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Objectives

- Review implementation phases for disproportionality.
- Review Maryland’s Model for disproportionality.
- Provide technical assistance on the local *Reducing and Eliminating Disproportionate Impact of School Discipline Action Plan.*
Implementation: Phase 1

- Data dissemination
- Information gathering
- Professional development
- Stakeholder engagement

January 2017
Implementation: Phase 2

School Year 2017 – 2018

- Root cause analysis by school systems and school level teams
- Professional development provided by MSDE
- Stakeholder and partner engagement through pre-post surveys
Implementation: Phase 3

School Year 2018-2019

Full implementation which includes:

- Identification of Schools
- Submission of strategic plan by local system to eliminate disproportionality
Implementation: Three Phase Approach

Phase 1: Initial Data Review

Phase 2: Root Cause Analysis

Phase 3: Full Implementation

2017-2018
Maryland’s Model
## Maryland Model: Two Disproportionality Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risk Ratio</strong></th>
<th><strong>State Comparison</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of disproportionality within a school between a student group and all other students.</td>
<td>Degree of disproportionality between a student group at a school compared to “All Students” at the State level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Ratio Method

Step 1. Calculate removal rates (Student Group & All Other Students)

\[
\text{Removal Rate} = \frac{\text{Unduplicated Count of Students in Group Removed}}{\text{Total Count of Students in the Group}} \times 100
\]

Step 2. Calculate Risk Ratio

\[
\text{Risk Ratio} = \frac{\text{Student Group Removal Rate}}{\text{All Other Students Removal Rate}}
\]
Risk Ratio Example…

The removal rate for Black/African American students at ABC Elementary School is 20%.

The removal rate for all other students (non-Black) is 6.67%. The risk ratio is $20 \div 6.67 = 3.00$

Therefore, the risk of removal for African American students is 3 times higher than the risk of removal for all other students at the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
<th>Level of disproportionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Two times higher risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Three times higher risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Comparison Measure

- Tells us if a school is applying exclusionary discipline to a student group more frequently than the statewide removal rate.
- State-wide removal rates, by grade band (elementary and middle/high), based on the prior three years of Maryland’s data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Removal Rate¹</th>
<th>School Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>Elementary (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>Middle/High (M/H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Comparison Measure

Step 1. Calculate Student Group removal rate

\[
\text{Removal Rate} = \frac{\text{Unduplicated Count of Students in Group Removed}}{\text{Total Count of Students in the Group}} \times 100
\]

Step 2. Calculate State Comparison Measure

\[
\text{State Comparison Measure} = \frac{\text{Student Group Removal Rate}}{\text{Statewide Removal Rate (E or MH)}}
\]
The removal rate for students with disabilities at XYZ Middle School is 18%.

The statewide removal rate for all students in Maryland middle/high schools is 6.75%.

The risk of removal for students with disabilities at XYZ Middle School is 2.7 times higher than the risk of removal for middle/high school students statewide (18% ÷ 6.75%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Removal Rate&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>School Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>Middle/High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Business Rules

- Data source for the removal rate denominator
  - End-of-Year Attendance
  - Students are counted in the denominator for each school in which they are enrolled for 10 or more days during the school year.

- Treatment of combined schools
  - Reported separately by grade band and compared to the statewide removal rate consistent with the grade band.

- Detailed business rules outlined in the data guidance document
Example data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>LEA Number</th>
<th>LEA Name</th>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>(A) Student Group Removal Count</th>
<th>(B) Student Group Total Count</th>
<th>Student Group Removal Rate (A:B)</th>
<th>(X) All Other Students Removal Count</th>
<th>(Y) All Other Students Total Count</th>
<th>All Other Students Removal Rate (X:Y)</th>
<th>Risk Ratio Measure (A : B) ÷ (X : Y)</th>
<th>Statewide Removal Rate</th>
<th>State Comparison Measure (A / B) ÷ (Statewide Removal Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>4501</td>
<td>Blue Elementary</td>
<td>Elem</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Sunny High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Sunny High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>Sunset Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>Sunset Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland Model: Identification of Schools

- Beginning in School Year 2018-2019…
- A school will be identified as disproportionate if…
  - The Risk Ratio and State Comparison measures for one or more student groups within a school meet or exceed a value of 3.0.
Action Plan
Purpose

- To develop a plan of action to address removal data determined to have disproportionate impact on students of color and students with disabilities.
Local Action Plan Certification (p.4)

- Local Education Agency
  - Demographics
  - Points of Contact
  - Signatures
Members of the local educational agency (LEA) teams could include:

- Superintendent (assistant superintendent, directors of student services, etc.)
- Local board of education and teacher association leadership
- LEA positive behavior interventions and support point of contact
- Program Leadership: English as a second language, title programs, special education, directors of student services, school counseling supervisors, pupil personnel supervisor, health and safety coordinator, and school psychology supervisor
- Parents
- Local college or university
- LEA or community groups
- Other
Executive Summary (p.6)

Brief narrative describing areas of concern identified in the review of the data.

Address the following:

- Current efforts underway to address disproportionality
- How the LEA will address areas of concern.
- Overall strategies that will be implemented to address identified schools and schools to watch
Local Education Agency Data Profile (p.7)

Schools Identified by Risk Ratio and State Comparison methodologies:

- Summary of data by race/ethnicity of all identified schools
- Summary of data by students with disabilities identified schools
- Summary of data by grade levels for identified schools (elementary, middle, and high, and combined schools)
Local Education Agency Data Profile (p. 8)

Schools to Watch by Risk Ratio and State Comparison methodologies:

- Summary of data by race/ethnicity of all identified schools
- Summary of data by students with disabilities identified schools
- Summary of data by grade levels for identified schools (elementary, middle, and high, and combined schools)
Analyzing questions (p.9)

Schools identified by Risk Ratio and State Comparison methodologies values of 3.0 or higher:

- Challenges identified by race/ethnicity and students with disabilities
- Challenges identified terms of grade levels (elementary, middle, and high)
Analyzing questions (p.9)

Schools to Watch identified by Risk Ratio and State Comparison methodologies values of 2.0-2.99:

- Challenges identified by race/ethnicity and students with disabilities
- Challenges identified terms of grade levels (elementary, middle, and high)
- Evidence-based strategies and promising practices for implementation to ensure non-identification
Strategic 3-Year Plan (p.10)

Identify root cause(s)

- Develop a SMART Goal
  - List activities
  - Timeframe
  - Indicators of measurement
  - Responsible person(s)
  - Goal status
Action plan submission (p.16)

- Year 1 (2018-2019) all LEAs identified as disproportionate submit an action plan
- Year 2 (2019-2020) LEAs submit all revised sections
- Year 3 (2020-2021) LEAs submit all revised sections
THANK YOU