

PART B DISCIPLINE DATA NOTES

2012-13 Reporting Year

This document provides information or data notes on the ways in which states collected and reported data differently from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data formats and instructions. In addition, the data notes provide explanations of substantial changes or other changes that data users may find notable or of interest in the data from the previous year.

Alabama

Removal to IAES

On-going technical assistance and professional development has been provided to district and building level data entry personnel to ensure that correct procedures are applied when documenting and reporting student discipline infractions in the Alabama student management system.

Arizona

Removal to IAES

The significant difference in the interim removals (column 1A) and the removal reasons (columns 1B and 1D) is due largely in part by the erroneous data submission by one public education agency (PEA).

On December 4, 2013, the Part B data manager met with the special education director of this PEA to discuss concerns related to the discipline data report in FY 2013. They implemented a new student management system in FY 2011 and experienced difficulty during this transition which resulted in the over-identification of reportable disciplinary incidents in FY 2012.

Georgia

Reasons for Unilateral Removal and Removal to IAES

National events have increased attention on student safety issues. This emphasis is regarded as a factor influencing Georgia's increase in the unilateral removal of students to an interim alternative setting by school personnel for weapon and drug related violations. In addition, beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, the Georgia Department of Education enhanced its Student Safety data collection to include additional reporting codes. These enhancements eliminated the reporting value of 'other' or non-state specified disciplinary infraction. The changes in the reporting structure, associated edits and data element classification as well as rigorous training and technical assistance with districts are believed to be associated with the increase in reported events.

Part B Discipline Data Notes

Hawaii

Schools have been attempting to find more alternatives to long term discipline. These data are being monitored closely and it is expected that the numbers will normalize within a few years.

Mississippi

Removal to IAES

Discipline and removal policies vary by LEA and are set by the LEAs. The total number of incidents involving drugs, weapons, or serious bodily injury increased from the previous year across the State for all students.

Missouri

Suspensions/Expulsions

The number of removals > 10 days in length decreased from 2011-12 to 2012-13. The decrease was comprised of a large number of districts with decreases. Since districts each have their own discipline policies, this change is not related to state-level policy changes.

Nevada

The numbers of students subjected to disciplinary removals was lower during 2012-2013 than during 2011-2012, which may be due to program supports for behavioral interventions.

New Jersey

Discipline data for students classified Developmentally Disabled, which pertains to classified students 3 and 4 years of age is not collected by New Jersey's Discipline/Violence and Vandalism collection system.

Per NJ Administrative Code 6A:14-2.8 Discipline/suspension/expulsion

1. Notwithstanding (a) above, preschool students with disabilities shall not be suspended, long-term or short-term, and shall not be expelled.

North Dakota

The significant changes reported in the data between FFY 2011 -12 and FFY 2012 – 13 were/are due in part to the oil boom currently going on within the state. The influx of individuals or migrant population moving to the state for employment and bringing along their school aged children is reflected in the data through the increases year to year. On the other side of that there is a large percentage of the migrant population that may leave within a relative short time due to personal circumstances which also affect the actual year to year percentages of the individuals that do remain constant in ND.

Part B Discipline Data Notes

South Carolina

Removal to IAES

There was an increase in the number of students “removed to an interim alternative education setting based on a hearing officer’s determination of likely injury to the child or others” from 16 in FFY 2011–12 to 66 in FFY 2012–13. The state notes the following regarding the year-to-year changes. First, between FFY 2011–12 and 2012–13, three local educational agencies (LEAs) within one county merged into one large LEA. For the 2011–12 reporting year, these three LEAs had no removals under #2 of Table 5. In FFY 2012–13, the combined LEA reported twenty-six students in this category. Second, in FFY 2011–12, three districts made up the 16 removals; in FFY 2012-13, five districts made up the 66. In other words, there were more districts reporting in this category in FFY 2012–13. Third, one LEA, with limited community capital coupled with increasing levels of gang violence, reported 8 children in their FFY 2011-12 report; for the 2012-13 report, that number had increased to 30, accounting for the increase between years. Finally the state has worked to improve and increase LEAs’ ability to track disciplinary offenses in the state’s Student Information System (SIS). The state’s SIS has enabled districts to more accurately capture and report discipline data for all children, including those with disabilities.

Tennessee

Suspensions/Expulsions

Tennessee saw an increase in the number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. This might be attributed in part to increased communication with districts about accurately providing discipline data into the statewide student information system and ensuring that ALL incidents are reported. It has been a goal of the division to ensure that all information regarding suspensions/expulsions of students with disabilities are carefully tracked both by districts and the Tennessee Department of Education to make certain students with disabilities are getting the necessary services and supports that must be in place should they be suspended/expelled more than 10 days within the school year. We see the overall increase as corollary to the technical assistance that has been provided and an increasing familiarity with the statewide student information system that is being more regularly and accurately used. As a state we will monitor the data on suspensions/expulsions for students with disabilities over the coming months to see if there are any patterns in the data for the 2013-14 SY that are similar to the data in the 2012-13 SY.

Removal Reason

Tennessee saw an increase in three removal reasons for students with disabilities. As noted above with regard to suspensions, there has likely been more fidelity in the reporting of incidents involving students with disabilities that might have been previously less reported or

Part B Discipline Data Notes

Utah

A detailed review of discipline reports submitted in 2011-2012 by LEAs to the USOE revealed several data quality issues.

- * Multiple offenses related to a single incident were reported as multiple suspensions. For example, if the student was involved in a fight with weapons and under the influence of alcohol this was reported as three distinct suspensions of three days each, even though the actual experience of the student was a single 3-day suspension for all offenses. For the 2012-2013 reporting year, the SEA reported each incident as a single suspension with multiple characteristics.
- * Many LEAs did not provide full reporting of all removals. Instead, only removals that were 10 or more consecutive (not cumulative) days were reported. As part of the USOE data quality and correction process, during the 2012-2013 school year, each reported removal of a student for 10 more days was investigated and verified by USOE staff.
- * Many LEAs did not provide full reporting of all removals. USOE staff has noted that the data reported in this Year to Year comparison tab does not match the data reported in the tab of students removed <=10 >10 days.
- * Multiple offenses related to a single incident were reported as multiple incidences. For example, if the student was involved in a fight with weapons and under the influence of alcohol this was reported as three distinct incidents. For the 2012-2013 reporting year, the SEA reported each incident as a single incident with multiple characteristics.

During the 2012-2013 school year, the USOE provided extensive technical assistance to LEAs related to the quality of the discipline data.

- * During this process, we discovered confusion among LEA staff about the use of suspension and expulsion. Through clarification of discipline terms as related to students with disabilities, the data for 2012-2013 increased in accuracy.
- * During this process, we discovered confusion among LEA staff about the definition of removal. Technical assistance was provided to clarify that if the student is assigned in-school suspension and does not receive special education services while in this setting, this qualifies as a removal. Further, technical assistance was provided that any removal of ½ day or more is counted as a full day of removal. Through clarification of discipline terms as related to students with disabilities, the data for 2012-2013 increased in accuracy.
- * During the 2012-2013 school year, the USOE provided extensive technical assistance to LEAs related to the quality of the discipline data. During this process, we discovered confusion among LEA staff about the use of IAES. Through clarification of discipline terms as related to students with disabilities, the data for 2012-2013 increased in accuracy.

Part B Discipline Data Notes

Vermont

Beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, incident-level discipline data reported by LEAs includes identifying student information. As a result, duplicate records can be resolved, and IEP status, disability, gender, and LEP status are now verified before submitting discipline data.

Virginia

Reasons for Unilateral Removal

The data reported by VDOE for the 2012-2013 removal to an IAES by school personnel for drugs, weapons, or serious bodily injury have been reviewed and are accurate. Nationally, there is an increased awareness regarding discipline that has translated into additional rigor with states providing targeted assistance to local school divisions in the form of increased training and technical assistance. In Virginia, the decrease cannot be causally contributed to any reportable factor however, correlationally Virginia has provided ongoing training and technical assistance activities to local educational agencies (LEA) in order to utilize resources that support their staff and students. Examples of these activities include but are not limited to: school recognition programs, focus on early intervention and intervention, administration of the Youth Behavior Survey in collaboration with the Virginia Department of Health and the Governor's initiative on drug use prevention.

Virgin Islands

1. There has been an increase in higher level infractions
2. There has been a decrease in lower level infractions.

Washington

Reasons for Unilateral Removal

The State conducted training throughout the 2013-14 school year in the area of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities. It was determined at this time that district staff did not really understand the uniqueness of the category serious bodily injury. Since these training occurred late in 2013-14 we do not anticipate any data changes for the area of serious bodily injury to be visible until 2014-15 reporting.

Wisconsin

Suspensions/Expulsions & 088 – Disciplinary Removals

Wisconsin produced technical assistance around discipline and removals which helped to reduce the number of removals overall and in particular those that were greater than 10 days.