DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 372 UD 032 031

AUTHOR	Gottlieb, Jay; Alter, Mark
TITLE	An Analysis of Referrals, Placement, and Progress of Children with Disabilities Who Attend New York City Public Schools. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., NY. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Bronx, NY.
PUB DATE	1994-11-17
NOTE	138p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Criteria; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; Ethnicity; Instructional Effectiveness; Mainstreaming; *Minority Groups; Questionnaires; *Referral; School Districts; *Special Education; *Student Placement; Tables (Data); Urban Schools; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Disproportionate Representation (Spec Educ); *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The overrepresentation of students of color referred for special education in New York City was studied using data taken from the New York City Board of Education for 813 elementary and middle schools and 102 high schools. Analyses were based on Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White students. The racial and ethnic disproportion of special education students was found to be the cumulative result of disproportion in referrals and in eligibility and placement decisions by the city's Committee on Special Education. Black and Hispanic students were overrepresented in special education and Whites and Asians were underrepresented, although substantial district-wide variations were evident in these findings. Racial and ethnic disproportion was more apparent for Black than Hispanic students. Academic achievement, misbehavior, and speech and language problems were the main reasons students were referred to special education. Standardized educational criteria for making referrals to special education or for eligibility for placement in special education do not exist, and there is substantial variability across schools and school districts. Criteria should be developed for identifying the success of prereferral instructional activities as a means of retaining students in general educational classes. A substantial need for better teacher training in behavior analysis was also identified. In spite of the state's recommendation that all mildly handicapped students receive academic mainstreaming, only about one in six actually do receive academic mainstreaming. Regardless of race or ethnicity, there were no exit criteria for special education. Once placed in special education, few students ever leave. Appendixes include profiles of referrals and classifications for the city, charts of racial and ethnic distributions in special education, the data collection form, and the teacher interview schedule. (Contains 10 tables and 64 charts.) (SLD)

An Analysis of Referrals, Placement, and Progress of Children with Disabilities Who Attend New York City Public Schools

Final Report

Jay Gottlieb and Mark Alter
New York University

November 17, 1994

An Analysis of Referrals, Placement, and Progress of Children with Disabilities Who Attend New York City Public Schools

Executive Summary

Jay Gottlieb and Mark Alter
New York University

Executive Summary

We studied of the overrepresentation of students of color referred for special education in New York City. The data we present in this report focus on two related, and sequential, facets education: referrals and placement. Referrals are a phenomenon of general education insofar as they are most often made by classroom teachers, and to a lesser extent, by parents. Placements are a phenomenon of special education insofar as the Committee on Special Education (CSE) is responsible for determining eligibility and deciding the appropriate classification and placement. This evaluation study, by virtue of the questions raised in the RFP, was not confined to issues of referrals but also focused on special education.

General findings included the following:

Racial/ethnic disproportion is the cumulative result of disproportion in referrals and in eligibility and placement decisions of the CSE.

Black and Hispanic students are overrepresented in special education and white and Asian students are underrepresented. Substantial district-wide variations were evident in these findings.

Racial/ethnic disproportion, particularly as it pertains to special class placement, was more readily apparent for black students than for Hispanic students.

As the percentage of either white or black children in a school building increases, there is a corresponding increase in the percentage of the other racial/ethnic group that is referred to special education. This phenomenon occurs far less frequently for Hispanic students.

The special education population is substantially higher in middle schools than in elementary schools.

<u>Summary of major findings to nine questions raised in RFP</u>

Academic achievement, misbehavior and speech/language, are the three major reasons why children are referred to special education. Academic reasons are the most frequently cited, and many children who are referred for academic reasons also misbehave. Data obtained from our case studies indicate that the principals' perceptions of the purposes and effectiveness of special education also relates to number of referrals.

At the present time, there appear to be no objective standards being employed for deciding when a youngster should be

decertified from special education, and only about 1% are decertified. We cannot determine from our statistical analyses what factors, if any, relate to length of stay in special education.

We could not detect any significant correlations between money spent in general education and referrals to special education. Nor did we detect any meaningful correlations between external collaborative programs and referral rates. Both the availability of guidance counsellors and non-teaching assistant principals are positively correlated to number of referrals, but interpretation of these correlations is difficult. Interviews of classroom teachers indicated that not all are familiar with the array of remedial and/or preventative services that are offered in their schools.

Students who are referred are in need of additional services to facilitate instruction. However, not all students who are in need of special education are referred. There appears to be an invisible cap on the number of referrals that are made in a school. This cap is not official and may change as the need dictates.

Our analyses suggest that there are no linkages between referral and classification decisions, and funding considerations. Interview data obtained in our case studies suggested that some parent referrals might be influenced by the availability of SSI income.

Services and programs exist that reduce the need for referrals for some individual children some of the time. However, the magnitude of the number of children who are at risk for referral is so great that as one student is removed from the list of potential referrals, other students immediately take his place.

Few students in self-contained classes post meaningful gains in reading achievement as indicated by scores on the DRP reading test administered annually to all students. Performance scores for a two-year interval indicated that about 2.5% of special class students are able to improve beyond the lowest quartile. This finding is complicated by the fact that there are no clear-cut guidelines for the goals of special classes. As a result, some principals and teachers place primary focus on students' social and emotional needs and less on students' academic needs.

There are statistically significant differences in the performance profiles of students placed in resource rooms and self-contained classes, with students in resource room scoring higher on standardized tests. However, the achievement data do not support the continued placement of students in self-contained classes as long as these classes retain their present operating styles. Criteria for academic and/or social success are not

available. We have no way of knowing, however, whether students would perform the better, the same, or worse if they were to remain in general education classes.

In a given school year fewer than 7.5% of students in self-contained classes are moved to a less restrictive environment as a result of re-evaluation. Still fewer resource room students are moved to less restrictive environments.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Definitive answers to several of the questions raised in this report are difficult to produce. There are several reasons for this situation, all of which impact on the current operations of special education. These include the following:

1. Standardized educational criteria for making referrals to special education or for eligibility for placement in special education do not exist. Presently, there is substantial variability in the process across school districts and buildings. Realizing that no one school can always have the full continuum of special education services, administrators and teachers must identify pre-referral instructional interventions and criteria for referrals.

2. Criteria should be developed for identifying and gauging the success of pre-referral instructional activities as a means for retaining students in general educational classes should be developed. Policies should be loosened so that students can have access to related services and special educational interventions without being labeled as children with disabilities, that is, when they are still enrolled in general education. At the present time, the primary pre-referral activity in many school districts appears to be *contact with parents.* Other potentially successful strategies, such as curriculum or instructional adaptations are done sporadically, partly because classroom teachers do not have time to provide such adaptations and partly because they are not trained.

3. There is a *substantial* need for classroom teachers to be better trained in behavior analysis. Interviews of teachers reveal that increasing numbers of students are exhibiting behavior that teachers view as inappropriate. At the present time, only special education teachers are required to take coursework in behavior analysis. All teachers should be required to take this coursework.

4. There is a need for a school-based definition of least restrictive environment. Not all schools have the same constellation of programs and services for placement of students

to programs at various points along the continuum of restrictiveness. For example, some professional staff members believe that MIS I less restrictive than MIS II, while others disagree.

5. Criteria for making placement decisions should be developed. More often than not, lower-IQ students (<85) are placed in self-contained classes and higher-IQ students are placed in resource rooms. Students in special classes also tend to score lower on the DRP exam. There are many exceptions to this, however. Moreover, the data regarding severity of behavior difficulty enter into placement decisions in ways that are not systematic and that do not lend themselves readily to behavioral or instructional interventions.

6. Despite the state's requirement that all mildly handicapped students receive academic mainstreaming, only about one in six students in New York City public schools receive academic mainstreaming.

7. There is a need for standards or expectations regarding the academic and/or behavioral performance of students in special classes. Currently, there is no consistency in expectations for what level of progress students should demonstrate in special classes, or in resource rooms, for that matter.

8. There are no clear criteria for determining the frequency and/or duration of related service that is prescribed for individual students with disabilities. There did not appear to be any obvious relationships between severity of need and recommendations for the frequency of related services (e.g., once or twice weekly), or for recommendations for the intensity of related services (e.g., individual or small group sessions).

9. Approximately 20% of all initial referrals are actually re-referrals. Parents refuse to sign off on CSE recommendations and the case is dropped. Approximately one-third of these cases are re-referred within two years.

10. Regardless of race or ethnicity, there are no exit criteria from special education. Once placed in special education, few ever leave. Such criteria must be developed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

This is the final report for the analysis of referrals, placements and progress of children with disabiltiies in New York City public schools. The data we present in this report focus on two related and sequential facets of special education: referrals and placement. Referrals are a phenomenon of general education insofar as they are most often made by classroom teachers and to a lesser extent by parents. Placements are a phenomenon of special education insofar as the Committee on Special Education (CSE) is responsible for deciding upon an appropriate classification and placement for each eligible student. We will demonstrate later in the report that overrepresentation of students of color in special education is the result of a cumulative pattern of overrepresentation at both the referral stage and the CSE decision-making stage.

The report is comprised of four sections and several appendices. In the body of the report, we present information on: (a) methods of evaluation; (b) responses to the nine evaluation questions in the sequence they were presented in the Request for Proposal document distributed by the New York State Education Department, (c) supplementary questions that were raised by members of the Board of Regents, New York State Education Education Department, and members of the Regent's Roundtable, and; (d) conclusions and recommendations. In the appendix we present a portrait of the patterns of referrals and classifications in New York City schools, especially as they relate to racial and ethnic variations. Various statistical tables accompany the narrative material in the appendix.

SECTION 1- METHODS OF EVALUATION-SOURCES OF DATA

The data used in this evaluation come from different sources. Some data gathering was funded by grants from the federal government, and other data was acquired from the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) of the New York City Board of Education. The OREA data, distributed on a set of diskettes which cumulatively contain over 1,000 variables for each public school in New York City, provide information on educational performance, social and socio-economic indicators, special education, limited English proficient students, and school resources. We requested, and received, one additional data file that has not been released to the public: an ethnic breakdown of referrals by race/ethnicity for each school in the city. The data OREA supplies is aggregated at the city-wide, district, and school levels. Data for individual students or teachers is not available from these files.

The data in the following pages are subject to several caveats. First, in order to respond to many of the nine evaluation questions and to present an overall statistical profile of racial and ethnic distributions in referrals and placements that appear in the appendix, we relied heavily, but not exclusively, on the OREA school profiles. Although OREA compiles data for all schools in the city, we focused mainly on

the data for elementary and middle schools. We addressed the issue of referrals at the high school level sparingly, and when we did, we did not report the data separately by high school superintendencies (this is the administrative term that the Board uses. A superintendency crresponds roughly to a borough). Either we reported data aggregated at the city-wide level or we reported descriptive statistics for data compiled from analyses at each high school. There are substantially fewer referrals at high schools than at elementary and middle schools, and we concluded that it was not cost-effective to invest substantial time with data at the high school level.

Our data do not conform exactly to the data reported by OREA. The OREA diskettes contain data on 820 elementary and middle schools. Our analyses were conducted on 813 schools. The special run on ethnic breakdowns in referrals that OREA gave us two to three months prior to the larger data set contained information about 813 schools. We matched and merged the two sets of files resulting in a data set of 813 cases on anything having to do with referrals. Similarly, we were able to match only 102 of the 108 high schools.

Third, we omitted from our analyses the category of Native American and Pacific Islander. There were only 98 students of this ethnic group in special education out of 65,567 in the entire city, and rather than conduct 20% more analyses to include this group, we determined that it would be cost efficient to drop them. All analyses we report are based on Asian, black, Hispanic, and white students. The fact that we analyzed data from 813 schools and that we excluded Native Americans could result in a deviation of about 1% to 1.5% from the data appearing in OREA analyses. This deviation will not affect the overall conclusions we reach.

The fourth and final point that we must mention is that the special education students who appear on the school profiles diskettes include only students assigned to one of the community school districts. They do not include District 75 students, those who are enrolled in city-wide programs. At our request, we received a hard copy of the District 75 data because diskettes were not available. OREA keeps limited data on District 75 students, a substantial percentage of which is devoted to racial and ethnic analyses. These data, which appear laetr in this report indicate that black students, but not Hispanic students, are substantially overrepresented in District 75.

In addition to the OREA school profiles data, we used a second source of data that was available from our ongoing research into the topic of referrals and evaluations of special education students. We have been funded by federal sources to conduct two studies of the special education referral process. One study was to conduct a records review of the referral,

evaluation, placement, and progress (REPP) of students in special education. The second study was to determine why some children are referred to special education and why other, seemingly similar children, are not referred.

As part of our first study we developed a 22-page data retrieval form, appended to this report. This form allowed us to record information on 196 randomly selected students who had recently (as of June, 1992) been referred for evaluation. As part of this study we also randomly sampled 140 students who had already been enrolled in special education programs and were recently referred for a re-evaluation, or who were scheduled to receive their triennial evaluations. Thus, this phase of the research contained voluminous data on a total of 336 students.

As part of the first study, we also developed questionnaires for general education teachers who recently referred students. This questionnaire, too, is appended to this report. We were interested in finding out why teachers referred students, what efforts they made to retain students, what assistance they thought they would need to retain students in general education, among other areas of inquiry. We received responses from 207 teachers, data from which are included in analyses presented herein.

In yet another portion of this first study we distributed questionnaires to special education teachers of the 140 students who had been enrolled in special education and who were participating in some form of re-evaluation. Finally, we distributed questionnaires to parents of students whose records we randomly sampled. In all instances where questionnaires were distributed, the return rate was about 67%, which is very high for this type of data collection.

A second study funded by federal sources was concerned with determining why some students who are low-functioning are referred to special education, found eligible, and subsequently enroll, while other, seemingly comparable students, are not referred and never become part of the special education system.

We conducted the second study in six elementary schools in Community School District 4, East Harlem, and replicated the findings in three elementary schools in Community School District 11 in the Bronx. Basically, during the beginning of the school year, we distributed two rating scales to teachers in grades K-3, a behavior rating scale and an academic rating scale, and asked them to complete the two forms for the eight lowest-functioning students in their classes whom the teachers targeted. We waited for a referral of one of the targeted students to occur naturally. When a targeted student was referred, we identified a non-referred student from the class who was previously rated similarly for academics and behavior, and asked that student's

teacher why one child was referred and the other was not. We identified 32 referred students in this study and interviewed each teacher.

The third and final data set was supported by the contract with the New York State Education Department to evaluate referrals. This contract enabled us to conduct case studies in schools, to interview community superintendents, and to distribute questionnaires to additional referring teachers. This final phase of our work enabled us to validate and explain some important findings which emerged from our review of records.

We interviewed six community superintendents to solicit their views about special education, if and how it supported or hindered their overall school program. Some superintendents elected to be interviewed in the presence of their district administrator for special education.

We selected three schools for our case studies, a high referring school, an average referring school, and a low referring school from the same school district. We reasoned that whatever variation in referral rates was attributable to variations in overt or latent policies at the district level would be obviated if we conducted all case studies in one district. As part of our case studies, we interviewed building principals, school based support team members, and classroom teachers.

SECTION II- RESPONSES TO THE NINE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Question #1: What variables relate to entry into special education?

During the 1992-1993 school year 24,000 elementary and middle school students were evaluated by the CSE. Of these, 20,000 were enrolled in primary schools and the remaining 4,000 attended junior high or middle schools. Approximately 83% of all referrals were found eligible for special education classification. Obviously, the referral to special education is the single most important factor in deciding whether a student will enter the special education system. Our research on a random sample of referrals in the Bronx indicated that school professionals (teachers, principals, etc.) make the bulk of the referrals (51%), and parents refer the majority of the remainder (28%). In about 7% of the instances, the school records indicate that referrals were made jointly by parents and teachers. Approximately 14% of all referrals are made by sources other than teachers and parents. These other sources include physicians, professionals at community organizations, and family court.

Why do teachers refer students? Three primary factors, alone or in combination, lead teachers to refer. In descending

order of importance, these variables are academic difficulty, behavior problems, and language that is not age-appropriate.

Responses we received from a sample of 194 general education teachers who referred students for special education evaluations indicate that students who are referred are academically impaired. Of the students referred, 52.8% were rated as the lowest achievers in class, and an additional 27.7% were rated as being in the lowest quartile of their classes academically. Stated differently, fourth-fifths of the students referred are in substantial academic need.

An additional 8.7% were rated as being the most misbehaved in their class or in the bottom quarter of their class. In all, about 53% of referred students are rated by teachers as being in the bottom quarter of the class behaviorally. These data appear in Table 1.

As is evident from inspection of the underlined values in the lower right-hand portion of Table 1, slightly fewer than 11% of referred students were described by their teachers as not being in the bottom quarter of the class academically or behaviorally. These students tended to be referred primarily for speech and/or language-related difficulties.

The fact that children were referred for language-related difficulties does not imply that they did not have academic or behavioral difficulties. Most did. Only nine of the 167 students (5.4%) for whom data were available (out of a total of 194) were referred for language-related difficulties exclusively. We are not suggesting that only 5.4% of the students have language difficulties or disabilities, simply that during the course of ongoing school routines, 5.4% of them are referred by their classroom teachers.

TABLE 1

Percentages of Referrals by Academic Ranking (Rows) X Behavioral Rankings (Columns)

	Lowest	Bottom Quarter	Bottom Half	Upper Half	TOTAL	N
Lowest	22.56	6.67	8.72	14.87	52.82	103
Bottom Qtr	9.23	5.64	4.10	8.72	27.69	54
Bottom Hlf	3.08	.00	2.05	1.54	6.67	13
Upper Half	4.62	1.03	1.54	5.65	12.31	24
TOTAL	39.49	13.33	16.41	30.77	100.00	
N	77	26	32	59	194	

Our case studies provided another, different, portrait of why referrals occur. The willingness of the principal to view special education as a source of help for students contributes to the overall referral rate in the schools. Our case study of a high referring school clearly established that the building principal perceived the smaller class size of special education as beneficial to a sizable number of students who desperately required help. Although the principal was ambivalent about whether special classes would improve achievement scores, that principal was confident that the students would get more attention from a teacher who instructed only 12 students than from a general education teacher who taught more than 25 students. The principal believed that because the students came from an impoverished neighborhood which contained many dysfunctional families that did not pay sufficient attention to their children, it was imperative that an adult be available to talk to the children, to provide structure and discipline, and to relate to them. Given the available resources in the school, the principal believed that special education teachers should play that important role. Schools having principals who did not share this view tended to refer fewer children.

Summary: Academic achievement, misbehavior and speech/language are the three major reasons why children are referred to special education. Academic reasons are the most frequently mentioned, and many children who are referred for academic reasons also misbehave. The principal's perception of special education also relates to the number of referrals.

Question #2: What variables relate to the length of stay in special education?

As we indicated in our proposal, we intended to investigate this question by examining decertification rates for school-level data. Of 91,359 elementary, middle, and high school students currently receiving special education in the 32 school districts comprising the New York City public school system, 351 were decertified in elementary schools, 432 were decertified in middle schools, and 377 were decertified in high schools during the 1992-1993 school year. Thus, about 1.3% of students who attended resource rooms or special classes were decertified from the special education registers. We did not have any data on special education children who receive related services only; consequently, they are not represented in the data on decertifications.

The low number of decertifications relative to the population of students in special education prevented meaningful correlations from being obtained. The range in the number of decertifications was too low for statistically significant correlations to emerge. To illustrate, our analysis of these data

for all 639 elementary schools in New York City failed to yield any meaningful correlations. That is, no special education variables at the school building level correlated substantially with decertification rates.

Instead, we relied on our interviews of special education teachers for relevant data to address this issue. Teachers told us that the main reason a child is decertified from special education is a belief by the special education teacher that the student will be able to "hold his/her own" in a general education classroom without special education intervention. We were also told by general education teachers that some of their special education colleagues are reluctant to decertify their most capable students, fearing that the gains made in special education would dissipate if that youngster were placed in general education programs.

Summary: At the present time, there appear to be no objective standards being employed for deciding when a youngster should be decertified from special education, and only about 2% are decertified. We cannot determine on a statistical basis what factors relate to length of stay in special education.

Question #3: Are special education referrals the result of insufficient or inadequate services in general education?

There are many ways to approach this question, as we indicated in our proposal. We can begin with the most general finding: across all elementary schools (N=639) and across all junior high or middle schools (N=181) in New York City there is not a significant correlation between the amount of money spent on general education and the percentage of general education students in a school who are referred for initial evaluation. The coefficient at the elementary school level is .075 and at the middle school level it is .081. The lack of a significant correlation between initial referrals and amount spent also occurs when the percentage of students in poverty within the school is accounted for. At the elementary school level the partial correlation coefficient is .057.

Beyond the general correlation between money spent and referrals, we could anticipate that the availability of more specific services could be expected to have a direct impact on referrals. Two school professionals, in particular, guidance counsellors and non-teaching assistant principals, could be related to the number of referrals that are made. The correlation between number of guidance counsellors and number of initial referrals at the elementary school level for the 1991 school year is .30 and for the 1992 school year it is .34. At the middle school level it is .17 for the 1991 school year and .20, for the 1992 school year. Each of these four coefficients is

statistically significant. The same pattern and magnitude of correlation coefficients exists for the availability of non-teaching assistant principals. At the elementary schools the correlation between the availability of non-teaching assistant principals and referrals is .37 for the 1991 and the 1992 school years. The interpretation of these correlation coefficients is problematic, however. We do not know whether the availability of guidance counsellors and assistant principals results in greater attention to the needs of students and, therefore, results in more referrals, or that guidance counsellors and assistant principals are assigned to schools where the student population is in greater need and where more students are likely to be referred.

Another area that could be expected to affect referrals is the number of collaborative programs, external to the schools, that are designed to provide additional resources to students. These include: junior achievement, school volunteers, scholarships, top, co-op education, aidp-cbo, and school-to-school collaborations. For both elementary and middle schools, the highest correlations between the presence or absence of any of these collaborations and the number of referrals in the schools was -.10. With 639 schools at the elementary level, a correlation coefficient of -.08 is required for statistical significance. Some of the correlation appear in Table 12. There is thus some indication that external resources could reduce the referral rate to a limited degree, but the correlations are weak and in their current form they should probably not be relied on to result in dramatic reductions in referrals.

TABLE 2

Correlations of Collaborative Programs with Total Referrals

Collaborative Program	Elementary	Middle
AIDP-CBO (N=79)	.02	-.10
School volunteers (N=204)	.00	-.08

Summary: We could not detect any significant correlations between money spent in general education and referrals to special education. Nor did we detect any meaningful correlations between external collaborative programs and referral rates. Both the availability of guidance counsellors and non-teaching assistant principals correlate significantly to number of referrals, but interpretation of these correlations is difficult.

Question #4. Are the students considered to be in need the ones being referred?

We addressed this question earlier in this report when we indicated that almost 90% of all student referrals were rated by their teachers as being in the lowest quartile of their class either academically or behaviorally. An additional 10% were referred for language-related or speech problems. But these statistics do not address the question of whether there are students who could be referred and who are not.

As part of our federally-funded research in Community School District 4, we asked teachers in grades K-3 in six elementary schools to complete academic and behavioral ratings of the lowest functioning eight students in their classes. This was done during the fall of 1992. Twenty-nine teachers completed the questionnaires. We waited for referrals to occur under natural circumstances; that is, we in no way intervened. Fourteen students from our list were initially referred during the school year, most often during the spring. We identified a comparison group of non-referred students matched by gender whose initial ratings were similar to those recorded for the referred students. When we interviewed teachers regarding why they referred one student but not another one rated similarly during the fall, the teachers' responses fell into one of two categories: (1) the student was actually less capable than the comparison student, and he was not able to keep up as well; and (2) the student did not differ from the comparison child, but a critical incident occurred that triggered the referral. These critical incidents, mentioned by slightly less than half the teachers, invariably focused on misbehavior.

Half of the referred students whom teachers stated were less capable than non-referred classmates were viewed by the teachers as the lowest achieving student in the class. However, when we compared the standardized test scores (DRP) of the referred and non-referred students in CSD 4, we did not detect any statistically significant differences between referred and non-referred comparison students. In those cases where the reason for referral was not that teachers believed the children in question to be the lowest achiever in their class, the children were referred because they exhibited a particularly outrageous act of misbehavior. These students, who were also poor achievers and tended to misbehave, but no worse than other students in class, would not have been referred had they not engaged in a single act that teachers found particularly offensive.

Examples of these behaviors included the second grade boy who was referred when he hid in a wardrobe and did not respond when the teacher called him. The teacher, frightened that the child was not in class and may have left the building, called the principal. When the principal came to the class, the child emerged from the wardrobe.

Another example was the third grade boy who ran out of the

classroom and slammed the door with such force that the upper half of the door, made of glass, shattered. Still another example was a second grade boy who ran around the classroom, annoying his classmates by hiding under their seats.

Summary: Students who are referred are in need of additional support services. However, other students who are not referred and do not receive special education services could also benefit from these services.

Question #5: To what extent are referral and classification decisions motivated by funding considerations?

An answer to this question requires that we separate referrals and classifications. As we indicated in the opening paragraph, referrals and classifications are made by different parts of the school system, and they operate in different ways.

At the referral stage, school personnel, most often classroom teachers, are the ones who refer children for an assessment. In our random sample of 336 referrals in the Bronx, teachers and other school personnel such as guidance counsellors and principals referred 51% of all students. Parents referred 28%. An additional 7% are made jointly by parents and teachers. Neither teachers nor parents are aware of or appear to be concerned with funding considerations that relate to the referral and subsequent placement of children in special education. While their motivations might not always coincide entirely, in the overwhelming majority of instances, both parents and teachers want to secure improved academic performance. Furthermore, analysis of achievement data of referred students indicates that indeed they are below grade level and in need of additional instructional support.

The remaining 14% of the referrals are made by outside agencies. Examples of the outside sources of referrals are doctors, family court, social service agencies, and so on. In sum, there is very little likelihood that referrals to special education are motivated by funding considerations.

While referrals might not be motivated by funding considerations, are decisions not to refer motivated by funding considerations? In our sample of 207 general education teachers who had recently referred a student, 18% believed that the school administration discouraged referrals, 29% believed that the school's attitudes was to encourage referrals and 52% stated that they believed the school neither encouraged nor discouraged referrals. It is difficult to determine the motivation of the 18% of school administrators who are perceived by teachers as discouraging referrals, however. Even if all 18% did discourage referrals, it does not imply that they do so for economic reasons. It is possible that a principal may interpret

referrals as a sign that he/she is unable to provide effective instructional leadership. Moreover, even though teachers believed that their school administrators discouraged referrals, it did not prevent the referral from being made. Therefore, the likelihood is low that funding considerations influence referrals or non-referrals to an appreciable degree.

The second stage in the multi-disciplinary process of determining eligibility for special education, deciding the appropriate classifications, involves the CSE. The school-based support teams conduct the testing and make the recommendations, which are then sent to the CSE for review and final determination. Are classification decisions influenced by funding decisions? There are several ways to approach this question. First, 65% of all students found eligible for special education are classified as learning disabled. The major variability is whether the placement is in a self-contained class or in a resource room, a placement decision which has financial implications. If we can demonstrate that there are clear-cut and logical differences in the performance (needs) of students placed in resource rooms and in self-contained classes, it would suggest that educational need and not funding considerations, is the dominant theme in these decisions.

A 1985 study that we conducted for the Beattie Commission examined this question directly. The study involved a random sample of 758 special education students (excluding District 75) from 12 community school districts. In the study, we were able to identify differences in the academic and behavioral profiles of students who were classified as emotionally disturbed, learning disabled in self-contained classes, learning disabled in resource rooms, and students who were found to be ineligible for special education. Students placed in self-contained classes tended to have lower IQ scores and lower scores on standardized tests of achievement than students who were placed in resource rooms. That trend continues. In elementary schools, for example, 91.4% (N=14,066) of all special class students' DRP reading scores are in the first quartile, between the first and twenty-fifth percentiles. The corresponding figure for resource room students is 70.3% (N=10,041). For general education students, excluding resource room students, the figure is 28.8% (N=61,270).

Data from the high schools also address differences between students that are not related to funding considerations. There are 17% fewer students in Modified Instructional Support (MIS I), programs for children having primarily academic needs, most of whom are classified as learning disabled, between October 31 and June 30 of the school year. The corresponding decrease for MIS II students, most of whom are classified as emotionally disturbed, is 29%. These percentages represent statistically significant differences and suggest motivational and/or ability

differences among students of different classifications, differences not directly attributable to funding.

Summary: Our analyses suggest that there are no linkages between referral and classification decisions and funding considerations.

Question #6: Are there services, programs, or delivery systems which are shown to reduce the need for special education referrals or classifications?

This is a very difficult question to answer with the methodology available to us. In reality, a two-step process is required to answer this question. The first part would examine whether the availability of non-special education support programs reduces the need for special education for individual children. The second part would examine whether there is a corresponding reduction in referral rates. Interviews with superintendents, principals, and teachers indicated that available instructional support programs, such as Chapter 1, do, indeed, cut down on the need to refer some students. For other students, teachers indicate that Chapter 1 is not adequate to reduce referral rates.

Our case studies indicate that the magnitude of the problem of children in need is far more substantial than the relatively small number of referrals to special education indicates. Conversations with principals, and school based support team (SBST) personnel indicate that in impoverished communities the majority of students in a school, up to approximately two-thirds, require some form of mental health service. The vast number of students in academic and/or social/emotional need makes it very difficult to relate the availability of services and programs to reductions in referral rates in a statistical sense. We can use Reading Recovery in Community School District 2 (CSD 2) as a case in point. By all accounts, Reading Recovery is a highly successful program. It takes first graders in the bottom twentieth percentile of their class, instructs them over the course of 12-14 weeks, and discontinues approximately 80% of them. That is, they are brought up to par with their class. We would expect reductions in referrals to special education as a result of improved reading performance among otherwise low-performing students. Yet, the referral rate in CSD 2 increased slightly from 1992 to 1993, from an average of 23.7 per school to 25.2 per school.

Admittedly, our illustration with Reading Recovery in CSD 2 is not an effective way to address the question of the relationship between availability of services and number of referrals. A far more appropriate method to study this relationship would be to examine referrals on a child-by-child basis, and not on a district-wide or a school-wide basis. It should be anticipated, however, that decreases in referrals are

not likely to occur in schools having many more students in need of support services than the school can reasonably accommodate. When some students exhibit improved academic performance or socio-emotional adjustment and no longer require special education, there are many other students not enrolled in special education who will need more intensive services than are currently available within general education. In the absence of an identified pool of successful, validated interventions within general education, referrals to special education will not likely decline.

The most effective way to answer the question of the success of interventions to reduce referrals would be to follow students within schools for a three- to four-year period during which time they are offered a variety of support services and programs within general education and see how many of them get referred and why.

Summary: Services and programs exist that reduce the need for referrals for some individual children some of the time. However, the magnitude of the number of children who are at risk for referral is so great that as one student is removed from the list of potential referrals, other students are available to take his or her place.

Question # 7: What are outcomes of special education for students with disabilities?

Poor reading skills are the primary academic deficit area that propels students into special education. Math deficits alone tend not be a reason to refer students. It should be recognized, however, that students who have difficulty in math also tend to have difficulty in reading, and they tend to be rated by teachers as exhibiting a generalized academic failure. Smaller class size, specialized curriculum materials, specially trained teachers and generally higher per pupil costs are all utilized to achieve one common end: improving the academic (reading) performance of students with academic disabilities so that they may be decertified and returned to general education. How do these students fare in special (self-contained) education classes?

Data on two-year gains in reading performance are presented in Table 3 and 4 separately for elementary and middle schools. These data are for the entire population of students in New York City (all 820 schools) and represent the scores for students for the last two years of their enrollment in school. For example, in a middle school comprised of grades 5 through 8, the data below would be for students' scores while they were enrolled in grades 7 and 8; in an elementary school comprised of grades 3 through 6, the data that are tabled would be for grades 5 and 6.

The two years of scores are based on three tests: Spring, 1990, 1991, and 1992. Two separate cycles of data are presented. One set covers the two-year period between 1990 and 1992. The second set of data covers the period of 1991 to 1993. All data are only for children enrolled in self-contained classes. By way of explanation, the underlined value in Table 3 indicates that 128 students whose reading score on the Degree of Reading Power standardized test placed them in the first quartile (between the 1st and 25th percentile) in 1990 had a score in 1992 that placed them in the second quartile (26th to 50th percentile).

TABLE 3

Two-Year Gains in Reading Achievement for Special Education Students in Elementary Schools: By Quartiles

		Quartile in 1992			
Quartile in 1990	**Students**	**Q1**	**Q2**	**Q3**	**Q4**
Q1	2120	1955	128	31	6
Q2	77	35	27	11	4
Q3	29	16	7	4	2
Q4	8	2	2	1	3
	Total 2234				

Two-Year Gains in Reading Achievement for Special Education Students in Elementary Schools: By Quartiles

		Quartile in 1993			
Quartile in 1991	**Students**	**Q1**	**Q2**	**Q3**	**Q4**
Q1	2003	1825	144	22	12
Q2	116	63	29	18	6
Q3	29	13	8	3	5
Q4	17	6	1	5	5
	Total 2165				

52 of 2234 (2.5%) elementary school students in 1992 (frequencies underlined) and 58 of 2165 (2.7%) elementary school students in 1993 improved their reading scores from below grade level to grade level or above over their final two years in elementary school. Fewer than one in 12 elementary school students in self-contained classes (7.8%) improved their scores so that they are no longer in the bottom quartile on test scores in 1992. The corresponding figure in 1993 was 8.9%

TABLE 4

Two-Year Gains in Reading Achievement for Special Education Students in Middle Schools: By Quartiles

		Quartile in 1992			
Quartile in 1990	**Students**	**Q1**	**Q2**	**Q3**	**Q4**
Q1	1529	1287	218	22	2
Q2	96	26	48	22	0
Q3	40	8	8	22	2
Q4	12	5	0	4	3
Total	1677				

Two-Year Gains in Reading Achievement for Special Education Students in Middle Schools: By Quartiles

		Quartile in 1993			
Quartile in 1991	**Students**	**Q1**	**Q2**	**Q3**	**Q4**
Q1	1390	1180	187	19	4
Q2	120	27	63	26	4
Q3	43	6	14	19	4
Q4	11	3	0	4	4
Total	1564				

Aggregating the middle school data across the two independent data sets, fewer than one in four students (52/216) who were in the second quartile improved their quartile ranking. This is balanced by 53 students who began in the second quartile and finished in the first quartile two years later. In all, fewer than 100 students in self-contained classes (2.5%) read at grade level or higher when they complete the first two levels of schooling (elementary and middle) in New York City schools.

Our case studies presented a somewhat different picture of the functions and outcomes of special classes. From interviews with principals, teachers, and SBST personnel, we were provided with a consistent portrait of a general population of school children in far greater need than was the case even a few years ago. Students are described as lower functioning academically and more psychologically impaired now than several years ago. Referrals to special classes are heavily influenced by misbehavior as we indicted earlier in this report. However, the fact that many referred students are described as having severe social and emotional needs leads many professionals to view improvement in this sphere as the most important goal for special education. Consequently, many special classes, although certainly not all, and possibly not even the majority, focus on providing emotional support for children rather than on academic performance.

Summary: Few students post meaningful gains in reading achievement as indicated by scores on the DRP reading test administered annually to all students. Performance scores for a two-year interval indicated that about 2.5% of special class students are able to improve beyond the lowest quartile. However, there are no clear-cut instructional goals to guide special classes. As a result, some principals and teachers place primary focus on students' social and emotional needs, and less on students' academic needs.

Question #8. To what extent is special education placement along the continuum of services justified to meet the needs of individual students?

We indicated in our response to Question #5 that there were achievement differences between students who were placed in resource rooms and in self-contained classes. There was also overlap in their standardized test scores, with 91% of self-contained students and 70% of resource room students scoring in the bottom quartile. There are also statistically significant differences in IQ scores of students placed in resource rooms and self-contained classes. In our analysis of students in the Bronx, we had IQ data on a random sample of 41 students in resource rooms (M=87.1) and 56 students who were placed in self-contained classes (M=79.7). These mean IQ scores differed significantly

from each other ($F=6.57$, $df=1/95$, $p < .02$). Again, there was obvious overlap in scores. In a gross statistical sense, there are differences in ability between students at the two main points of the continuum for which we have data.

The question, however, is whether these two points along the continuum are justified to meet the needs of individual students. We indicated in our response to question #7 that very few students in self-contained classes progress academically in a way that is reflected in scores on standardized tests of reading. We had intended to examine teachers' statements regarding the skill acquisition of students at different levels of the continuum, especially for District 75 students for whom we do not have standardized test scores, but we had too few responses from teachers (of SIE programs) to make meaningful interpretations of these data.

The data indicate clearly to us that there is a need to re-conceptualize self-contained classes. In the absence of controlled research studies, however, we do not know whether the students who do not progress in self-contained classes would be likely to make better progress, the same level of progress, or less progress, had they remained in the general education classroom. Similarly, we do not know whether the same children would have made better progress had they been educated in special classes that had fewer students, or better trained teachers. The fact that the majority of students are referred by classroom teachers indicates that the teachers believe that the students will not progress adequately in general education, with the configuration of resources thta are currently available.

In two separate research studies we conducted, in 1990 and 1992, between 70% and 80% of general education teachers stated that they believed that students would progress better in special classes than in general education classes. This belief remains to be validated.

Summary: There are statistically significant differences in the performance profiles of students placed in resource rooms and self-contained classes. However, the achievement data do not support the continued placement of students in self-contained classes as long as these classes retain their present operating styles. Also, we have no way of knowing whether students would perform better in general education classes.

Question #9. What is the frequency of movement to a less restrictive environment?

As we indicated in our proposal, data bearing on placement in less restrictive environments is available on the school profile diskettes distributed by OREA. Separate compilations are

available for primary, middle, and high schools. We are reproducing these data below for students in self-contained special classes.

TABLE 5

Results of Re-evaluations for Students in Self-Contained Classes (for Elementary Schools)

	Requested review		Triennial Evaluation		Totals	
Remain in special class with no change	2701	52.7%	2424	76.4%	5125	61.8%
Change in special education program and remain in special class	2002	39.0%	554	17.5%	2556	30.8%
Less Restrictive Placements						
Placed in resource room	295	5.8%	144	4.5%	439	5.3%
Change to related service	73	1.4%	23	0.7%	96	1.2%
Decertified	57	1.1%	26	0.8%	83	1.0%
Totals	5128		3171		8299	

The data for elementary schools in Table 5 indicate 7.5% of children in self-contained (MIS) classes move to less restrictive environments as a direct consequence of re-evaluation. The categories included in a less restrictive environment for special class students include placement in resource room, change to related service, and decertification.

The tabled data for middle schools, in Table 6, indicate that as a direct result of re-evaluation, 8.6% move to less restrictive environments. The categories included in a less restrictive environment for special class students include change to related service, placement in resource room, and decertification. The corresponding data on movement to less restrictive environments at the high school level, presented in Table 7, indicate that 5.4% of students in self-contained class move to less restrictive environments as a result of re-evaluation.

A condensed version of LRE movement for students in resource

room programs appears in Table 8. Findings aggregated across elementary, middle, and high schools indicate that 13.4% of all students enrolled in resource room programs move to less restrictive environments (1,531 of 11,458) as a result of being decertified.

TABLE 6

Results of Re-evaluations for Students in Self-Contained Classes (for Middle Schools)

	Requested review		Triennial Evaluation		Totals	
Remain in special class with no change	1775	57.3%	2304	83.4%	4079	69.6%
Change in special education program and remain in special class	983	32.1%	284	10.3%	1267	21.7%
Less Restrictive Placements						
Placed in resource room	257	8.4%	150	5.4%	407	7.0%
Change to related service	23	0.8%	6	0.2%	29	0.5%
Decertified	47	1.5%	19	0.7%	66	1.1%
Totals	3065		2763		5848	

TABLE 7

Results of Re-evaluations for Students in Self-Contained Classes (for High Schools)

	Requested review		Triennial Evaluation		Totals	
Remains in special class with no change	72	10.5%	579	18.1%	651	16.7%
Change in special education program	534	77.7%	2499	78.0%	3033	77.9%
Less Restrictive Placements						
Placed in resource room	60	8.7%	106	3.3%	166	4.3%
Change to related service	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	3	0.1%
Decertified	20	2.9%	19	0.6%	39	1.0%
Total	687		3205		3892	

TABLE 8

The data for resource room students is as follows:

	Less Restrictive		Decertified		More restrictive	
Elementary (5,347)	148	2.8%	484	9.1%	1152	21.5%
Middle (N=3,530)	73	2.1%	446	12.6%	448	12.7%
High School (N=2,581)	42	1.6%	338	13.1%	180	7.0%

Data on the extent of academic mainstreaming, another facet of the least restrictive environment, indicate that 16% of special class students at the elementary school level are mainstreamed and 36% of middle school students are mainstreamed. These numbers represent quantum increases over a six year period when only about 7% of students with disabilities were mainstreamed.

Summary: In a given school year fewer than 7.5% of students in

self-contained classes are moved to a less restrictive environment as a result of re-evaluation. Still fewer resource room students are moved to less restrictive environments. Between 9% and 13% of students in resource rooms are decertified as a result of re-evaluations. All told, of a total of 90,362 students who attended self-contained class or resource rooms in elementary, middle, and high schools during the 1992-1993 school year (excluding students who receive related services only, consultant teacher services or who attend District 75 programs), 1,719 (1.9%) were decertified.

SECTION III- SUPPLEMENTARY ISSUES

Ethnic distributions for District 75

During the 1992-1993 school year there were 13,593 students attending District 75 programs. Of these students, 352 (2.6%) were Asian, 4,543 (33.4%) were Hispanic, 6,955 (51.2%) were black, and 1,743 (12.8%) were white. Thus, when comparing District 75 students to the total census data (appearing later in the appendix in Tables 2a and 2b) it is apparent that black students are overrepresented. Whereas black students comprise 36.4% of the census in primary and middle schools and 38.4% of the census in high schools, they comprise 51.2% of the population of District 75. The 51.2% placement rate in District 75 is also substantially higher than the overall referral rate for black students. That is, approximately 40% of all referrals for special education evaluation are of black students, while approximately 51% of all placements in District 75 are of black students. As a parenthetical note, we did not have access to data which indicated the ethnic/racial composition of students in the various SIE services categories which comprise District 75.

We did not have access to a sufficiently representative sample of CSE data on District 75 students to determine whether there are detectable differences in students' academic and/or behavioral profiles that might explain the racial divide in District 75 placements. Clearly, this is an important future research activity that requires attention.

OREA provided data on two additional topics pertaining to District 75 students: the number of those who are mainstreamed and the distribution of scores on the Degree of Reading Power tests. Data on mainstreaming for students in District 75 indicate that 38, less than 1%, were mainstreamed during the 1992-1993 school year. Also 7.8% of students in District 75 classes read at or above grade level.

Parents' Views

As part of our research program, independent of this

evaluation report, we distributed questionnaires to 150 parents of students who had been referred to special education. This was the only way that we received information from parents; we did not conduct in-person or telephone interviews. Our intent was to determine parents' general level of participation in the special education evaluation and placement process, and their level of satisfaction.

Questionnaires were sent in English and in Spanish, and parents had the option to complete either version and return it to us. We received 102 returns from parents whose children had been referred for an initial evaluation, including 27 from parents who completed the Spanish version. We also received 61 completed forms from parents whose children had been re-evaluated.

In general terms, about three-fourths of the responses from parents indicated that they were satisfied with the various aspects of the special education system. More specifically, 82% of the parents agreed with the special education classification that the CSEs assigned to their children, 74% agreed with the program that was recommended, and overall 73% were very satisfied or satisfied with the evaluation that was conducted. The bulk of the remaining one-fourth were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

SECTION IV- CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Definitive answers to some of the questions raised in this report are difficult to produce. There are reasons for this situation, all of which impact on the current operations of special education. These include the following:

1. There are no standardized criteria for making referrals to special education or for eligibility for placement in special education. As a result, there is substantial variability in the process across school districts and buildings.

2. There is no clear understanding or application of pre-referral activities as a means of retaining students in general education classes. The major pre-referral activity in many school districts appears to involve contact with parents. Other potentially successful strategies, such as curriculum or instructional adaptations, are done sporadically, primarily because classroom teachers do not have time to provide such adaptations.

3. There do not appear to be clearly defined criteria for placement of students to programs at various points along the continuum of restrictiveness. More often than not, lower-IQ students (less than 85) are placed in self-contained classes and

higher-IQ students are placed in resource rooms. There are many exceptions to this, however. Moreover, the data regarding the severity of behavior difficulty that students exhibit do not appear in a quantified form that is useful for statistical analysis.

4. There do not appear to be any standards or expectations regarding the academic and/or behavioral performance of students in special classes. There is no consistency concerning the question of what level of progress students should demonstrate in special classes, or in resource rooms, for that matter.

5. We could not identify any clear criteria for determining the frequency and/or duration of service that is prescribed for individual students with disabilities. For example, we could not establish meaningful statistical relationships across districts between severity of need and recommendations for related services. Nor did there appear to be any obvious relationships between severity of need and recommendations for related services (e.g., counselling) once or twice weekly, or recommendations for individual or small group sessions.

6. There is no consistent, practical definition of the least restrictive environment. It is not clear how or why students are mainstreamed.

7. There are no exit criteria from special education. Once placed in special education, few ever leave.

Appendix A

PORTRAITS OF REFERRALS AND CLASSIFICATIONS FOR NEW YORK CITY

The data we present in this section pertain exclusively to the issue of racial and ethnic distributions in referral to and placement in special education. The nine evaluation questions raised in the RFP did not directly address the issue of racial and ethnic distributions in referral and placement, and we believe it is helpful to present data on the scope of referrals and eligibility determinations, especially given the title of the RFP, "Overrepresentation of Children of Color Referred to Special Education in New York City." We obtained these data from the school profiles diskettes distributed by the New York City Public Schools' Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment. The data presented below offer the reader a glimpse of the racial and ethnic variations that exist.

Interpreting the Tables

Throughout this portion of the report we analyze issues related to overrepresentation of minority groups in two distinct ways. One set of analyses focuses on identifying the population of students within a school enrolled in special education, and of that number, determining how many are of a given racial/ethnic group. The denominator in this fraction is the number of special education students in the school. We illustrate this approach to data presentation with a fictional school containing a total of 1,000 students, where 200 students, or 20% of the student body, are Hispanic. Let us assume that in this fictional school there are 100 students enrolled in self-contained special classes, 25 of whom are Hispanic. In this schools, then, 25% of the special class students are Hispanic, but only 20% of the total register is Hispanic, a 5% difference. In this type of analysis, the sums of the percentages for a row of data tally to 100%, subject to minor rounding errors.

The second way we present the data is to indicate the percentage of a given racial/ethnic group that is referred to and/or placed in special education. In this set of analyses the denominator is the total number of students in a given racial or ethnic group. To illustrate with our fictional 1,000-student school, suppose that in addition to 200 Hispanic students, there are 250 black students, 50 Asian students and 500 white students. If 20 Hispanic students were referred for special education evaluation, then the referral rate for Hispanic students would be 10 percent, that is, 20 of 200 students. If 10 white students were referred, their referral rate would be 2%, or 2 of 500. In these analyses, the sums of the rows data do not total to 100%.

Referrals and Placement by Race/Ethnicity The ethnic census of the 676,289 students in New York City elementary and middle schools combined for the 1992-1993 school year is as follows: Asian, 8.45%; black, 36.42%; Hispanic, 36.86%; white, 18.28%. Of the 676,289 students, 65,567 are receiving special education, either in a self-contained placement or in a resource room (recall that District 75 students are omitted from these analyses). The pool of students who are potential candidates for referrals to special education, therefore, is 610,722. The ethnic distribution of this population is: Asian, 9.1%; black, 35.8%; Hispanic, 36.6%; white, 18.5%. The corresponding figures for the 25,157 referrals for initial special education evaluation, 4.1% of the eligible pool, are: Asian, 3.1%; black, 40.2%; Hispanic, 39.4%; white 17.4%.

There are 37,725 students in special education classes, not including resource rooms. The ethnic breakdown of this population is: Asian, 1.9%; black, 45.5%; Hispanic, 40.4%; white, 12.2%. Of the 27,842 students in resource room programs, Asians constitute 2.9%; blacks, 38.3%; Hispanics, 37.6%; and, white, 21.3%. Finally, the aggregate of 65,567 students in resource room and special classes is: Asian, 2.3%; black, 42.4%; Hispanic, 39.2%; white, 16.0%. The data in the preceding two paragraphs is tabulated on the following pages. In Table 1 immediately below, the data for elementary schools only are posted as ratios to a base of 1. That is, for each one white student we indicate the number of other students who are referred and placed in special education. The data in Table 1 were aggregated at the district level. The districts' scores were summed and divided by 32.

TABLE 1

Ratios of Students in Elementary Schools (Data United-Weighted at District Level)

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Total Population	1.00	1.99	2.02	0.46
Referred to Sp. Ed.	1.00	2.31	2.26	0.18
Placed In Resource Room	1.00	1.80	1.77	0.14
Placed In Special Class	1.00	3.73	3.31	0.16

TABLE 2a
Number of Students by Ethnicity and Race for Elementary and Middle Schools in 32 Community School Districts[1] (1992-1993)

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	123,591	246,274	249,243	57,180
General educ.	112,987	218,244	223,430	55,637
Referred	4,374	10,105	9,904	774
Resource room	5,917	10,643	10,448	801
Special Educ. (self-contained)	4,619	16,609	14,524	671
Percent of census who are:				
referred	3.53%	4.10%	3.97%	1.35%
in Res. Room	4.79%	4.32%	4.19%	1.40%
in spec. class	3.73%	6.74%	5.82%	1.18%
Percent of general education who are:				
referred	3.87%	4.63%	4.43%	1.39%

[1] All data in Table 2a are based on 820 schools. Referral data are based on 813 schools.

The data in the top part of Table 2a indicate the numbers of white, black, Hispanic and Asian children in the total census and in general education, which is defined here as all children excluding children in resource rooms and self-contained MIS classes. In addition, we present raw numbers on referrals, referral room enrollments, and self-contained class enrollments.

The bottom part of Table 2a indicates the percentage within a racial/ethnic group who are referred or who attend resource rooms or self-contained classes. For example, the left column indicates that 3.53% of all white students in elementary and

middle schools were referred to special education in the 1992-1993 school year. The corresponding percentages of black and Hispanic youngsters are 4.10% and 3.97%.

The second way to present racial/ethnic distributions, as we mentioned earlier, is to determine the percentage of the special education population that is white, black, Hispanic, etc. When the data are presented in this manner, as we have done in Table 2b, the sum of the rows tally to 100%. For example, in the bottom row of Table 2b we notice that 12.2% of the population of self-contained classes is white, whereas 45.5% of all students in self-contained classes are black. Combining the information in Tables 2a and 2b, we note that 6.74% of all black students are in self-contained classes and that 45.5% of the students in the self-contained classes are black.

TABLE 2b

City-wide Percentages of Students by Ethnicity in General Education, Special Education, and Referred for Evaluation (Primary and Middle Schools)

	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
Total Census (676,289)	8.4%	36.4%	36.9%	18.3%
General education (610,722)	9.1	35.8	36.6	18.5
Referrals for evaluation (25,157)	3.1	40.2	39.4	17.4
Resource Rooms (27,842)	2.9	38.3	37.6	21.3
Special Classes (36,725)	1.9	45.5	40.4	12.2

The information contained in Table 2b is repeated in Table 3 for students who are in high schools.

TABLE 3

City-wide Percentages of Students by Ethnicity in General Education, Special Education, and Referred for Evaluation (High Schools)

	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
Total Census (265,885)	8.9%	38.4%	33.2%	18.1%
General education (248,374)	10.6	37.8	32.8	18.5
Referrals for evaluation (1,023)	3.5	41.9	31.1	23.5
Resource Rooms (10,229)	2.7	41.2	34.2	21.9
Special Classes (15,667)	1.9	46.8	37.6	13.6

Perusal of the data in Tables 2a, 2b, and 3 illustrate the nature and scope of the problem regarding overrepresentation of minority students in special education. At the elementary and middle school levels, the primary area of disproportion is with black students in self-contained classes. Of all students enrolled in special classes, 45.5% are black. Of all students attending public schools in New York City, 36.4% are black. There is thus a 9.1% disproportion in the percentage of black

students attending special classes. The disproportion among black students is comprised of two parts that are not entirely additive: a 4.4% disproportion relative to the eligible pool who can be referred (35.8% v. 40.2%) and a 5.3% disproportion between the percentage who are referred and the percentage who attend self-contained classes. The corresponding data at the high school level also indicate that the major disproportion occurs for black students. There is an 8.4% higher proportion of black students enrolled in self-contained classes than exists for the population at large. As is evident from Table 2a, this disproportion is attributable to disproportions in both referrals and in placements in self-contained classes. There is less disproportion for Hispanic students.

Among the four ethnic groups we studied, Hispanic youngsters attend special classes in the closest proportions to their numbers in the population at large. At the primary and middle school levels, there is a 3.5% discrepancy (36.9% v. 40.4%) between the census of Hispanic youngsters and their enrollment in special classes. We indicate later that the close representation of Hispanic students in special education and Hispanic students in the total population is evident across schools that are heavily Hispanic and schools that are fairly evenly integrated with students of all racial/ethnic groups. White and Asian students are underrepresented in special education referrals and placements, with the latter group dramatically underrepresented.

Disproportion in Relation to the Ethnic/Racial Concentrations. A view that is voiced among those concerned with patterns of and reasons for racial/ethnic disproportion is that referrals of a particular group relate negatively to the concentration of students from that group within schools. This view suggests, for example, that the greatest imbalance of black children referred to special education would occur in schools having few black students. In Tables 4a, 4b, and 4c we present census and referral data for schools having differing concentrations of students by race/ethnicity. In Table 4a, the data are presented for schools varying in the percentage of white students; Table 4b depicts the corresponding data for schools varying in the percentage of black students, and Table 4c provides the same analysis for schools varying in the percentage of Hispanic youngsters. We arbitrarily divided schools into quintiles, that is in 20% increments for racial/ethnic group distributions. These analyses are based on school-level data, with each school weighted equally, regardless of the number of children who attend. To understand the meaning of this, consider two schools, one enrolling 500 Hispanic students where 50 were referred to special education and the other enrolling 50 Hispanic students where 5 were referred. In both schools data would be recorded that 10% of the Hispanic population were referred to special education.

TABLE 4a[1]

Percentage of White, Black, and Hispanic Students Referred to Special Education in Schools Varying in the Percentage of White Students (Elementary and Middle Schools)

	Percentage of White Students in School				
	0-19%	20-39%	40-59%	60-79%	>79%
Number of Schools containing the percentage of white students	537	82	105	69	27
Avg. Percent of White Students Referred per School	9.5%	4.2%	3.3%	4.6%	4.0%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	1	8	11	18	21
Avg. Percent of Black Students Referred per School	5.6%	8.2%	9.1%	9.9%	24.3%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	16	10	6	5	2
Avg. Percent of Hispanic Students Referred per School	4.8%	6.6%	5.4%	9.2%	6.2%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	15	12	6	5	1

[1] Totals for number of schools sum to 820. Referrals are based on data for a minimum of 800 schools and a maximum of 813.

TABLE 4b

Percentage of White, Black, and Hispanic Students Referred to Special Education in Schools Varying in the Percentage of Black Students (Elementary and Middle Schools)

	Percentage of Black Students in School				
	0-19%	20-39%	40-59%	60-79%	>79%
Number of Schools containing the percentage of black students	346	179	86	79	130
Avg. Percent of White Students Referred per School	4.6%	7.1%	9.9%	12.7%	11.6%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	10	3	3	2	1
Avg. Percent of Black Students Referred per School	9.8%	6.6%	5.5%	4.9%	3.7%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	5	12	17	23	24
Avg. Percent of Hispanic Students Referred per School	4.8%	6.6%	5.4%	9.2%	6.2%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	15	12	6	5	1

TABLE 4c

Percentage of White, Black, and Hispanic Students Referred to Special Education in Schools Varying in the Percentage of Hispanic Students (Elementary and Middle Schools)

	Percentage of Hispanic Students in School				
	0-19%	20-39%	40-59%	60-79%	>79%
Number of Schools containing the percentage of Hispanic students	314	183	122	148	53
Avg. Percent of White Students Referred per School	7.5%	7.9%	8.7%	7.1%	5.2%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	8	6	3	1	1
Avg. Percent of Black Students Referred per School	7.7%	7.2%	7.2%	6.5%	7.3%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	14	15	12	10	4
Avg. Percent of Hispanic Students Referred per School	6.1%	5.5%	5.0%	4.9%	4.1%
Number of children per school referred that correspond to the avg. percentage (to nearest whole number)	3	10	16	25	28

The data in Tables 4a, 4b and 4c indicate that as the register of black and white students, but not Hispanic students, increases within a school, a smaller percentage of the increasing ethnic group tends to be referred for special education evaluation. For example, in schools having fewer then 20% black students, an average of 9.8% of all black students in those schools are referred to special education. In schools having 80% or more black students, 3.7% of all black students in those schools are referred to special education. Similarly, in schools that have few white students (less than 20%), 9.5% of all white students attending such schools are referred to special education, whereas in schools that are predominantly white (80% or more), 4.0% of all white students are referred.

Interpretation of these data is difficult, however. There are several possible reasons why these referral patterns exist, and in the absence of detailed studies it is difficult to determine the precise reasons for them. For example, part of the decrease in referrals of the same ethnic/racial group may be artifactual. There could be a generally accepted, although unspoken, ceiling on the number of referrals that a school can accommodate, and this cap may prevent more students, who are most likely to come from the numerically dominant group in the school, from being referred.

It is also likely that the location where a child lives and attends school is influenced by income levels. For example the data in Table 4b demonstrate that as the percentage of black students in schools increase, there is a corresponding increase in the percentage of white students who are referred. Perhaps white students who live in predominately minority areas are poorer than white students who live in primarily white neighborhoods and attend schools that are mainly white.

The data presented in Tables 4a, 4b, and 4c present one disturbing fact of the New York City schools: the extent of separation by race/ethnicity. Notice in the extreme right-hand columns in Table 4b that there are 130 (of 820) schools that are 80% or more black, but that from Table 4c we see that there are only 53 schools that are 80% or more Hispanic. These data should be considered in relation to the data in Table 2a (p. 26) which indicated that there are approximately equal numbers of black and Hispanic students in the New York City schools.

Other data regarding racial and ethnic breakdowns by district appear in Table 5 and 6 for elementary schools. The data in Table 5 offer information on the percentage of children within a given racial/ethnic group who receive special education, either in resource rooms or in self-contained classes, while Table 6 presents data only for self-contained classes. For example, the first data column in Table 5, titled white, indicates that 9.6% of white children in District 1 elementary

schools receive special education. The same column in Table 6 indicates that 4.92% of white children are enrolled in self-contained special classes.

TABLE 5

Percentage Of Racial/Ethnic Groups Receiving Special Education (Elementary Schools)

District	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
1	9.6%	15.3%	16.4%	2.3%
2	5.8	13.1	13.9	3.2
3	4.5	11.3	10.2	5.1
4	6.0	13.3	11.9	6.3
5	15.8	9.2	8.8	7.5
6	8.7	8.4	5.6	2.1
7	22.2	10.9	11.0	13.9
8	7.5	8.2	7.5	1.2
9	8.8	7.2	6.0	3.6
10	7.4	10.3	8.3	2.6
11	11.9	11.5	11.0	4.2
12	15.5	8.7	7.9	3.2
13	4.6	8.0	10.1	3.7
14	4.8	11.5	8.1	2.4
15	5.6	14.2	9.0	3.4
16	22.2	8.6	8.0	10.0
17	10.2	5.8	4.6	1.2
18	3.6	7.9	7.9	1.6
19	13.9	9.1	8.8	2.0
20	9.0	17.7	10.1	2.3
21	9.0	17.2	14.8	2.1
22	5.5	10.1	8.4	1.6
23	8.2	10.1	10.4	9.4
24	6.6	9.6	7.1	1.4
25	7.5	16.8	9.8	1.8
26	7.0	17.8	9.9	2.3
27	9.1	13.0	9.2	2.9
28	6.1	11.1	7.6	2.2
29	4.8	7.7	5.4	1.4
30	6.0	10.5	6.6	1.3
31	7.1	13.9	11.1	2.4
32	18.8	9.9	7.8	1.6
Avg.	**9.2%**	**11.2%**	**9.2%**	**3.5%**

TABLE 6

Percentage Of Racial/Ethnic Groups In 637 Elementary Schools Enrolled In Special Classes

District	Percent White	Percent Black	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian
1	4.92%	9.50%	8.79%	0.90%
2	1.89	5.90	5.57	1.03
3	1.85	6.14	5.21	2.55
4	3.40	8.19	7.35	4.69
5	9.90	6.14	5.93	7.50
6	3.38	5.60	3.44	1.40
7	13.89	7.14	7.35	8.33
8	2.37	5.19	5.23	0.39
9	4.90	5.27	4.36	3.30
10	4.15	6.13	4.91	1.80
11	5.20	7.23	6.93	2.11
12	3.88	5.92	5.13	2.02
13	2.94	4.81	5.94	2.44
14	3.15	8.19	4.95	2.06
15	2.02	7.08	4.09	0.84
16	14.81	5.31	5.83	0.00
17	5.83	3.82	3.35	0.82
18	2.17	4.96	4.34	1.30
19	8.05	6.40	5.88	1.26
20	3.87	11.27	5.59	1.42
21	3.51	9.03	6.35	0.95
22	2.40	5.47	4.65	0.83
23	5.41	6.22	6.26	9.43
24	3.84	5.27	4.23	1.08
25	3.20	7.98	4.73	0.98
26	3.23	11.30	5.61	1.54
27	4.09	8.00	5.20	1.97
28	2.35	6.64	3.93	0.78
29	2.06	4.78	3.24	0.72
30	2.30	6.14	3.30	0.74
31	2.75	8.43	6.46	1.10
32	9.38	6.37	4.94	0.54
Avg.[1]	4.60	6.74	5.28	2.09

1. The average was computed by weighting each school equally. The average reported is not the same as the overall city-wide average which weights each school according to the number of children enrolled within a racial group.

The corresponding data for middle schools appear in Tables 7 and 8.

TABLE 7

Percentage Of Racial/Ethnic Groups In 176 Middle Schools Enrolled In Special Classes

District	Percent White	Percent Black	Percent Hispanic	Percent Asian
1	6.195%	15.904%	10.902%	1.377%
2	3.593	7.989	10.684	0.973
3	1.822	10.561	9.554	2.151
4	4.839	7.934	7.789	4.167
5	27.273	11.050	7.335	12.500
6	7.407	9.510	6.380	1.695
7	4.348	15.879	15.722	5.556
8	5.803	11.866	9.952	0.901
9	8.571	10.190	11.463	8.511
10	5.982	8.721	7.668	1.560
11	10.901	8.749	8.252	1.554
12	11.538	8.849	8.625	1.923
13	0.000	9.589	16.742	0.000
14	17.718	11.172	9.181	1.695
15	5.588	13.502	8.949	1.149
16	0.000	10.162	9.191	0.000
17	10.204	7.090	7.692	2.128
18	4.464	7.661	8.571	1.775
19	6.417	9.947	8.618	2.326
20	5.772	8.553	7.129	1.826
21	3.924	14.373	8.947	1.326
22	3.270	8.389	7.254	0.774
23	23.529	10.504	10.352	0.000
24	6.569	9.574	6.161	1.362
25	4.824	9.493	7.419	1.438
26	6.365	13.447	16.254	0.926
27	5.133	11.256	8.869	1.836
28	3.378	9.469	7.045	1.082
29	2.303	5.556	4.545	1.316
30	4.668	11.649	5.837	1.772
31	5.014	12.313	9.003	1.917
32	18.182	5.116	8.997	1.869
Avg.[2]	7.362	10.188	9.096	2.168

[2]

1. The average was computed by weighting each school equally. The average reported is not the same as the overall city-wide average which weights each district according to the number of children enrolled within a racial group.

TABLE 8

Percentage Of Racial/Ethnic Groups Receiving Special Education (Resource Room Or Special Class) (176 Middle Schools)

District	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
1	13.27%	24.10%	21.95%	2.48%
2	8.98	20.66	24.21	5.68
3	7.06	15.34	14.81	6.45
4	9.68	13.68	13.38	4.17
5	50.00	15.39	11.98	12.50
6	9.26	14.83	10.18	10.17
7	13.04	21.46	21.43	11.11
8	14.12	17.45	15.93	0.90
9	17.14	14.39	14.49	10.64
10	13.00	15.77	15.19	2.77
11	18.60	14.60	14.59	6.74
12	23.08	13.88	12.55	5.77
13	11.11	13.81	20.59	0.00
14	22.22	16.48	13.91	2.54
15	12.35	24.05	16.80	5.75
16	0.00	14.70	11.40	0.00
17	18.37	10.70	10.30	2.13
18	8.82	12.76	14.92	5.33
19	17.11	16.09	14.10	6.05
20	12.70	15.07	14.37	3.94
21	11.24	24.77	19.56	3.31
22	8.90	15.33	13.47	2.13
23	29.41	16.11	16.30	0.00
24	12.75	17.73	12.40	2.99
25	11.43	21.20	15.30	2.88
26	11.77	20.17	23.32	2.59
27	13.45	19.20	15.39	3.55
28	7.29	16.50	13.57	3.05
29	6.58	10.00	8.13	2.41
30	10.72	19.59	10.50	3.10
31	12.39	25.00	16.96	3.39
32	39.39	8.86	14.42	1.87
Avg.	**14.85**	**16.86**	**15.20**	**4.26**

Of greatest interest are the substantial variations among districts and the fact that many more students in middle schools are enrolled in special education.

The data in Table 9 present the percentage of pupils within each community school district that is enrolled in resource room and self-contained classes. These data are low estimates because they do not include students who receive related services only. These latter data are not available from the school profiles diskettes that the New York City public schools distributes.

TABLE 9

Percent Of Elementary and Middle School Population Receiving Special Education Services (Resource Room or Special Class)

DISTRICT No.	Elementary school	Middle school
1	14.8%	19.5%
2	7.8	13.0
3	9.8	14.2
4	12.2	13.3
5	9.2	14.8
6	5.9	10.7
7	11.0	21.3
8	7.6	16.0
9	6.4	14.4
10	8.4	14.4
11	11.0	14.6
12	8.1	13.0
13	8.3	14.7
14	8.4	14.7
15	8.6	17.2
16	8.6	14.2
17	5.6	10.6
18	6.9	12.0
19	8.9	14.9
20	8.5	12.2
21	10.9	14.4
22	7.8	11.4
23	10.0	16.2
24	6.1	10.9
25	7.0	10.7
26	7.0	11.5
27	10.1	15.6
28	7.7	11.6
29	6.8	9.2
30	6.2	10.9
31	8.3	14.2
32	8.3	12.3

Table 10 is presented as a complement to district data regarding pupil ethnicity. This table contains the distribution of teachers' race and ethnicity for each of the 32 community school districts. The data are presented separately for elementary and middle schools.

TABLE 10

Percentage of Teachers by Ethnicity

District	Elementary Schools			Middle Schools		
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic
1	71.5	9.2	16.5	72.7	11.1	12.6
2	71.7	7.5	5.7	70.3	10.0	8.9
3	54.1	24.8	19.9	60.1	21.1	17.9
4	44.9	20.6	32.5	52.4	21.7	24.9
5	17.7	68.7	11.9	25.8	61.3	11.7
6	45.7	13.4	39.7	43.3	22.4	32.9
7	36.8	25.4	37.4	45.2	25.7	27.9
8	60.8	17.7	20.3	54.0	25.8	16.6
9	34.7	36.3	27.7	32.1	46.9	20.1
10	62.2	14.0	22.7	69.4	13.8	15.8
11	76.3	15.1	8.5	69.1	22.0	8.0
12	38.6	27.1	33.6	41.1	32.9	24.3
13	41.9	51.0	5.8	24.7	64.7	9.8
14	72.2	12.3	14.4	70.4	16.9	11.3
15	76.8	7.8	14.6	78.9	10.4	10.4
16	23.3	70.6	5.5	15.4	78.5	5.4
17	38.6	55.3	4.7	28.0	69.1	1.9
18	82.1	16.1	1.6	74.7	22.8	1.4
19	56.8	27.4	14.3	56.2	29.7	13.2
20	84.6	2.4	10.3	81.9	4.9	8.8
21	88.9	3.6	6.5	87.8	6.3	3.8
22	87.3	9.3	2.4	88.8	6.5	4.0
23	31.8	58.7	7.6	27.7	63.8	6.3
24	80.5	4.0	12.7	85.9	4.2	7.4
25	88.8	5.7	3.2	91.5	2.9	3.9
26	91.3	4.9	2.2	83.5	11.9	2.9
27	78.8	16.4	4.2	83.3	12.1	3.8
28	75.6	18.2	5.4	75.1	20.8	4.2
29	70.8	24.4	4.0	56.8	38.9	3.5
30	80.7	7.5	10.4	75.8	10.4	10.1
31	95.8	2.2	1.7	93.5	2.8	3.1
32	43.0	22.8	32.9	46.6	29.5	20.5

Additional analysis of the teacher ethnicity data indicate that districts having higher proportions of minority students also have higher proportions of minority teachers. For 813 elementary and middle schools, the correlation between the

percentage of black students in school and the percentage of black teachers is .77. The corresponding correlations for Hispanic students and teachers is .76. For white students and teachers the correlation is .67.

Appendix B

Racial/Ethnic Distributions for Elementary and Middle Schools by District

DISTRICT 1 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	5.3	15.7	71.0	8.0
Percentage Referred	2.7	18.1	77.3	1.9
Percentage in resource rooms	3.6	13.7	80.9	1.7
Percentage in special classes	3.2	18.5	77.4	.9
Percentage receiving special education services	3.4	16.4	79.0	1.3

DISTRICT 2 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	31.6	14.2	21.8	32.4
Percentage Referred	30.0	23.6	35.5	10.9
Percentage in resource rooms	25.8	21.5	38.0	14.7
Percentage in special classes	20.0	28.0	40.8	11.2
Percentage receiving special education services	23.6	24.0	39.1	13.0

DISTRICT 3 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	14.1	45.6	37.7	2.6
Percentage Referred	12.7	47.2	38.5	1.7
Percentage in resource rooms	7.9	50.6	40.1	1.4
Percentage in special classes	5.1	55.0	38.5	1.3
Percentage receiving special education services	6.5	52.9	39.3	1.3

DISTRICT 4 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	2.3	35.4	61.7	0.6
Percentage Referred	0.8	39.2	59.7	0.3
Percentage in resource rooms	1.3	38.6	59.9	0.2
Percentage in special classes	1.0	38.4	60.2	0.4
Percentage receiving special education services	1.1	38.5	60.1	0.3

DISTRICT 5 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	0.9	76.4	22.3	.4
Percentage Referred	1.9	68.2	30.0	0
Percentage in resource rooms	1.8	77.3	20.9	0
Percentage in special classes	1.5	76.5	21.5	.5
Percentage receiving special education services	1.6	76.8	21.3	.3

DISTRICT 6 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	1.2	10.2	87.7	.9
Percentage Referred	1.7	14.8	82.8	.7
Percentage in resource rooms	2.9	12.6	84.3	.3
Percentage in special classes	1.2	15.7	82.8	.3
Percentage receiving special education services	1.8	14.5	83.4	.3

DISTRICT 7 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.3	32.0	67.3	.3
Percentage Referred	1.6	37.6	60.7	.2
Percentage in resource rooms	.8	32.5	66.2	.5
Percentage in special classes	.6	31.3	67.7	.4
Percentage receiving special education services	.7	31.7	67.2	.4

DISTRICT 8 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	11.9	30.4	55.9	1.8
Percentage Referred	8.4	41.8	49.2	.7
Percentage in resource rooms	22.0	33.1	44.4	.5
Percentage in special classes	5.9	32.9	61.1	.1
Percentage receiving special education services	11.8	33.0	54.9	.3

DISTRICT 9 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.5	39.2	58.5	1.9
Percentage Referred	1.0	41.6	57.1	.3
Percentage in resource rooms	1.1	43.0	55.6	.3
Percentage in special classes	.5	43.9	54.3	1.3
Percentage receiving special education services	.7	43.7	54.6	1.0

DISTRICT 10 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	8.6	21.4	65.3	4.7
Percentage Referred	6.4	25.6	65.6	2.3
Percentage in resource rooms	8.4	26.1	64.4	1.1
Percentage in special classes	7.2	26.5	64.7	1.7
Percentage receiving special education services	7.7	26.3	64.6	1.5

DISTRICT 11 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	15.3	48.2	31.6	5.0
Percentage Referred	13.1	49.5	33.0	4.5
Percentage in resource rooms	22.8	46.2	28.6	2.4
Percentage in special classes	12.1	53.0	33.3	1.6
Percentage receiving special education services	16.4	50.3	31.4	1.9

DISTRICT 12 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.8	31.2	66.2	1.8
Percentage Referred	.8	33.0	65.4	.7
Percentage in resource rooms	3.1	30.6	65.5	.8
Percentage in special classes	.6	34.8	64.0	.7
Percentage receiving special education services	1.4	33.4	64.5	.7

DISTRICT 13 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	1.8	81.7	15.8	.6
Percentage Referred	3.1	79.8	16.9	.2
Percentage in resource rooms	.9	78.9	19.9	.2
Percentage in special classes	1.1	79.5	19.1	.3
Percentage receiving special education services	1.0	79.3	19.4	.3

DISTRICT 14 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	8.3	21.5	67.6	2.6
Percentage Referred	5.0	27.8	67.0	.1
Percentage in resource rooms	4.6	23.5	71.6	.3
Percentage in special classes	4.8	32.4	61.7	1.0
Percentage receiving special education services	4.8	29.3	65.3	.7

DISTRICT 15 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	23.2	16.2	53.0	7.5
Percentage Referred	12.1	26.7	57.0	4.2
Percentage in resource rooms	17.4	24.1	54.4	4.1
Percentage in special classes	12.2	29.9	56.3	1.6
Percentage receiving special education services	15.0	26.7	55.3	3.0

DISTRICT 16 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.3	89.5	10.1	.1
Percentage Referred	.6	87.8	11.6	0
Percentage in resource rooms	.7	92.2	6.8	.3
Percentage in special classes	.8	88.3	10.9	0
Percentage receiving special education services	.8	89.8	9.4	.1

DISTRICT 17 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	1.1	86.9	10.7	1.3
Percentage Referred	2.8	90.6	6.7	0
Percentage in resource rooms	2.6	90.0	7.1	.3
Percentage in special classes	1.7	88.5	9.5	.3
Percentage receiving special education services	2.0	89.0	8.7	.3

DISTRICT 18 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	19.7	70.5	6.5	3.3
Percentage Referred	8.9	82.2	8.2	.7
Percentage in resource rooms	11.0	79.9	8.8	.3
Percentage in special classes	10.1	82.3	6.6	1.0
Percentage receiving special education services	10.4	81.4	7.5	.7

DISTRICT 19 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	2.7	52.7	41.6	3.0
Percentage Referred	3.2	53.9	42.1	.8
Percentage in resource rooms	5.6	50.7	43.0	.8
Percentage in special classes	3.6	55.5	40.3	.6
Percentage receiving special education services	4.2	54.0	41.1	.7

DISTRICT 20 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	52.8	5.5	23.7	18.0
Percentage Referred	60.8	6.4	26.5	6.3
Percentage in resource rooms	63.1	8.2	25.1	3.6
Percentage in special classes	48.1	14.6	31.2	6.0
Percentage receiving special education services	55.7	11.4	28.2	4.8

DISTRICT 21 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	46.4	20.3	19.7	13.6
Percentage Referred	39.3	31.8	24.9	4.1
Percentage in resource rooms	42.4	27.4	27.6	2.6
Percentage in special classes	33.7	37.8	25.8	2.7
Percentage receiving special education services	38.5	32.0	26.8	2.6

DISTRICT 22 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	33.5	47.6	12.0	6.9
Percentage Referred	27.4	58.7	11.8	2.0
Percentage in resource rooms	27.7	58.9	12.0	1.4
Percentage in special classes	20.0	64.7	13.9	1.4
Percentage receiving special education services	23.7	61.9	13.0	1.4

DISTRICT 23 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	4.9	79.4	15.1	.5
Percentage Referred	5.6	83.3	10.4	.7
Percentage in resource rooms	3.6	80.0	16.4	0
Percentage in special classes	4.3	79.7	15.3	.7
Percentage receiving special education services	4.0	79.8	15.7	.5

DISTRICT 24 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	25.9	5.4	51.7	16.9
Percentage Referred	30.6	7.0	57.9	4.4
Percentage in resource rooms	28.8	9.5	59.6	2.1
Percentage in special classes	27.2	7.8	60.0	5.0
Percentage receiving special education services	27.8	8.5	59.8	3.8

DISTRICT 25 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	36.1	9.3	21.7	32.9
Percentage Referred	36.0	14.6	33.5	15.9
Percentage in resource rooms	41.5	22.1	29.1	7.3
Percentage in special classes	35.6	22.9	31.5	9.9
Percentage receiving special education services	38.8	22.5	30.2	8.5

DISTRICT 26 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	51.0	10.4	8.9	29.7
Percentage Referred	57.6	16.7	13.7	12.0
Percentage in resource rooms	59.8	20.9	11.8	7.4
Percentage in special classes	43.5	31.1	13.3	12.1
Percentage receiving special education services	51.0	26.4	12.6	10.0

DISTRICT 27 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	25.3	39.9	26.0	8.8
Percentage Referred	23.9	48.9	23.6	3.6
Percentage in resource rooms	28.7	45.5	24.0	1.9
Percentage in special classes	17.9	55.5	23.5	3.0
Percentage receiving special education services	22.6	51.2	23.7	2.5

DISTRICT 28 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	18.7	40.8	21.8	18.7
Percentage Referred	15.6	54.8	23.9	5.8
Percentage in resource rooms	19.6	50.6	22.2	7.6
Percentage in special classes	10.6	65.3	20.6	3.5
Percentage receiving special education services	14.8	58.5	21.3	5.4

DISTRICT 29 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	5.1	73.6	13.1	8.2
Percentage Referred	4.3	84.0	9.2	2.6
Percentage in resource rooms	5.3	81.9	10.6	2.2
Percentage in special classes	2.6	85.7	10.3	1.4
Percentage receiving special education services	3.6	84.2	10.4	1.7

DISTRICT 30 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	23.4	15.7	43.8	17.0
Percentage Referred	18.2	28.5	48.3	5.0
Percentage in resource rooms	28.0	22.2	46.8	3.0
Percentage in special classes	17.5	31.4	47.1	4.1
Percentage receiving special education services	22.8	26.8	46.9	3.6

DISTRICT 31 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	68.7	14.6	11.3	5.4
Percentage Referred	63.6	19.4	15.1	2.0
Percentage in resource rooms	67.9	18.4	12.1	1.6
Percentage in special classes	48.3	31.6	18.6	1.5
Percentage receiving special education services	58.6	24.6	15.2	1.6

DISTRICT 32 elem

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	0.6	24.9	72.6	1.9
Percentage Referred	1.3	32.3	65.9	.6
Percentage in resource rooms	2.0	28.5	68.9	.7
Percentage in special classes	1.2	30.3	68.4	.2
Percentage receiving special education services	1.5	29.6	68.6	.4

DISTRICT 1 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	3.9	14.3	69.4	12.5
Percentage Referred	1.8	16.4	76.6	5.0
Percentage in resource rooms	3.0	12.6	82.9	1.5
Percentage in special classes	2.3	22.1	73.8	1.7
Percentage receiving special education services	2.6	17.6	78.1	1.6

DISTRICT 2 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	23.2	14.4	23.7	38.7
Percentage Referred	15.7	18.0	49.6	12.9
Percentage in resource rooms	15.4	22.5	39.6	22.5
Percentage in special classes	17.0	23.5	51.8	7.7
Percentage receiving special education services	16.0	22.9	44.2	16.9

DISTRICT 3 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	9.3	48.8	39.9	2.0
Percentage Referred	6.7	40.0	36.7	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	9.7	46.6	41.9	1.7
Percentage in special classes	1.8	56.1	41.6	0.5
Percentage receiving special education services	4.6	52.8	41.7	0.9

DISTRICT 4 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	3.2	38.0	58.1	.6
Percentage Referred	4.0	39.6	62.2	.5
Percentage in resource rooms	2.8	39.1	58.1	0.0
Percentage in special classes	2.0	39.1	58.6	0.3
Percentage receiving special education services	2.3	39.1	58.4	0.2

DISTRICT 5 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.7	73.7	25.4	.2
Percentage Referred	0.0	91.3	5.6	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	3.4	70.5	26.0	0.0
Percentage in special classes	1.8	79.6	18.2	0.3
Percentage receiving special education services	2.3	76.8	20.6	0.2

DISTRICT 6 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.8	10.2	88.2	.8
Percentage Referred	2.0	17.2	77.6	2.5
Percentage in resource rooms	0.4	13.6	84.2	1.8
Percentage in special classes	0.9	14.6	84.4	0.2
Percentage receiving special education services	0.7	14.2	84.3	0.8

DISTRICT 7 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.6	31.2	67.8	.4
Percentage Referred	.8	29.2	70.4	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	.9	30.6	68.1	0.4
Percentage in special classes	.2	31.6	68.1	0.2
Percentage receiving special education services	.3	31.4	68.1	0.2

DISTRICT 8 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	7.9	33.0	57.3	1.7
Percentage Referred	8.3	34.3	50.7	1.5
Percentage in resource rooms	11.1	31.1	57.8	0.0
Percentage in special classes	4.6	38.8	56.5	0.2
Percentage receiving special education services	7.0	36.0	57.0	0.1

DISTRICT 9 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.4	40.9	56.5	2.2
Percentage Referred	1.0	42.5	58.9	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	1.0	49.0	48.7	1.3
Percentage in special classes	0.3	38.4	59.6	1.7
Percentage receiving special education services	0.5	41.0	56.9	1.6

DISTRICT 10 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	8.0	23.1	62.9	6.0
Percentage Referred	7.9	33.9	55.3	1.0
Percentage in resource rooms	8.1	23.3	67.6	1.0
Percentage in special classes	6.5	27.2	65.1	1.3
Percentage receiving special education services	7.2	25.3	66.3	1.2

DISTRICT 11 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	8.4	56.8	30.1	4.7
Percentage Referred	8.1	60.4	29.1	3.0
Percentage in resource rooms	10.6	54.3	31.1	4.0
Percentage in special classes	10.9	58.9	29.4	0.9
Percentage receiving special education services	10.7	57.0	30.1	2.2

DISTRICT 12 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.6	34.2	63.9	1.3
Percentage Referred	1.0	41.7	54.2	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	1.7	39.5	57.6	1.1
Percentage in special classes	0.9	35.0	63.8	0.3
Percentage receiving special education services	1.1	36.6	61.7	0.6

DISTRICT 13 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.3	85.2	13.9	.6
Percentage Referred	0.0	89.2	9.4	2.3
Percentage in resource rooms	0.8	86.4	12.9	0.0
Percentage in special classes	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
Percentage receiving special education services	0.2	80.2	19.6	0.0

DISTRICT 14 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	6.5	21.4	69.7	2.3
Percentage Referred	6.4	40.8	57.5	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	6.2	24.0	69.4	.4
Percentage in special classes	11.4	24.0	64.0	.4
Percentage receiving special education services	9.9	24.0	65.8	.4

DISTRICT 15 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	15.6	21.7	58.7	4.0
Percentage Referred	8.7	28.8	56.9	3.0
Percentage in resource rooms	13.0	28.2	56.6	2.3
Percentage in special classes	9.6	32.2	57.7	.5
Percentage receiving special education services	11.2	30.3	57.2	1.3

DISTRICT 16 JHS.

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.4	86.6	12.7	.2
Percentage Referred	4.5	90.9	3.3	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	0.0	93.3	6.7	0.0
Percentage in special classes	0.0	88.3	11.7	0.0
Percentage receiving special education services	0.0	89.8	10.2	0.0

DISTRICT 17 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.6	90.0	8.3	1.1
Percentage Referred	1.6	96.8	1.5	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	1.4	92.5	6.1	0.0
Percentage in special classes	.8	89.9	9.0	.3
Percentage receiving special education services	1.0	90.7	8.0	.2

DISTRICT 18 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	16.8	74.1	5.9	3.2
Percentage Referred	8.6	81.0	7.3	1.5
Percentage in resource rooms	14.7	75.6	7.5	2.3
Percentage in special classes	10.8	81.2	7.3	.8
Percentage receiving special education services	12.4	78.8	7.4	1.4

DISTRICT 19 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	3.6	51.1	41.1	4.1
Percentage Referred	3.4	48.3	42.8	1.2
Percentage in resource rooms	6.5	52.9	38.0	2.6
Percentage in special classes	2.6	56.8	39.6	1.1
Percentage receiving special education services	4.1	55.2	38.9	1.7

DISTRICT 20 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	35.4	17.8	30.8	16.0
Percentage Referred	35.7	29.3	37.8	3.9
Percentage in resource rooms	39.7	18.7	36.1	5.5
Percentage in special classes	33.8	25.1	36.3	4.8
Percentage receiving special education services	36.8	21.9	36.2	5.2

DISTRICT 21 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	48.0	19.6	18.9	13.5
Percentage Referred	36.6	31.7	26.6	2.5
Percentage in resource rooms	44.9	26.0	25.6	3.4
Percentage in special classes	28.7	42.8	25.7	2.7
Percentage receiving special education services	37.5	33.7	25.7	3.1

DISTRICT 22 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	43.1	41.0	8.4	7.5
Percentage Referred	32.8	55.2	10.4	3.5
Percentage in resource rooms	41.1	48.3	8.9	1.7
Percentage in special classes	25.5	62.4	11.1	1.1
Percentage receiving special education services	33.6	55.1	9.9	1.4

DISTRICT 23 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.5	85.4	13.9	.2
Percentage Referred	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	.5	84.9	14.6	0.0
Percentage in special classes	1.2	85.2	13.6	0.0
Percentage receiving special education services	.9	85.1	14.0	0.0

DISTRICT 24 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	24.0	5.9	50.3	19.8
Percentage Referred	14.2	12.7	59.2	9.8
Percentage in resource rooms	27.3	8.8	57.9	5.9
Percentage in special classes	28.6	10.2	56.3	4.9
Percentage receiving special education services	28.0	9.5	57.1	5.4

DISTRICT 25 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	35.4	12.2	20.5	31.9
Percentage Referred	32.9	19.7	38.2	8.0
Percentage in resource rooms	40.1	24.4	27.6	7.9
Percentage in special classes	35.3	23.9	31.4	9.5
Percentage receiving special education services	37.9	24.1	29.3	8.6

DISTRICT 26 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	44.3	15.2	10.5	30.0
Percentage Referred	52.5	22.2	11.6	13.2
Percentage in resource rooms	51.4	21.9	15.9	10.8
Percentage in special classes	41.2	29.8	24.9	4.1
Percentage receiving special education services	45.3	26.6	21.3	6.8

DISTRICT 27 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	19.0	45.3	25.7	10.1
Percentage Referred	19.4	57.4	19.6	2.9
Percentage in resource rooms	22.5	51.2	23.9	2.5
Percentage in special classes	11.4	59.7	26.7	2.2
Percentage receiving special education services	16.4	55.9	25.4	2.3

DISTRICT 28 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	20.2	40.6	20.9	18.3
Percentage Referred	12.6	55.2	19.5	8.7
Percentage in resource rooms	14.7	53.2	25.4	6.7
Percentage in special classes	11.0	62.0	23.8	3.2
Percentage receiving special education services	12.7	57.9	24.5	4.8

DISTRICT 29 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	4.3	78.8	10.4	6.5
Percentage Referred	0.0	86.0	6.9	4.2
Percentage in resource rooms	4.5	84.8	9.0	1.7
Percentage in special classes	2.0	86.9	9.4	1.7
Percentage receiving special education services	3.1	86.0	9.2	1.7

DISTRICT 30 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	23.0	16.3	45.6	15.1
Percentage Referred	18.1	22.9	47.6	6.7
Percentage in resource rooms	27.8	25.8	42.5	4.0
Percentage in special classes	18.2	32.1	45.2	4.5
Percentage receiving special education services	22.6	29.2	43.9	4.3

DISTRICT 31 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	68.4	14.8	10.6	6.3
Percentage Referred	60.3	22.9	14.6	1.3
Percentage in resource rooms	64.3	23.9	10.7	1.2
Percentage in special classes	54.3	28.8	15.0	1.9
Percentage receiving special education services	59.8	26.0	12.6	1.5

DISTRICT 32 JHS

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Census	.6	36.7	60.9	1.9
Percentage Referred	0.0	21.8	74.0	0.0
Percentage in resource rooms	2.5	28.6	68.8	0.0
Percentage in special classes	1.4	25.1	73.1	0.5
Percentage receiving special education services	1.8	26.4	71.4	0.3

Appendix C

CSE Data Collection Form

CSE Data Collection Form 051892

Enter EPC date in the appropriate space:

_____ Init. _____ Re-eval. _____ Triennial

Name of data collector: _____ Dist. ____
ID __ __ __ __ School: _____
Grade at referral: _____

REFERRAL FORM (TEACHER)

Source of referral: Teacher(1)
Parent(2)
Other school personnel(3)
Other(4)
Not indicated(5)

Gender of referring teacher: Male(1)
Female(2)

Is the Reason for Referral Form available in the child's file?

Yes(1) No(2)

Any prior referral? Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, date _____
If yes, was the child found to be handicapped? Yes(1) No(2)
If yes, did parent sign for placement? Yes(1) No(2)

Primary reason for referral:

Academic(1) Behavioral(2) Both(3) Other(4)_____

Secondary reason for referral:

Academic(1) Behavioral(2) Both(3) Other(4)_____
School level:

Elem. School(1) Interm. School(2) Junior High School(3)

Date of most recent initial referral: _____
Did child have any prior placement in special education?

Yes(1) No(2)

SCHOOL HISTORY

How ...oling? Mono_____ Biling_____ N/I_____
Did Yes(1) No(2)

Did ...n? Yes(1) No(2)

Numb NYC schools: _____
Indi ...ls the pupil attended prior to the school from which
he/s

_____

LAB S... NP metric:) Year _____ Score _____

LAB ... NP metric) Year _____ Score _____
Has ... ved bilingual education? Yes(1) No(2)

Has ... ved ESL services? Yes(1) No(2)

Was ...onolingual or bilingual class?

Bilingual(2) N/A (3)

If m... ...l been opted out from bilingual general education?
No(2) N/A(3)

Has ... ...ed academic instructional
serv... ...day by someone other than the teacher?

Yes(1) No(2)

...one...
PCEN/Chapter 1 (1)
ERR/At-Risk Resource Room (2)

Has ... ...ed counseling services
with Yes(1) No(2)

...one...
PASE/ERSS Counseling (1)
Guidance Counseling (2)

...counselor...
Monolingual(1) Bilingual(2)

Were ...transfers? Yes(1) No(2)

...y _____

Were ...ransfers from monolingual
to b... ...ion or vice versa? Yes(1) No(2)

...y?_____

Has ... ...d over? Yes(1) No(2)

Has any effort been made to retain pupil in general education prior to referral?

Yes(1) No(2) Not indicated(3)

If prior effort was made, please indicate what efforts were made (circle all appropriate choices)

Home contact	(1)	Contact with sch. adminstration	(5)
Change of teacher	(2)	Behavior management program	(6)
Change of materials	(3)	Peer tutoring	(7)
Use of aide	(4)	Other	(8)

If reason for referral was either Academic or Both, indicate which, if any, specific academic reasons were cited by the teacher in the written narrative describing the reason for the referral.

_____ general academic problems
_____ language problem
_____ reading problem
_____ writing problem
_____ arithmetic problem
_____ visual perception
_____ attention problem
_____ overactivity
_____ sensory problem

Indicate whether the following behaviors were checked from the Reason for Referral form

Cooperative and helpful to teachers or peers	Yes(1) No(2)
Persistence at tasks	Yes(1) No(2)
Distractibility, short attention span	Yes(1) No(2)
Physical abusiveness to peers or teacher	Yes(1) No(2)
Verbal abusiveness to peers or teacher	Yes(1) No(2)
Destructiveness to property	Yes(1) No(2)
Frequent crying	Yes(1) No(2)
Self-abusive behavior	Yes(1) No(2)
Self-deprecating behavior	Yes(1) No(2)
Little or no contact with peers	Yes(1) No(2)

Was pupil suspended during past two years? Yes(1) No(2)

Pupil's DRP reading score (in percentile) during year of the initial referral (use the score for the testing that was closest in time before the initial referral)

DRP _____

Teacher's estimate of reading level(Referral form) _____

Below provide the following scores for those pupils who are being selected during their triennial evaluation or during re-evaluation.

If appropriate indicate the following year's DRP score (using the same metric)

1989 _____

And the year after that 1990 _____

Pupil's MAT math percentile score during year of the referral (same as above) MAT score _____

Teacher's estimate of math level (from Referral form)_____

For pupils who are being sampled during the triennial evaluation:
Indicate the following year's MAT arithmetic score using the same metric)

1989 _____

And the year after that 1990 _____

Please indicate whether the pupil is demonstrating excellence (E); satisfactory performance (S); or poor performance (P) in each areas below:

_____ working independ.

_____ performing consistently

_____ abstract thinking

_____ completing assignments

_____ responding to questions

_____ remembering vocabulary

_____ follow oral dir.

_____ follow written. dir.

_____ draw. conclusions

_____ study skills

_____ attend to vis. pres.

_____ attend. oral pres.

_____ using refer. material

Please indicate if pupil is demonstrating excellence (E); satisfactory performance (S); or poor performance (P) in each area below:

READING

_____ ident. letters

_____ ident. shapes

_____ comprehend material

_____ keeping place on page

MATHEMATICS

_____ unders. set theory

_____ ident. shapes

_____ counting numerals

_____ computing number facts

_____ reading aloud

_____ reading silently

_____ phonics

_____ sequencing events

_____ choosing main ideas

_____ understanding concepts <>

_____ aligning numerals

_____ underst. spatial relations

_____ underst. time concepts

_____ using measurement

_____ solving verb. problems

_____remembering signs & symbols

Social interaction. Indicate pupil's response(s) to management approaches. Check all applicable areas.

A. Student works well:

_____ on one to one basis

_____ in small groups

_____ in large groups

_____ during teacher directed activity

_____ independently

_____ during play activity

_____ during quiet time

_____ in lunch room

Student interacts well with

_____ peers

_____ younger students

_____ adults

Student responds well to:

_____ praise

_____ punishment

_____ pos. reinforce.

_____ parent contact

Is pupil's general knowledge appropriate to his/her age peer group

Yes(1) No(2)

From the Reason for Referral Form (p. 5) check area if student has significant difficulty with:

_____ articulation (1)

_____ expressing him/her self orally (2)

_____ using age appropriate language (3)

_____ understanding what is said (4)

_____ speaking whole sentences (5)

SOCIAL HISTORY

Date of birth: _____

Place of birth: _____

Child lives with: Mother and father(1) mother only(2) father only(3) grandparent(s)(4) foster parent(s)(5) other(6)_____

Other siblings in special education:

None(0) One(1) Two(2) More than two(3) No information(4)

If appropriate, age at entry into mainland U.S.:

_____ years, _____ months _____ N/A

Did the child remain in the United States? Yes(1) No(2)

Pupil's Gender: Male(1) Female(2)

***This part to be completed for families whose native language is not English (taken from social history/update, cum record and/or home language survey)*

How many years has family been in the United States?_____

Where were parents born?

Mother_____ Father_____

In what language did mother receive most of her education?

_____

In what language did father receive most of his education?

_____

How many years of schooling did mother complete? _____

How many years of schooling did father complete?_____

What language is spoken most of the time at home? _____

In what language does the child usually speak to parents?_____

In what language does child usually speak to his sibling?_____

In what language does child usually speak to his/her friends?_____

Race/ethnicity:

White/_____(1)
Black/_____(2)
Hispanic/_____(3)
Asian/_____(4)
Other/_____(5)

IEP

Was the child found to be handicapped? Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, did parent sign for placement? Yes(1) No(2)

Pupil's special education classification (Circle one or more):

(1) Autistic (2) Emotionally Disturbed

(3) Learning disabled (4) Mentally Retarded

(5) Deaf (6) Hard of Hearing

(7) Speech-impaired (8) Visually impaired

(9) Orthopedically impaired (10) Other health-impaired

(11) Multiply handicapped

If pupil was declared ineligible for special education check here:

Nonhandicapped _____

Pupil's special education placement (if bilingual, indicate 1 or 2 in right-hand column:

		Monoling.	Bilingual
SIS I	(1)	_____	_____
SIS II	(2)	_____	_____
SIS III	(3)	_____	_____
MIS I	(4)	_____	_____
MIS II	(5)	_____	_____
MIS III	(6)	_____	_____
MIS IV	(7)	_____	_____
		MONOLING.	BILING.
MIS V	(8)	_____	_____

MIS VI (9) _____ _____

MIS VII (10) _____ _____

MS VIII (11) _____ _____

SIE I (12) _____ _____

SIE II (13) _____ _____

SIE III (14) _____ _____

SIE IV (15) _____ _____

SIE V (16) _____ _____

SIE VI (17) _____ _____

SIE VII (18) _____ _____

SIE VIII (19) _____ _____

SIE IX (20) _____ _____

SIE X (21) _____ _____

Home instruction(22) _____ _____

Private School (23) _____ _____

Alternate Placement? Yes(1) No(2)

Interim Placement: Yes(1) No(2)

Did the CSE recommend that the pupil should be mainstreamed <u>for academics</u>?

Yes(1) No(2) Can't tell(3) N/A(4)

Please indicate the first three academic goals (for reading) that were written for the pupil (note Initial).

<u>Long Term</u>

I _____

I _____

I _____ <u>Short Term</u>

I _____

I _____

I _____
I _____
I _____

Please indicate the first three academic goals (for math) that were written for the pupil (note Initial and Re-eval/Triennial).

Long Term

I _____

I _____

I _____
I _____

Short Term

I _____
I _____
I _____
I _____

Please indicate the first three academic goals (for reading) that were written for the pupil (note Re-eval/Triennial).

Long Term

RT _____
RT _____

RT _____

Short Term

RT _____
RT _____
RT _____
RT _____

Please indicate the first three academic goals (for math) that were written for the pupil (note Re-eval/Triennial).

I _____

I _____

I _____
I _____

I _____

Please indicate the first three (if appropriate) ESL goals that were written for the pupil.

Long Term

I _____

I _____

I _____

Short Term

I _____

I _____

I _____

Long Term

RT _____

RT _____

RT _____

Short Term

RT _____

RT _____

RT _____

Please indicate the first three language arts goals that were written for the pupil.

Long Term

I _____

I _____

I _____

Short Term

I _____

I _____
I _____

Long Term

RT _____
RT _____
RT _____
Short Term

RT _____

RT _____

RT _____

Please indicate the first three (if appropriate) social/emotional goals that were written for the pupil.

Long Term

I _____

I _____

I _____
Short Term

I _____

I _____
I _____

Long Term

RT _____
RT _____
RT _____
Short Term

RT _____

RT _____

RT _____
Please indicate the first three (if appropriate) Speech and Language Goals that were written for the pupil.

Long Term

I _____

I _____

I _____
Short Term

I _____

I _____
I _____

Long Term

RT _____
RT _____
RT _____
Short Term

RT _____

RT _____

RT _____

PSYCHOLOGICAL

Was a WISC-R given? Yes(1) No(2)

WISC III? Yes(1) No(2)

If either is yes, was it given in English or in Spanish?

English(1) Spanish(2)

If in Spanish, was the EWIN-P given?
Yes(1) No(2) N/I(3)

Was a WPPSI given? Yes No WPPSI-----> Orig. or Revised

If yes, in English(1) or in Spanish(2)

Was Stanford-Binet given? Yes No Form L-M _____ 4th ed. _____

If yes, in English(1) , or in Spanish(2)

Was a translator used to assist a monolingual examiner?

Yes(1) No(2)

Was a Rorschach and/or a TAT and/or a TEMAS administered?

Either one or both was administered Yes(1) No(2)

Were the Rorschach and/or the TAT scores reported? Yes(1) No(2)

Was the Rorschach and/or the TAT discussed in the narrative

Yes(1) No(2)

Is there any indication that the psychologist collected performance-based data

Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, specify the kind of performance-based data

_____

_____

Indicate the pupil's WISC-R/III scores as follows: initial triennial

Init. date _____ tri. date _____

Full-scale IQ	_____	_____
Verbal IQ	_____	_____
Performance IQ	_____	_____

Are the IQ scores above an estimate? Yes(1) No(2)

Subscale scores in scale score units:

	Init. scores Eng/Span/other	Trien. scores Eng/Span/other	Bi-Initial	Bi-Trien
Information	____	____	___/___/___	___/___/___
Similarities	____	____	___/___/___	___/___/___
Arithmetic	____	____	___/___/___	___/___/___
Vocabulary	____	____	___/___/___	___/___/___
Comprehension	____	____	___/___/___	___/___/___
(Digit span)	____	____	___/___/___	___/___/___

Pict. completion	_____	_____	___/___/___	___/___/___
Pict. arrangemt.	_____	_____	___/___/___	___/___/___
Block design	_____	_____	___/___/___	___/___/___
	Init.	Trien.	Eng/Span/other	Eng/Span/other
Object assembly	_____	_____	___/___/___	___/___/___
Coding	_____	_____	___/___/___	___/___/___
(Mazes)	_____	_____	___/___/____	___/___/___

Were subtest scores estimated? Yes(1) No(2)

EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

List the battery of tests (abbreviate name) administered by the educational evaluator, and to the right of each indicate the language in which it was administered (for initials and re-eval/triennials). Note line beginning with I is for initials and line beginning with R/T is for re-evals. or triennials. Language is recorded as E, S, or O, for Eng., Span. or Other. Also note that the first subtest, with six lines allotted, should be used for the Woodcock Johnson, when it is administered.

NOTE to data collectors: On individual educational tests administered by educational evaluator, try to obtain same reading and arithmetic tests for all pupils, if possible, e.g. all Key Math and all Gray Oral.

Test	Name of subtest	Score	Lang.
I _____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
I _____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

I _____ _____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

I _____ _____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

List name of other tests used by educational evaluator on initials

I _____

I _____

I _____

I _____

For Triennial and Re-evaluation Testing

Note: Remember to include initial test data for all Re-evals and Triennials (Use perentile scores whenever possible)
First RT testing line used for Woodcock Johnson.

Test	Name of Subtest	Score	Lang.
RT			
RT			
RT			
RT			

List names of other tests used by educational evaluator on triennial/reeval.

RT _____

RT _____

RT _____

RT _____

Were any informal procedures utilized to determine language proficiency?
Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, briefly describe the procedures or the purpose for which they were administered

_____

_____

_____

Was a translator used to assist a monolingual examiner?

Yes(1) No(2)

Was a bil. clinician a member of the assessment team?

Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, check which one(s):

School psychologist(1) ____ Social Worker(2) ____

Educational Evaluator(3) ____

Was a bilingual person a part of the EPC Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, check which one(s)

School psychologist(1) ____ Social Worker(2)____

Educational Evaluator(2) ____

Was a bilingual person a member of pupil's CSE review? Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, check which one(s)

School psychologist(1) ____ Social Worker(2) ____

Educational Evaluator(3) ____

Indicate which best describes the team conducting the evaluation.

SBST Contracted outside

		out	assessment
Psychologist	____	_____	_____
Educ. Evaluator	____	_____	_____
Soc. Worker	____	_____	_____
Psychiatric	____	_____	_____
Speech/lang.	____	_____	_____

Was the parent present at the decision-making conference (EPC)

	Yes(1)	No(2)
Initial	____	____
Review	____	____
Triennial	____	____

Was the teacher present at the decision-making conference (EPC)

	Yes(1)	No(2)
Initial	____	____
Review	____	____
Triennial	____	____

Was the parent present at the CSE review? Yes(1) No(2)

Initial	____	____
Review	____	____
Triennial	____	____

Was a translator present at the EPC? Yes(1) No(2)

Initial	____	____
Review	____	____
Triennial	____	____

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION/BEHAVIORAL ANECDOTALS

Was a classroom observation done? Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, was there any empirical behavior-measurement conducted

Yes(1) No(2)

In what setting? _____

By which team member? Psychol.(1) Educ. Eval.(2) Soc. Worker(3)

Was a teacher interview (or anecdotal) part of the observation procedure?
Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, indicate which reports and what type were available

Para.	Interview	Anecdotal	Yes	No
Teacher	Interview	Anecdotal	Yes	No
Agency	Interview	Anecdotal	Yes	No
Suspension	Interview	Anecdotal	Yes	No
Police/ Court	Interview	Anecdotal	Yes	No
Adminis. Principal, AP, Dean, etc.	Interview	Anecdotal	Yes	No
Attendance Report	Interview	Anecdotal	Yes	No

Is the student or family known to an outside agency? Yes(1) No(2)

Speech and Language Evaluation

Who recommended the S/L evaluation?

Parent(1)	_____	Teacher(2)	_____
SBST: Psychologist (3)	_____	Ed. Evaluator(4)	_____
Soc.Worker(5)	_____		
Other/specify(6)	_____		

Was the Speech and Language assessment done? Yes(1) No(2)

If available, why was it recommended?
Write in appropriate space:

Parent/SW: _____
Teacher: _____
Psychologist: _____
Ed. Evaluator: _____
Who provided the assessment (check)?

Sp C

Speech teacher serving student (1) _____ _____

Per session evaluator (2) _____ _____

Private contractor (3) _____ _____

Hospital/outside agency (4) _____ _____

Was the service recommended? Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, list group sizes and frequencies

Size Frequencies

_____ _____

If the S/L evaluation was done, were the results reported on the initial IEP or on an IEP update?

Initial(1) Update(2)

Diagnosis:
(CHECK AS MANY AS PROVIDED IN THE SUMMARY SECTION OF REPORT)

Articulation(1) _____ Language(2) _____

Voice(3) _____ Fluency (stutter)(4) _____

Hearing impairment(5) _____ None(6) _____

other_____(7)

If triennial, was the service changed or terminated?

Yes(1) No(2)

Was the service split (e.g., 1x-ind. & 2x-gp.)

Group size recommended _____

Tests administered in: English(1); Second Language_____ Both(3)

Is S/L service provided by an outside agency? Yes (1) No (2)

Names of tests administered:

Test	Scores Init.	Trien
Vocab.(expr.)		
(recp)		
Lang. (exp)		
(recep)		
Articulation		
Voice		(Informal)

Did S/L report a section on hearing? Yes(1) No(2)

Was a hearing screening conducted? Yes(1) No(2) Pass Fail

Was an audiological done? Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, did the child Pass(1) Fail(2)

Parent reports child's dominant language as: _____

Teacher reports child's dominant language as: _____ Evaluation revealed child's dominant language as: _____

What language does the child prefer? _____
What language did the evaluator determine to be the most appropriate for instruction? _____

MAINSTREAMING

If the pupil was recommended for mainstreaming, for which academic area(s) was the pupil recommended (check where appropriate)?

	Monoling.	Bilingual
Reading	_____	_____
Arithmetic	_____	_____
Science	_____	_____
Soc. studies	_____	_____

Was there an indication of the amount of time that the pupil should be mainstreamed?

Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, how many periods weekly were recommended? _____
Was there any indication that the pupil was recommended for decertification either at the triennial or prior to the triennial?

Yes(1) No(2)

If yes, by whom or when?

Teacher _____ Parent_____ Assessment team _____

EPC _____ Review_____

Was any related service recommended for the pupil?

Yes(1) No(2)
Was the recommendation for Monoling. _____ or Bilingual _____ service?

If yes, Type Frequency Group size

_____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

Was the child exempted from bilingual instructional services?

Yes (1) No(2)

When comparing the initial and triennial/reevals, which if any of the clinicians were the same for both sets of testings (check where appropriate? (Enter Same (S) or Different (D) on each line)

Psychologist _____

Educ. Evaluator _____

Social Worker _____

PSYCHIATRIC

Did the child receive a psychiatric evaluation? Yes (1) No (2)

If yes did child receive a formal diagnosis? Yes (1) No (2)

If yes what was it? _____

Was the Psychiatric evaluation conducted by:

Monoling. Biling. Translator

Board of Education _____ _____ _____

Outside public	_____	_____	_____
Outside private	_____	_____	_____

Appendix D

Teacher Interview Schedule

Questions for Teachers During Interviews (allow for follow-up if responses warrant)

1. What did the child do that lead you to refer him/her?
2. Describe the child's past and current academic and behavioral performance history.
3. What is your prognosis for the child's academic and behavioral progress were he to remain in your class without receiving additional support?
4. What do you see as the most appropriate placement and/or service for the child? Why?
5. How long have you through about referring him for outside support?
6. What interventions prior to the referral did you offer the child to progress in your class?
7. What educational support services are available in the school?)
8. For each program or service that the teacher knows, what is the service? For whom is it designed? What are the procedures for referring a youngster to each service? How does the support teacher operate the program/service? From past experience, if any, how has it helped children you had previously referred?
9. What role, if any, did parents play in the decision to refer?
10. What does sending a child to a particular service accomplish for a child?
11. What does it accomplish for the classroom as a whole?
12. When you refer a child for a special services how do you feel it affects your image within the school?
13. In what room is each of these services offered?
14. Is the school generally supportive or not supportive of referring children to: (1) special education; (2) Chapter 1; (3) other support programs.
15. Could you select a match in your class to the child just referred? In what ways is that child distinctive from the referred child?
16. If the child were ineligible to receive support services outside your classroom, what assistance would you require in your classroom to be able to retain him/her?

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

UD03203/

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:	An Analysis of Referrals, Placement, and Progress of Children with Disabilities Who Attend New York City Public Schools
Author(s):	Mark Alter, Ph.D. & Mark Alter, Ph.D.
Corporate Source:	New York University School of Education, Dept. of Teaching & Learning
Publication Date:	11-21-97 11-17-94

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

(An Evaluation written & Funded by the NYC Board of Education, Committee on Special Education)

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

[XX]

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

[ ]

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Mark Alter, Professor & Chair Dept. of Teaching & Learning
Organization/Address: The Department of Teaching & Learning School of Education, NYU 239 Greene Street, Suite 200 New York, NY 10003	Telephone: 212-998-5460 FAX: 212-995-4049 E-Mail Address: alter@is2.nyu.edu Date: 11-21-97

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Box 40, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com