have a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity and also policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. To this end, Nebraska requires LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity to complete and return a policy, procedure, and practice (PPP) review checklist and student file reviews, which includes these factors, and to send supporting documents, including student files as requested by NDE. LEAs with significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity are also encouraged to take steps to identify and address the root causes of the discrepancies before they are found to have a significant disproportionality.

What if we have a small number of children?

Non-calculation and alternate risk ratios

The regulations allow states to exclude from the calculations groups that are too small for reliable calculations. For Indicators 9 and 10 and significant disproportionality, Nebraska uses a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum n size of 30. For Indicator 4, Nebraska does not have a minimum cell size and uses a minimum n size of 40. This has consequences for all disproportionate representation, significant discrepancy, and significant disproportionality calculations. The particular consequences depend on whether the small numbers affect the target group or the comparison group.

- Target group cell size (not applicable to Indicator 4 - significant discrepancy). If the target racial or ethnic group has fewer than 10 children in the numerator of any risk or TRPC calculation, that calculation is not performed for that racial or ethnic group. For example, if an LEA has fewer than 10 American Indian or Alaskan Native children identified with emotional disturbance, then no risk calculation is made for American Indian or Alaskan Native children in the emotional disturbance category. This would affect significant disproportionality and Indicator 10.
- Target group n size. If the target racial or ethnic group has fewer than 30 (40 for Indicator 4/significant discrepancy) children in the denominator of any risk or TRPC calculation, that calculation is not performed for that racial or ethnic group. For example, if an LEA has fewer than 30 (40 for Indicator 4/significant discrepancy) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander children identified with a disability, then no risk calculations are made for American Indian or Alaskan Native children in any of the seven placement or discipline categories of significant disproportionality, nor for significant discrepancy (Indicator 4B).
- Comparison group cell size and n size. This paragraph does not apply to significant discrepancy because that calculation has no comparison group. If the comparison group has fewer than 10 children in the numerator of any risk or TRPC calculation, or fewer than 30 in the denominator of any risk or TRPC calculation, it is replaced by a comparison group at the state level, which is presumed to be large enough. This is called an “alternate risk ratio.” For example, if an LEA has 30 or more White children with disabilities, with 10 or more of them inside separate schools and residential facilities, then a risk calculation can be made. If, however, the LEA has fewer than 30 non-White children with disabilities or fewer than 10 inside separate schools and residential facilities, then the alternative risk ratio must be used. The risk for White children in the LEA is divided by the state-level risk for non-White children.

15 *White children with disabilities inside separate schools and residential facilities*

60 *White children with disabilities*

$$\text{Risk} = 15/60 = 0.25$$

100 *non-White children with disabilities inside separate schools and residential facilities IN THE STATE*

200 *non-White children with disabilities IN THE STATE*

$$\text{State-Level Risk} = 100/200 = 0.50$$

$$\text{Alternate Risk Ratio} = .25/.50 = 0.50$$

Must an LEA meet the definition for significant disproportionality in each of the categories before being identified with significant disproportionality?

No. The LEA only needs to meet the definition for one of the 14 categories and one of the 7 racial or ethnic groups to be identified with significant disproportionality.

When is LEA data examined for significant disproportionality, significant discrepancy, and disproportionate representation?

Identification and Placement data will be examined each summer and districts will be notified in the fall. Discipline data will be examined in the winter each year and LEAs will be notified in the spring.

Where does the data being examined come from?

Identification and Placement data is taken from the October 1st Special Education Child Count submitted to ADVISER. Discipline data is taken from data submitted by LEAs throughout the year in ADVISER with a June deadline.

How will an LEA be notified if they have significant disproportionality or are in a cautionary zone for significant disproportionality?

Districts identified with significant disproportionality or in a Cautionary Zone for Discipline will be notified in writing by NDE in the spring. Districts identified with significant disproportionality or in the Cautionary Zone for Identification or Placement will be notified in writing by NDE in the fall.

Color scheme for significant disproportionality calculations in a single category and a single year

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| ^a insufficient data √ | Equitable † | Cautionary Zone 3 ‡ | Cautionary Zone 4 Δ | Significant Disproportionality ∞ |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|

LEAs found to have a risk ratio of at least 3.0 but less than 4.0 in the current year in one or more of the 98 calculation categories are considered to be in cautionary zone 3 for significant disproportionality and will be notified in writing by NDE.

Example of cautionary zone 3:

| 2019-2020 | 2018-2019 | 2017-2018 |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| 3.02 ‡ | N size < 30 √ | N size < 30 √ |

LEAs found to have a risk ratio of 4.0 or more in one or more of the 98 calculation categories in the current year but not in both prior years are considered to be in cautionary zone 4 for significant disproportionality and will be notified in writing by NDE.

Example of cautionary zone 4:

| 2019-2020 | 2018-2019 | 2017-2018 |
|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| 5.32 Δ | 3.86 ‡ | N size < 30 √ |

LEAs found to have a risk ratio of 4.0 or more in one or more of the 98 calculation categories in the current year and the two prior years are considered to have significant disproportionality and will be notified in writing by NDE.

Example of significant disproportionality:

| 2019-2020 | 2018-2019 | 2017-2018 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 5.32 ∞ | 4.34 Δ | 4.55 Δ |

LEAs with significant disproportionality are federally required to use IDEA funds for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS). Cautionary zones 3 and 4 are designed to help LEAs avoid getting to the point of significant disproportionality. LEAs in these cautionary zones and LEAs identified for Indicators B4, B9, and B10 are required or encouraged to take certain actions as described in Table 1.

^a Insufficient data means the cell size and/or the n size wasn't met to complete the calculation.

What happens if an LEA is identified as having significant disproportionality?

LEAs found to have significant disproportionality must identify and address the factors contributing to the significant disproportionality. NDE will provide support for this process. One tool that will be required is the IDEA Data Center's Success Gaps Toolkit. Additionally, the LEA must set aside 15 percent of their special education funds to provide Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services designed to help address the factors identified.

Districts will receive notification for a significant disproportionality in Discipline in the spring. They will have until October to gather a team and complete the Success Gaps Toolkit, determine the root cause, and develop a Corrective Action Plan. Districts will receive notification for a significant disproportionality in Identification or Placement in the fall. They will have until February to gather

a team and complete the Success Gaps Toolkit, determine the root cause, and develop a Corrective Action Plan. These Corrective Action Plans are part of their continuous improvement efforts. The Corrective Action Plan must include quarterly benchmarks. NDE will facilitate this work.

Districts with active significant disproportionality action plans will report on achievement of plan benchmarks and any plan modifications by March 1, June 1, September 1, and December 1. They will meet with NDE to review these reports within 30 days of the due dates. For districts with continuing significant disproportionality, these reports of continuing progress will sometimes replace the need for a separate root cause/action planning process.

Where can I find additional information about Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS)?

A guidance document around CEIS and CCEIS is located on the NDE Special Education website at https://cdn.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/NEBRASKA_Guidance_Document_CEIS.pdf

Can an LEA provide early intervening services even if they aren't identified with Significant Disproportionality?

Yes, LEAs may voluntarily set aside up to 15 percent of their special education funds to provide Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS). An

LEA might choose to do this, for example, if they have been identified in the Cautionary Zone for disproportionality.

How can an LEA be disproportionate when the population is fairly homogenous?

When an LEA has a very small number of students in its second largest racial/ethnic group, it would be unreliable to calculate a risk ratio because the comparison group is too small. In these cases, the comparison group is switched from the district level to the state level. This is called an alternate risk ratio. An alternate risk ratio must be understood differently than a risk ratio. To take an example,

- an LEA with a risk ratio of 4.0 for White students in the autism category should think: "White students in my LEA are four times as likely as non-White students in my LEA to be identified with autism," but
- an LEA with an alternate risk ratio of 4.0 for White students in the autism category should think: "White students in my LEA are four times as likely as non-White students in Nebraska to be identified with autism."

The risk ratio makes a clear statement about racial or ethnic disproportionality. The alternate risk ratio needs further investigation. Alternate risk ratios compare two risks:

- The risk for students of the identified racial/ethnic group in the LEA,
- The risk for students NOT of the identified racial/ethnic group in the state.

As a preliminary step in their root cause analysis, LEAs identified with alternate risk ratios are encouraged to compare two additional risks:

- The risk for students of the identified racial/ethnic group in the state,
- The risk for all students in the state.

When an LEA has a very small number of students in its second largest racial/ethnic group, it would be unreliable to calculate a risk ratio because the comparison group is too small. In these cases, the comparison group is switched from the district level to the state level.

In some cases, alternate risk ratios say little about racial and ethnic disproportionalities and, instead, say much about the overrepresentation of students from the identified LEA as compared to the rest of the state in a disability category, in the placement of students in more restrictive environments, or in the disciplining of students.

Table 1: LEA Required and Recommended Responses to Disproportionality Identifications & SEA Support

| Identified for | PPP Checklist for Identification and student file reviews | PPP Checklist for Placement and student file reviews | PPP Checklist for Discipline and student file reviews | Action Plan | SG Toolkit | SEA Support |
|---|---|--|---|-------------|-------------|--|
| ^a B4a: > 3% of SWDs long-term suspended or expelled | | | required | | recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide PPP checklist, student file review form, and guidance when requested for completing Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video |
| ^b B4b: > 3% of [identified racial/ethnic group] SWDs long-term suspended or expelled | | | required | | recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide PPP checklist, student file review form, and guidance for completing Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video |
| ^c B9: One or more racial/ethnic groups have a risk ratio ≥ 3 for identification as a SWD (ages 5 [in kindergarten] through 21) | required | | | | recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide PPP checklist, student file review form, and guidance when requested for completing Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video |
| ^d B10: One or more racial/ethnic groups (ages 5 [in kindergarten] through 21) have a risk ratio ≥ 3 for identification in a particular disability category | required | | | | recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide PPP checklist, student file review form, and guidance when requested for completing Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video |
| Significant Disproportionality Cautionary Zone 3: maximum $RR^e \geq 3.0$, but < 4.0 for most recent year | recommended if identified in this area | recommended if identified in this area | recommended if identified in this area | recommended | recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide PPP checklist, student file review form, and guidance when requested for completing Provide link to Success Gaps Toolkit and Introductory Video |

^a Small n sizes generate statistically unreliable data. Therefore, when the number of students with disabilities in a district is less than 40, the calculation is skipped and the district is not identified.

^b Small n sizes generate statistically unreliable data. Therefore, when the number of students with disabilities from a particular racial/ethnic group in a district is less than 40, the calculation is skipped and the district is not identified for that group.

^c Small n sizes and cell sizes generate statistically unreliable data. Therefore, when the number of students from a particular racial/ethnic group in a district (n) is less than 30, or the number of those students identified with disabilities (cell) is less than 10, the calculation is skipped for that racial/ethnic group. A reasonably sized comparison group of students who are NOT in the targeted racial/ethnic group is also needed. If there are fewer than 30 students in the district who are NOT members of the targeted racial/ethnic group or fewer than 10 of those students who are identified with disabilities, then the comparison group comes from the much larger state population -- this is called an alternate risk ratio.

^d Small n sizes and cell sizes generate statistically unreliable data. Therefore, when the number of students from a particular racial/ethnic group in a district (n) is less than 30, or the number of those students with a particular disability in the district (cell) is less than 10, the calculation is skipped for that racial/ethnic group and disability category. A reasonably sized comparison group of students who are NOT in the targeted racial/ethnic group is also needed. If there are fewer than 30 students in the district who are NOT members of the targeted racial/ethnic group or fewer than 10 of those students who are identified with a particular disability, then the comparison group comes from the much larger state population -- this is called an alternate risk ratio.

^e For each LEA, 98 calculations are required: $98 = 7$ racial/ethnic groups times 14 categories. Small cell and n sizes can create exceptions. When the cell size of the target group is less than 10 or the n size of the target group is less than 30, the calculation is skipped. When the cell size of the comparison group is less than 10 or the n size of the comparison group is less than 30, the alternate risk ratio is substituted for the risk ratio.

Table 1: LEA Required and Recommended Responses to Disproportionality Identifications & SEA Support (continued)

| Identified for | PPP Checklist for Identification and student file reviews | PPP Checklist for Placement and student file reviews | PPP Checklist for Discipline and student file reviews | Action Plan | SG Toolkit | SEA Support |
|--|---|--|---|-------------|-------------|---|
| Significant Disproportionality Cautionary Zone 4: maximum $RR^e \geq 4.0$ for most recent year, but not both prior years | recommended if identified in this area | recommended if identified in this area | recommended if identified in this area | recommended | recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide PPP checklist, student file review form, and guidance when requested for completing • Provide PPP checklist, student file review form, and guidance when requested for completing |
| Significant Disproportionality: maximum $RR^e \geq 4.0$ for most recent and two prior years, all using the same one of the required 98 annual calculations | required | required | required | required | required | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Series of individual LEA team meetings to facilitate (1) developing a comprehensive team, (2) in-depth data analysis, (3) completion of Success Gaps Rubric and identification of root cause(s), including a review of policies, procedures, and practices, (4) evaluation of potential solutions to select best fit, (5) action planning (including planning for effective implementation and evaluation of efforts), and (6) monitoring and improving implementation • Required actions to be reflected in TIP |

^e For each LEA, 98 calculations are required: $98 = 7$ racial/ethnic groups times 14 categories. Small cell and n sizes can create exceptions. When the cell size of the target group is less than 10 or the n size of the target group is less than 30, the calculation is skipped. When the cell size of the comparison group is less than 10 or the n size of the comparison group is less than 30, the alternate risk ratio is substituted for the risk ratio.