VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Indicator 4: Suspension and Expulsion

Vermont

October 17, 2024

Prepared by Student Support Services and Data Management and Analysis Divisions

Technical Assistance Provided by IDEA Data Center

Table of Contents

Indicator 4A and 4B Methodology Setting

Purpose

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) requires each state to have in place a State Performance Plan (SPP). This plan describes and evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements of the IDEA Part B. The SPP includes annual targets for 18 indicators identified by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The SPP/APR (SPP/APR) includes indicators that measure child and family outcomes as well as indicators that measure compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. Each year, states must report against the targets in its SPP in an annual performance report (APR). Vermont Agency of Education (AOE) State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Target Setting process includes stakeholder involvement in setting the SPP targets.

The Agency seeks comment from the public on methodology and target setting on Indicator 4: Suspension and Expulsion for student with disabilities in Vermont. Public Input for Target Setting Proposals will be open from October 18,2024 until December 2, 2024. Proposals may be submitted as a specific number or as a range. Please email the completed form via email to AOE.SpecialEd@vermont.gov or by regular mail to the address below:

Ana Russo
Student Support Services Division
Vermont Agency of Education
1 National Life Drive, Davis 5
Montpelier, VT 05620-2501

This guide is designed to help the public understand and provide input on the methodology and target for Indicator 4A and 4B.

IDEA Data Center

The Vermont Agency of Education prepared this document with technical assistance provided by the IDEA Data Center (IDC). There is no official endorsement from IDC and the views expressed herein do not represent the positions or policies of IDC. For more information about the center's work and its partners, see IDEA Data Center Website.

Indicator 4A and 4B

Indicator 4A measures the percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Indicator 4B measures the percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) 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. (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22)) and (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)).

Data Reporting

Supervisory Unions and Districts (SU/SDs) report all instances of suspension and expulsion in the Year End Official data collection to the AOE. Student census, tuitioned student census and child count are also used for comparisons to student populations for these measurements which are collected in the fall during the school year.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices

Should there be an instance of noncompliance, the AOE is utilizing templates to lead the LEA in a self-assessment of policies, procedures and practices regarding the implementation of IEPs. These templates are based on the Success Gaps Toolkit by IDC. A version of those templates will also be used by the AOE for monitoring, documenting and enforcing accountability to avoid students' denial of a free and appropriate public education. This same process is paired with and highlighted in Vermont's procedural safeguards. The use of positive behavioral interventions and supports is written into Vermont statutes and monitored closely. The VT AOE currently has guidance to support teams in considering suspension and expulsion, data collection, and reporting for students under age 8 and is engaged in ongoing cross-division work to extend the guidance through high school.

Public Input Process

This document is meant to facilitate stakeholder feedback. Measurements and calculations do not represent actual SU/SD data; examples are for illustrative purposes. Feedback and recommendations can be submitted to AOE.SpecialEd@vermont.gov, public input period will close on December 2, 2024.

Vermont's Previous Methodology

In past reports, including the FFY2022 SPP/APR Report published July 29, 2024, An SU/SD was found to have a significant discrepancy if the number of students experiencing out-of-school suspension/expulsions greater than 10 days is more than the threshold of 3.00 percent of that SU/SD's total special education population. Vermont used addition to the state-level rate rather than multiplication due to the very low state-level rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities. The out-of-school suspension/expulsion rate was derived from the total number of out-of-school suspension/expulsions more than 10 days for special education students in an SU/SD (numerator) divided by the total number of special education students in the SU/SD (denominator). Only children with IEPs are considered.

Vermont AOE recognizes that Vermont school districts and supervisory unions suspend very few students on IEPs for greater than 10 days.

OSEP Response to Vermont's Methodology

In the FFY2022 SPP/APR Report published July 29, 2024 OSEP responded to the AOE, that the indicator 4A methodology "results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States." For Indicator 4B OSEP responded that Vermont's "methodology included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs".

Process for Methodology Setting for Indicator 4

Vermont Agency of Education is proposing four options:

- Option 1: State-Level Rate Ratio
- Option 2: State-Level Rate Difference
- Option 3: Rate Ratio of Students with Disabilities compared to Students without Disabilities
- Option 4: Rate Difference of Students with Disabilities compared to Students without Disabilities

Within each option, examples and measures are provided to:

1. Determine the type of comparison to be made.
2. Determine a threshold equal to or above which a district is found to have a significant discrepancy.
3. Determine if Vermont should use a minimum cell size, then define the minimum cell size requirements.
4. For Indicator 4A, determine a statewide target for the percentage of districts that have a significant discrepancy. Indicator 4B target is set at 0%.

Indicator 4A

Indicator 4A measures the percent of supervisory unions and school districts (SU/SDs) that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

Option 1: State-Level Rate Ratio

The State-Level Rate ratio method uses the suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to establish a threshold. This is done by multiplying the state-level rate by a specific value set by the state. For more details, see the State-Level Suspension/Expulsion Rate for Children guide on page 23 of the Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by the IDEA Data Center.

Method

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the SU/SD.

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities.

Step 3: Multiply the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities by a set value to establish the suspension/expulsion-rate threshold.

Step 4: Use this comparison as a basis for determining significant discrepancy.

An SU/SD has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is more than the state-level suspension/expulsion rate threshold for children with disabilities.

Calculation

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the LEA}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the LEA}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the State

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the State}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the State}} \times 100$$

Example

SU/SD Example	Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children with disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD A	1	100	1.00%
SU/SD B	4	100	4.00%
SU/SD C	1	350	0.29%
SU/SD D	5	350	1.43%
SU/SD E	1	600	0.17%
SU/SD F	11	600	1.83%
SU/SD G	2	400	0.50%
State Total	23	2100	1.10%

In this example, SU/SDs B, D, and F suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities is higher than the state-level suspension and expulsion rate (1.10%) for children with disabilities. Using this method, these SU/SDs are not yet found to have a significant discrepancy, just to have a higher rate than the state-side number. In order to be identified with a significant discrepancy they must meet or pass the threshold described in the next section.

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a threshold equal to or above which is district is found to have a significant discrepancy. In this option, any SU/SD with a rate that is at or above the threshold would be identified with a significant discrepancy.

For example, if the state chooses to set the threshold at the state-level rate, then SU/SDs B, D, and F would be identified with a significant discrepancy.

SU/SD Example	Rate	State-Level Rate	At or Above
SU/SD A	1.00%	1.10%	No
SU/SD B	4.00%	1.10%	Yes
SU/SD C	0.29%	1.10%	No
SU/SD D	1.43%	1.10%	Yes
SU/SD E	0.17%	1.10%	No
SU/SD F	1.83%	1.10%	Yes
SU/SD G	0.50%	1.10%	No

States may also choose to set the threshold by multiplying the state-level rate by an established number (e.g., any district with a suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities that is 1.1 times or more than the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is considered to have a significant discrepancy).

For example, if the threshold is set by multiplying the state-level rate by 1.1 times or more than the state-level rate, SU/SDs B, D and F would be identified with a significant dispensary.

SU/SD Example	Rate	State-Level Rate x 1.1	Identified
SU/SD A	1.00%	1.21%	No
SU/SD B	4.00%	1.21%	Yes
SU/SD C	0.29%	1.21%	No
SU/SD D	1.43%	1.21%	Yes
SU/SD E	0.17%	1.21%	No
SU/SD F	1.83%	1.21%	Yes
SU/SD G	0.50%	1.21%	No

Cell and N Size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as

minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Target Setting

Determine a statewide target for the percentage of SU/SDs that have a significant discrepancy. The target will represent the maximum tolerable percentage of SU/SDs with a significant discrepancy. Previous years targets were set at 0%, using a methodology that did not consistently find evidence of SU/SDs having a significant discrepancy. A revised methodology may yield more SU/SDs with identification.

Option 2: State-Level Rate Difference

The State-Level Rate Difference method uses the suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to establish a threshold. This is done by adding the state-level rate to a value set by the state. For more details, see the State-Level Suspension/Expulsion Rate for Children with Disabilities guide on page 23 of the Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by the IDEA Data Center.

Method

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the SU/SD.

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the State.

Step 3: Add to the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities by a value to set the suspension/expulsion-rate threshold.

Step 4: Use this comparison as a basis for determining significant discrepancy.

An SU/SD has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is more than the state-level suspension/expulsion rate threshold for children with disabilities.

Calculation

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the SU/SD.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the SU/SD}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the state.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the state}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the state}} \times 100$$

Example

In this example, SU/SDs B, D and F suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities is higher than the state-level suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities.

SU/SD Example	Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children with disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD A	1	100	1.00%
SU/SD B	4	100	4.00%
SU/SD C	1	350	0.29%
SU/SD D	5	350	1.43%
SU/SD E	1	600	0.17%
SU/SD F	11	600	1.83%
SU/SD G	2	400	0.50%
State Total	23	2100	1.10%

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a threshold equal to or above which is district is found to have a significant discrepancy. In this option, any SU/SD with a rate that is at or above the threshold would be identified with a significant discrepancy.

SU/SD Example	Rate	State-Level Rate	At or Above
SU/SD A	1.00%	1.10%	No
SU/SD B	4.00%	1.10%	Yes
SU/SD C	0.29%	1.10%	No
SU/SD D	1.43%	1.10%	Yes
SU/SD E	0.17%	1.10%	No
SU/SD F	1.83%	1.10%	Yes
SU/SD G	0.50%	1.10%	No

For example, if the state chooses to set the bar at the state-level rate, then SU/SDs B, D, and F would be identified with a significant discrepancy.

Vermont may choose to set the threshold by adding a certain number of percentage points to the state-level rate (e.g., any district with a suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities that is 3 percentage points or more above the state-level or state

mean suspension/ expulsion rate for children with disabilities is considered to have a significant discrepancy).

SU/SD Example	Rate	State-Level Rate + 1%	Identified
SU/SD A	1.00%	2.10%	No
SU/SD B	4.00%	2.10%	Yes
SU/SD C	0.29%	2.10%	No
SU/SD D	1.43%	2.10%	No
SU/SD E	0.17%	2.10%	No
SU/SD F	1.83%	2.10%	No
SU/SD G	0.50%	2.10%	No

For example, if the threshold is set by adding 1 percentage point to the state-level rate, SU/SD B would be identified with a significant discrepancy.

Cell and N Size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Target Setting

Determine a statewide target for the percentage of SU/SDs that have a significant discrepancy. The target will represent the maximum tolerable percentage of SU/SDs with a significant discrepancy. Previous years targets were set at 0%, using a methodology that did not consistently find evidence of SU/SDs having a significant discrepancy. A revised methodology may yield more SU/SDs with identification.

Option 3: Rate Ratio of Students with Disabilities compared to Students without Disabilities

The Rate Ratio method compares the suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities in a district to the rate for children without disabilities in the same district. For more information, see the rate ratio method on page 38 of the Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by the IDEA Data Center.

Method

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district.

Step 3: Divide the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district by the district-level suspension/ expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district.

An SU/SD has significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion when the rate ratio comparing its suspension/ expulsion rate for children with disabilities to its suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities is equal to or greater than a threshold.

Calculation

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the SU/SD

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the SU/SD}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the SU/SD.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD}}{\text{All children without disabilities in the SU/SD}} \times 100$$

Step 3: Divide the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district by the district-level suspension/ expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district.

$$\text{Rate Ratio} = \frac{\text{District Level suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities in the SU/SD}}{\text{District-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the SU/SD}}$$

Example

This example shows the data for students with disabilities within seven hypothetical SU/SDs.

SU/SD Example	Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children with disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD A	1	100	1.00%
SU/SD B	4	100	4.00%
SU/SD C	1	350	0.29%
SU/SD D	5	350	1.43%
SU/SD E	1	600	0.17%
SU/SD F	11	600	1.83%
SU/SD G	2	400	0.50%

The next table shows the data for students without disabilities in the same SU/SDs.

SU/SD Example	Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children without disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD A	4	770	0.52%
SU/SD B	8	770	1.04%
SU/SD C	8	2700	0.30%
SU/SD D	16	2700	0.59%
SU/SD E	10	4650	0.22%
SU/SD F	22	4650	0.47%

SU/SD Example	Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children without disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD G	0	3000	0.00%

The final table compares the data for children with disabilities to the children without disabilities in each SU/SD to provide the rate ratio.

SU/SD Example	District-level suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities in the district	District-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district	Rate Ratio
SU/SD A	1.00%	0.52%	1.92
SU/SD B	4.00%	1.04%	3.84
SU/SD C	0.29%	0.30%	0.96
SU/SD D	1.43%	0.59%	2.42
SU/SD E	0.17%	0.22%	0.77
SU/SD F	1.83%	0.47%	3.89
SU/SD G	0.50%	0.00%	NC

For SU/SD A, the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is 1.92 times the suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities.

NC means noncalculable, the value represents undefined results. The division of 0 results in NC.

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a bar equal to or above which is district is found to have a significant discrepancy. In option 2, Vermont must pick a rate ratio at or above which a district is identified as having a significant discrepancy.

SU/SD Example	Rate Ratio	Example Threshold	Identified
SU/SD A	1.92	2.00	No
SU/SD B	3.84	2.00	Yes

SU/SD Example	Rate Ratio	Example Threshold	Identified
SU/SD C	0.96	2.00	No
SU/SD D	2.42	2.00	Yes
SU/SD E	0.77	2.00	No
SU/SD F	3.89	2.00	Yes
SU/SD G	NC	2.00	Undefined

For example, if the state had chosen a rate ratio of 2 as its threshold, then SU/SD B, D and F would be identified as having a significant discrepancy because its rate ratio is above the threshold. For SU/SD G identification status is undefined. The NC could lead to further investigation of a significant discrepancy. This option creates a situation of increased variability that may introduce subjectivity in the identification.

Cell and N size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Target Setting

Determine a statewide target for the percentage of SU/SDs that have a significant discrepancy. The target will represent the maximum tolerable percentage of SU/SDs with a significant discrepancy. Previous years targets were set at 0%, using a methodology that did not consistently find evidence of SU/SDs having a significant discrepancy. A revised methodology may yield more SU/SDs with identification.

Option 4: Rate Difference of Students with Disabilities Compared to Students Without Disabilities

The Rate Difference method compares the suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities in a district to the rates for children without disabilities in the same district. For more details, see page 40 of the Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by the IDEA Data Center.

Method

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district.

Step 3: Subtract the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district from the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in the district.

An SU/SD has significant discrepancy when the difference between suspension/ expulsion rate for children with disabilities and suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities is at or above an established amount of percentage points.

Calulation

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the district}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the district}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the district}}{\text{All children without disabilities in the district}} \times 100$$

Step 3: Subtract the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district from the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in the district.

Rate Difference =	District-level suspension/expulsion for children with disabilities	–	District-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities

Example

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district.

SU/SD Example	Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children with disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD A	1	100	1.00%
SU/SD B	4	100	4.00%
SU/SD C	1	350	0.29%
SU/SD D	5	350	1.43%
SU/SD E	1	600	0.17%
SU/SD F	11	600	1.83%
SU/SD G	2	400	0.50%

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district.

SU/SD Example	Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children without disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD A	4	770	0.52%
SU/SD B	8	770	1.04%
SU/SD C	8	2700	0.30%
SU/SD D	16	2700	0.59%
SU/SD E	10	4650	0.22%

SU/SD Example	Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the SU/SD	All children without disabilities in the SU/SD	Rate
SU/SD F	22	4650	0.47%
SU/SD G	0	3000	0.00%

Step 3: Subtract the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district from the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in the district.

SU/SD Example	District-Level suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities in the district	District-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district	Rate Difference
SU/SD A	1.00%	0.52%	0.48
SU/SD B	4.00%	1.04%	2.96
SU/SD C	0.29%	0.30%	-0.01
SU/SD D	1.43%	0.59%	0.84
SU/SD E	0.17%	0.22%	-0.05
SU/SD F	1.83%	0.47%	1.36
SU/SD G	0.50%	0.00%	0.50

The difference between the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in SU/SD A and the suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in SU/SD A is 0.48 percentage points.

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a threshold equal to or above which is district is found to have a significant discrepancy. In this option, Vermont must pick a rate difference to set the threshold. Any district that is at or above the rate difference threshold would be identified as having a significant discrepancy.

SU/SD Example	Rate Difference	Example Threshold	Identified
SU/SD A	0.48	2	No
SU/SD B	2.96	2	Yes
SU/SD C	-0.01	2	No
SU/SD D	0.84	2	No
SU/SD E	-0.05	2	No
SU/SD F	1.36	2	No
SU/SD G	0.50	2	No

For example, if the state had chosen a rate difference of 2 percentage points as its threshold that SU/SD B would be identified as having a significant discrepancy because its rate difference is above the threshold.

Cell Size and N-Size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Target Setting

Determine a statewide target for the percentage of SU/SDs that have a significant discrepancy. The target will represent the maximum tolerable percentage of SU/SDs with a significant discrepancy. Previous years targets were set at 0%, using a methodology that did not consistently find evidence of SU/SDs having a significant discrepancy. A revised methodology may yield more SU/SDs with identification.

Indicator 4B

Indicator 4B measures the percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The racial and ethnic groups currently collected are Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Island, White, and Two or More Races. 4B includes an investigation into 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.

Option 1: State-Level Rate Ratio

The State-Level Rate ratio method uses the suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to establish a threshold. This is done by multiplying the state-level rate by a specific value set by the state. Each race and ethnic group with students that were suspended or expelled are calculated in this measure. For more details, see the State-Level Suspension/Expulsion Rate for Children guide on page 49 of the Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by the IDEA Data Center.

The state may choose to set the bar by multiplying the state-level or state-mean rate by an established number (e.g., any district with a suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in any racial/ethnic group that is 1.1 times or more the state-level suspension/ expulsion rate for children with disabilities is considered to have a significant discrepancy), or, equivalently, by setting it at a certain percentage above the calculated rate (e.g., any district with a suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in any racial/ethnic group that is 10% or more above the state-level suspension/ expulsion rate for children with disabilities is considered to have a significant discrepancy).

Method

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the district.

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the State.

Step 3: Use this comparison as a basis for determining significant discrepancy.

An SU/SD has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is more than the state-level suspension/expulsion rate threshold for children with disabilities.

Calulation

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the district.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the district by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the district by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the State.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the State by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the State by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a bar equal to or above which is district is found to have a significant discrepancy. In option 1, any district with a rate that is at or above the bar would be identified with a significant discrepancy.

Cell and N size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Targets

Target is 0% as set by the Office of Special Education Programs.

Option 2: State-Level Rate Difference

The State-Level Rate Difference method uses the suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to establish a threshold. This is done by adding the state-level rate to a value set by the state. Each race and ethnic group with students that were suspended or expelled are calculated in this measure. For more details, see the State-Level Suspension/Expulsion Rate for Children with Disabilities guide on page 49 of the Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by the IDEA Data Center.

Some states may choose to set the bar by adding a certain number of percentage points to the state-level or state-mean rate (e.g., any district with a suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in any racial/ethnic group that three percentage points or more above the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is considered to have a significant discrepancy).

Method

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the district.

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the State.

Step 3: Use this comparison as a basis for determining significant discrepancy.

An SU/SD has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is more than the state-level suspension/expulsion rate threshold for children with disabilities.

Calulation

Step 1: Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the district.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the district by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the district by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for each race and ethnicity group for children with disabilities for the state.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the State by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the State by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a threshold equal to or above which is district is found to have a significant discrepancy. This option, any district with a rate that is at or above the threshold would be identified with a significant discrepancy.

Cell and N size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Targets

Target is 0% as set by the Office of Special Education Programs.

Option 3: Rate Ratio

The rate ratio method uses a rate ratio to compare a district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the same district's suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities from each racial/ethnic group. Rate Ratio method can be found on page 68 in Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by IDEA Data Center.

Method

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children with disabilities in the district.

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children without disabilities in the district.

Step 3: Divide the suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children with disabilities in the district by the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children without disabilities in the district.

An SU/SD has significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion when the rate ratio comparing its suspension/ expulsion rate for children with disabilities to its suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities is equal to or greater than a threshold.

Calulation

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children with disabilities in the district.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the district by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the district by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children without disabilities in the district.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the district by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children without disabilities in the district by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Step 3: Divide the suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children with disabilities in the district by the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for each racial/ethnic group for children without disabilities in the district.

$$\text{Rate Ratio} = \frac{\text{District Level suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities in the district by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{District-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district by each race/ethnic group}}$$

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a threshold equal to or above which is SU/SD is found to have a significant discrepancy. In this option, Vermont must pick a rate ratio to set the threshold. Any district that is at or above the rate ratio threshold would be identified as having a significant discrepancy.

Cell and N size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Target Setting

Target is 0% as set by the Office of Special Education Programs.

Option 4: Rate Difference

Rate Difference method compares a district-level Suspension/ Expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the same district's Suspension/Expulsion rate for children without disabilities for each racial/ethnic group. Information related to this method can be found on page 70 in Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide by the IDEA Data Center.

Method

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district by each race/ethnic group.

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district by each race/ethnic group.

Step 3: Subtract the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district from the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in the district.

An SU/SD has significant discrepancy when the difference between suspension/ expulsion rate for children with disabilities and suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities is at or above an established amount of percentage points.

Calculation

Step 1: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities for the district by each race/ethnic group.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children with disabilities suspended/expelled in the district by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children with disabilities in the district by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Step 2: Calculate the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities for the district by each race/ethnic group.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Children without disabilities suspended/expelled in the district by each race/ethnic group}}{\text{All children without disabilities in district 1 by each race/ethnic group}} \times 100$$

Step 3: Subtract the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the district from the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in the district.

Rate Difference =	District-level suspension/expulsion for children with disabilities by each race/ethnic group	–	District-level suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities by each race/ethnic group

Threshold

After a methodology is determined, the state must set a threshold equal to or above which is district is found to have a significant discrepancy. In this option, Vermont must pick a rate difference to set the threshold. Any district that is at or above the rate difference threshold would be identified as having a significant discrepancy.

Cell and N size

This method can be unreliable when analyzing a small number of children. Small groups may lead to incorrect conclusions about significant differences in districts. To address this, states can set a minimum number of children to include in the analysis, known as minimum n-size or cell size. However, there's no perfect number; each option has pros and cons.

If the minimum size is too small, results may be unreliable. But if it's too large, many districts might be excluded from analysis, making it hard to identify issues in those areas. States need to find a balance between these two problems.

When determining minimum cell size, states should clarify what "cell" means for their data. For example, they might base it on:

- Cell Size example: The number of those children who were suspended or expelled (e.g., 3 children).
- N Size example: The total number of children without disabilities (e.g., 20 children).

Target Setting

Target is 0% as set by the Office of Special Education Programs.