

Disproportionate Representation of Minorities in Special Education –

How Bad?

A Presentation

for

The 3rd Annual Jane H. Leblanc Symposium in Communication Disorders

Arkansas State University

P.O. Box 910

State University, AR 72467-0910

June 4-5, 2009

by

Ruben Gentry, Ed.D.

Professor of Special Education

Jackson State University

Jackson, MS 39217

ruben.gentry@jsums.edu

(601) 979-1064

Disproportionate Representation of Minorities in Special Education – How Bad?

Abstract:

Appropriate special education is unquestionably beneficial for children with “real” disabilities. It offers them an individualized education plan to help develop their potential. But special education for children without specific disabilities, as more often the case of minorities, is unjustifiable. For the latter children, special education is inappropriate and carries stigmatizing labels that negatively affect their self-esteem and achievement in school and later life. This paper addresses the long-term, unresolved, and seemingly unmanageable issue in the education of children with disabilities – disproportionate representation of minorities in special education. Attention is focused on the facts, affects, and efforts of resolve for the condition. With results to date that seem unchanged; the merit of efforts not fully explored is discussed. One initiative for further exploration would be to make special education the enviable disciple that it is capable of becoming – regular education plus special education. With this, special education for persons with disabilities would be more than good (compared to regular education), it would be **bad!** (regular education plus special accommodating education). Finally, implications are made from the perspective, if special education were indeed special, how bad would overrepresentation of minorities be?

Introduction

When provided appropriately and in proper perspective, special education is beneficial for children with disabilities. There are many success stories of persons with disabilities (Alliance for Citizens with Disabilities, n.d.). But special education may be a disservice when it is the placement for students who do not need it. The statistics on

employment and socioeconomic status of persons labeled as having disabilities do not compare favorably with persons without disabilities (National Association of Workforce Boards, n.d.). This a major issue when addressing special education for minorities. It has been a concern since the beginning of modern special education. Attempts have been made to resolve the problem but they have not yielded desirable results.

The disproportionate representation of minorities in special education is well documented. Minority groups most often referred to in this context are African Americans, Latinos, American Natives, and Asians; in essence, all ethnic groups except Whites. Disproportionate representation means that the percentage of these groups in special education differs significantly from their percentage in the general school population. Generally, there is over representation of certain minority groups in high incidence special education categories such as mental retardation (now called intellectual disability), learning disabilities, and emotional disturbance. On the other hand, there is underrepresentation of certain minority groups in the area of gifted education.

Disproportionate representation has plagued the field of special education almost from its inception as a discipline. The question has even been raised - Special education for the mildly handicapped, is much of it justifiable? Remedies proposed to resolve the matter have included mainstreaming, least restrictive environment, and full inclusion in regular education. Educators in the field, administrators, governmental agencies, and parents are at a point of uncertainty and confusion on how to best accommodate the needs of children with disabilities. No education intervention or practice has produced convincing beneficial results over other methodologies or paradigms for educating these

children. It seems that so much time goes into discussing the best placement of children with disabilities at the expense of actually educating them.

What are the effects of disproportionate representation in special education? The major concerns are that special education has stigmatizing effects on the children that negatively affects their self-esteem or self-worth and that they do not learn as much academically in special education as in general education. However, students with disabilities have been found to be better socially adjusted in special education than in regular education.

The question becomes how could special education fail to be highly effective? Very early after its inception, the question was raised – What is special about special education? The usual response was that special education is regular education plus special education. If special education lived up to this promise, how bad would over representation of minorities in special education be for the respective groups? In fact, if special education were what it is purported to be, it would be the majority group complaining about the lack of more opportunity to enroll their “regular” children in special education.

This paper provides the facts on disproportionate representation of minorities in special education. It further examines the impact of disproportionate representation on the children with disabilities and the discipline. Finally, the issue is raised and expounded upon, is special education living up to its promise? If there is considerable room for improvement, then in what ways? Perhaps the solution to one of the biggest problems in special education is making it the enviable disciple that it is capable of becoming. When this happens, special education for the handicapped will be more than

good (compared to regular education), it will be **bad!** (regular education plus special accommodating education).

Disproportionate representation and its history

Disproportionality may be defined as the representation of a group in a category that exceeds expectations for that group, or differs substantially from the representation of others in that category. Groups may also be underrepresented in a category or setting such as in general education, gifted education, or visual impairment. The measurement of disproportionality can be quite complex. One may assess (a) the extent to which a group is over- or underrepresented in a category compared to its proportion in the broader population (composition index) or (b) the extent to which a group is found eligible for service at a rate differing from that of other groups (risk index and risk ratio). For example, African American students account for 33% of students identified as mentally retarded (now called intellectually disabled/ID), clearly discrepant from their 17% representation in the school-age population (Skiba & et al., 2008).

An alternative approach to describing disproportionality is to measure a group's representation in special education compared to other groups. For example, at the national level, 2.64% of all African American students enrolled in the public schools are identified as having intellectual disability. A ratio of the risk of the target group to one or more groups may be constructed, termed a risk ratio. A ratio of 1.0 indicates exact proportionality, whereas ratios above or below 1.0 indicate over and underrepresentation, respectively. Comparing African American risk for intellectual disability identification (2.64%) with the risk index of 1.18% of White students for that disability category yields a risk ratio of 2.24 (2.64/1.18), suggesting that African Americans are more than two

times more likely to be served in the category intellectual disability than White students (Skiba & et al., 2008).

African American students are typically found to be overrepresented in overall special education service and in the categories of intellectual disability and emotional disturbance, whereas American Indian/Alaska Native students have been overrepresented in the category of learning disabilities. Disproportionate representation is greater in the judgmental or “soft” disability categories of ID, ED, or LD than in the nonjudgmental or “hard” disability categories, such as hearing impairment, visual impairment, or orthopedic impairment. Rates of overrepresentation tend to increase as a minority group constitutes a relatively high percentage of their state’s population. Also, African American children were more likely than their peers with the same disability to be overrepresented in more restrictive settings, or underrepresented in the general education setting. This is likely due to factors other than severity of disability (Skiba & et al., 2008).

The disproportionate representation of minority students in special education is a critical and enduring problem that has been consistent over time. Possible causes of disproportionate special education representation are psychometric test bias, socio-demographic factors, unequal opportunity in general education (the most consistent findings in education research is that students achieve in direct proportion to their opportunity to learn), teacher ethnicity (as the percentage of African American teachers increased, overrepresentation of African American students in the emotionally disturbed category decreased); and special education eligibility and decision-making processes (teachers referred minority children more often than nonminority children and tended to

refer minority students for behavioral rather than academic issues). It was found that African American students are suspended at higher rates than other students and overrepresented in office referrals, corporal punishment, and school expulsion. Also, African American students received more severe punishments for less serious infractions or were referred to the office more frequently for more subjective reasons, such as disrespect or loitering. Another factor may be the concept of cultural mismatch. Education tends to reflect the knowledge, values, interests, and cultural orientations of White, middle-class cultural groups (Skiba & et al., 2008).

One of the first discussions documenting the issue of disproportionate representation of minorities in classes for students with mental retardation/intellectual disability was presented by Lloyd Dunn in 1968. Afterward there were court cases such as *Diana v. State Board of Education* (1970) that addressed this issue by mandating the types of tests given to students (non-verbal) as well as the manner that tests were administered (primary language). These proceedings began litigation concerning the overrepresentation of minorities in special education that continues to the present. The impact of disproportionate numbers of minority students on special education programs has influenced both federal legislation and Department of Education policies. Many of the problems cited by Dunn in 1968 still plague the field of special education today. Since the Office of Civil Rights targeted this issue as one of their initiatives beginning in 1993, many state departments of education and school districts have begun to examine special education program enrollments in an attempt to be proactive regarding the overidentification of minorities in programs for students with disabilities (Cahalane, 1996).

IDEA 1997 stressed the importance of efforts to prevent the intensification of problems connected with mislabeling and high dropout rates among minority children with disabilities. That effort was further amplified in the IDEA 2004, which specifies that states must monitor disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity in disability categories and special education placements and require the review of local policies, practices, and procedures when disproportionate representation is found. Local educational agencies determined to have significant disproportionality must devote the maximum amount of Part B funds allowable (15%) to early intervening programs. Significant disproportionality is not defined in IDEA 2004 or its implementing regulations, discretion is left to the states to develop the quantifiable indicators of disproportionality used for determining significance (Skiba & et al., 2008).

Professionals generally attribute overrepresentation to one of the followings: family and community issues, external pressures in schools (e.g., high stakes assessments, mandated curriculum), classroom instruction and classroom management, intrinsic characteristics of children themselves, and teacher perceptions and attitudes. Congress has called for greater efforts to ensure that minority children are classified accurately and appropriately placed. Problems associated with inappropriate classification and placement of minority include being denied access to the general education curriculum, being placed in separate programs with a more limited curriculum that may affect the students' access to postsecondary education and employment opportunities, and being stigmatized with a misclassification that may negatively affect the student's self-perception as well as the perceptions of others (Improving results, 2000).

The overrepresentation of Black and Hispanic children in special education classes is also a very sensitive subject in the debate over the achievement gap between White and minority children. Minority children are carrying around labels, like emotionally disturbed and intellectually disabled, that do not accurately describe them. They are being placed in special education because educators are misinterpreting behavior problems and misunderstanding cultural differences. The issue has forced some school districts to change the way they spend money on special education, pushed the state to increase monitoring of special education placement, and prompted administrators to train educators from districts where the numbers are particularly skewed on how to deal with racial and ethnic differences in the classroom. However, the problem still persists and in some situations is getting worse. In Connecticut, overall disproportion in the state grew worse from 1999 to 2004 (Salzman, 2005).

Strategies for reducing disproportionate representation need to include comprehensive and multifaceted assessment and intervention plans. Central to such an approach is a process that moves from data collection and examination, to interpretation, to culturally competent intervention and evaluation. Intervention and evaluation recommendations entail teacher preparation - teachers may simply lack the knowledge and skills to successfully interact with students different from themselves, improved behavior management - inadequate classroom management increases the risk for overreferral of minority students, prevention and early intervention, assessment, family and community involvement, and policy and system reform recommendations - there is a need to create culturally responsive educational systems (Skiba & et al., 2008). In

essence, disproportionality in special education may be impacted from a combination of forces both within and external to the educational system (Skiba & et al., 2008).

The need for much of special education was challenged

Lloyd M. Dunn was a champion in the field of education for children with challenges in learning. Reflecting on the humanity of those whose education he sought to improve, he said that if he had his way, the field would get rid of the term “special education.” There should be no dichotomy between general and special education. He thought that the problem was not knowing as much as needed about educating young people who are very different from the average. A hallmark of Dunn’s teaching and advising was his insistence that research results be put into practice. He was also influenced by the civil rights movement and concerns of educational equity. These perspectives led him to write a profoundly effective paper – “Special education for the mildly retarded – is much of it justifiable? (1968).

Both Dunn and Deno were outraged about the conditions of poverty. They were concerned that too many poor students were being placed in special education and felt that regular education must assume greater responsibility for “mildly handicapped” students. Both believed that by investing in research ways could be found to “fix” youth from disadvantaged backgrounds so that their capabilities would improve to the degree that they could be successful in the regular curriculum (Edgar & Polloway, 1994). Thus they advocated that special education serve a support role and become the research and development arm of education

When overrepresentation is bad; when underrepresentation is bad

Overrepresentation of minorities in special education is bad when it exists with most minority groups, when it occurs across the country, when it persists over time, and when the resolution is still elusive. It is bad when there is an overrepresentation of African-Americans in the initial referral stage (Cahalane, 1996). Overrepresentation of minorities in special education is bad when there is documented evidence of discriminatory testing procedures, when low-income African American and Hispanic students are frequently placed in lower level classes even with equal or higher test scores, when 45 out of 50 states have statistically significant overrepresentation of Black children in special education programs, and when many of these students are placed in programs with the intent to help them catch up with their peers and re-enter general education classrooms, but they actually receive inferior instruction and fall further behind students in regular classrooms (Dekker & et al., 2002).

Underrepresentation of minorities in special education is bad when it is apparent that minorities excel proportionately or overproportionately in numerous fields of study, corporate America, athletics, and other careers and professions across the board; but yet they remain underrepresented in programs for the gifted. Underrepresentation of minorities in gifted programs is especially bad when school systems willingly accept the existing status quo.

The jury's finding on special class vs. regular class placement

Special day classes (SDC) were once the norm in special education for the mildly handicapped. But the resulting disproportionate number of minority children in these classes opened them to critical scrutiny as pockets of segregation within schools. A

disproportionate number of students with educable retardation were Black, a fact that would precipitate litigation for the next 20 years (MacMillan & et al.).

Dunn objected to the universal placement of students with educable mental retardation into self-contained special classes. He outlined another service delivery model, the resource specialist teacher model, as potentially beneficial for a segment of the educable mentally retarded population. The concept – mainstreaming entailed integration of students with mild handicaps with their nonhandicapped peers for some portion of the school day. In subsequent years there would be pressure for the Regular Education Initiative and full inclusion—proposals that would shift responsibility for students with disabilities to regular education and would extend the range of children for whom integration was recommended (MacMillan & et al.).

Dunn listed a number of changes that had emerged in regular education that he believed would enable some or many students with EMR of the late 1960s to succeed in regular education. However, he failed in his prognostications to anticipate changes that would occur in regular education that would reduce the likelihood for success by the children targeted. He apparently anticipated that the borderline students would be afforded more equal educational opportunity by being served in regular programs unlabeled. On the other hand, a number of features of special day classes were sacrificed. For example, SDCs were characteristically associated with (a) low pupil-teacher ratios, (b) teachers with specialized training, (c) programs with vocational and social goals and sequences with experiences for achieving these goals, (d) expenditures on order of 1.75 to 2.5 times greater than costs per student in regular education, and (e) greater individualization of instruction and periodic reviews of student progress. In exchange,

these students were enrolled in regular programs with little or no ancillary services. Moreover, in the 1980s there was pressure to “return to basics” and to reinstitute “standards” viewed by many critics of public education as sorely lacking. One response to this press for excellence came in the form of proficiency assessments, known as minimum competency examinations. These changes would compromise the chances of the borderline students to receive a high school diploma. Associated with these developments were greater frustrations, failures, and increased dropout rates among the most “nonacademic” children with mild handicaps in the schools. The bright future for borderline students seen by Dunn in 1968 proved to be an illusion. Critics say that Dunn recommended a blueprint for change that lacked any empirical support and that an appropriate education for mentally retarded children has not yet been developed (MacMillan & et al.).

It appears safe to say that the jury on placement is still out. Some claim that what schools should do to meet the needs of all learners today is maintain high standards and expectations in the education of African-American students and not separating students for instruction (Williams, 2007). But others say, for example, inclusion for students who are socially and emotionally disturbed has usually been accompanied by diminished services. Parents, for the most part, had high hopes for the special class placement. For once, they were not bombarded with calls from school to come and get their unmanageable offspring (Morse, 1994).

The more things change, the more disproportionality remains the same (Why can't we just answer Dunn's question?)

Studies have found that test bias, lower teacher expectations, lack of communication with parents, ineffective teaching strategies, mandated teacher accountability, and lack of experience in multiculturalism all contribute to the overrepresentation of minorities in special education. While many efforts have been made to reduce the misplacement of minorities in special education, the trend of minority overrepresentation continues. The federal government officially recognized this problem and attempted to correct it with provisions made in the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 1997). Lawmakers were disappointed to find that more minority children continue to be served in special education than would be expected from the percentage of minority students in the general school population. IDEA has always required that all public agencies establish, maintain, and implement procedures to assure that the tests and other evaluation materials used for determination of eligibility for special education services are nondiscriminatory. In an attempt to reduce the magnitude of this problem, new state reporting requirements concerning minority enrollment were implemented beginning with the 1998-99 school year (Dekker & et al., 2002).

As noted above, things have changed in the conduct of special education but unfortunately, overrepresentation of minorities in the program remains. Therefore, Dunn's question – Is much of special education for the mildly handicapped justifiable? – still begs for an answer. Table 1 contains a proposed dichotomous answer to the question for educators who work with minority students. The massacre entries depict negatives

Table 1
Is much of special education justifiable?
The massacre/magic of “If,” “Then”

The massacre:

- If differ hues of skin color irritate your eyes and white has become your favorite color, much of special education is not justifiable;
- If energized students in the classroom make you uncomfortable and you insist that they sit quietly, much of special education is not justifiable;
- If the socioeconomic status of parents influence your willingness to work with their children, much of special education is not justifiable;
- If where children travel and vacate during the summer raises your eyebrow and playing in the streets devastates you, much of special education is not justifiable;
- If traditional husband-wife families capture your attention and single-parent families are a turn off, much of special education is not justifiable; or
- If the 3Rs are the boundaries of your acceptance/curriculum and there is not room for rap, saggy pants or braided hair, much of special education is not justifiable.

But, the magic:

- If you can truly embrace all children, barring none;
- If you can place the many appropriate instructional materials before students;
- If you can make your pedagogic strategies tailored to individuals’ learning styles;
- If you can fill each minute of teaching with 60 seconds worth of distance run;

And students are enabled to progress in the least restrictive environment –

- Then, for those who are determined eligible, much of special education would be justifiable.
-

that can actually make special education unjustifiable. They include personal prejudices; demands for unnecessary classroom/school decorum; a desire to work with children

based on their family status, experiences, and constitution and perceiving such factors as indices for learning; and affording a very restricted curriculum that has little appeal to diverse populations. The magic entries are positive attributes that may make special education as well as regular education justifiable. They include embracing all children, providing appropriate instructional materials, employing pedagogical strategies to match students' learning styles, and making full use of instructional time.

How minorities suffer from disproportionality?

Disproportionate representation of minority students in special education persists despite 30 years of debate, litigation, and initiatives. While the discussion goes on, each day and each year thousands of minority children are being provided an inappropriate education. The impact of the tragedy is not just that the children suffer marred self-esteem, it negatively affects them for the rest of their life and even places their offsprings at a disadvantage. A higher percentage of African American students were identified as having a learning disability in 10 out of 15 cities surveyed. Additionally, studies show that minority students are 2.3 times more likely to be identified with a mild mental/intellectual disability than a Caucasian student (Dekker & et al., 2002). America can do better than look the other way in meeting the education needs of its citizens

In 2003, special education and related services under IDEA, Part B were being provided to 6,046,051 students ages 6 through 21. This number represents 9.1 percent of the U.S. general population ages 6 through 21. The percentage served was largest for American Indian/Alaska Native students (13.8), followed by Black (12.4), White (8.7), Hispanic (8.2) and Asian/Pacific Islander (4.5). Secondary students with emotional

disturbance are more likely to be male, Black and to live in poverty than secondary students in the general student population (U.S. Department of Education, 2005).

If special education were special, how bad could it be?

Special education was once envisioned as an instructional entity with far-reaching possibilities. It meant a lower teacher-pupil ratio, individualized instruction, and highly trained teachers. It was offered through a continuum of services model and was thought to be what every child with disabilities needed. Special education was billed as a caring, individualized program. Adolescents would often say, in retrospect, “If it hadn’t been for that class and teacher I would have never made it” (Morse, 1994). How can special education be a negative influence unless miserably executed? When well executed, it seems that every pupil should have it so good.

But special education did not necessarily unfold as envisioned. It became viewed as a fatal disease rather than health producing. Special education took pride in its spawning categories and loss the academic achievement battle to regular education, with its push for excellence and higher graduation requirements. Special education started looking more at available funds than the needs of students. It was reported that one national leader of inclusion mentioned that special funds must be protected in the move toward full inclusion (Morse, 1994).

If there are advantages to a special class, large credit goes to the teacher. If there are advantages to the mainstream class, again much credit goes to the teacher and the elements of the work setting. Special teachers often report their greatest frustration is not the problem children but the problem system, which stymies what they could be doing. To succeed, many effective teachers are habitual rule breakers (Morse, 1994).

There are reports of included children who are in the classroom but are “out” of it. They are sitting in a regular education seat but lost in the process because there is not enough square inch of teacher to individualize—which is the birthright of special education. Now, some teachers have the Midas touch, but there are many who do not. A more justified special education rests on pending changes in regular education (Morse, 1994).

There is a need to shed the low expectations held by society for students with disabilities and dream of programs that will result in high levels of skills and values for them. There is a need to model Evelyn Deno and Lloyd Dunn and stay on the edge – pushing for equity and fairness and retaining their passion and energy, which is the true legacy of their work (Edgar & Polloway, 1994).

Strategies that may be attempted in the circle of influence for states, districts, and colleges and universities include: a statewide analysis of child count data to examine trends by demographic areas, placement, gender and ethnicity; the district could propose a plan to systematically work toward relieving the problem – include a goal oriented approach with timelines which target dates; higher education could infuse effective multicultural teaching practices into teacher education programs (Cahalane, 1996). In one study in Alaska, an intervention team approach slowed down probably three-fold the referrals to special education (Pilla, 1999).

Can special education live up to its promise?

Over the years, both the Office of Special Education Programs and the Office of Civil Rights have funded research investigating this issue. Researchers have moved from looking at the data to determine if a problem exists, to investigating what can be done to

reduce or eliminate it. Researchers are also studying ways to reduce the overrepresentation of students from minority backgrounds in special education. The program Skills Profiled through Arts, Reading, and Knowledge (SPARK) is a model preschool creative arts curriculum for teachers of young children with developmental delays or at risk of developing delays. Other studies are investigating literacy strengths and difficulties faced by language minority students with learning disabilities, developing demonstration models that provide a community-based program focused on serving children with emotional disturbance in a culturally competent manner, and establishing teacher training programs to prepare teachers to teach culturally and linguistically diverse populations. The 1997 IDEA Amendments emphasized the need to increase the number of teachers and related service personnel from culturally and linguistically diverse groups. (Improving results, 2000).

Other strategies to reduce the overrepresentation of minorities in special education may include (1) increasing family involvement through such methods as educating the family about the child's disability, providing the family with the supports needed, gaining parental trust and support, and becoming active participants in planning their child's education; (2) reducing the number of minorities referred for special education through staff development – becoming knowledgeable about underlying theories, approaches, and ideologies of the multicultural education process; (3) revising teacher education – too often minority students are given inferior instruction which is paired with low teacher expectations. Teachers need to build upon these children's experiences, prior knowledge, and strengths; and (4) implementing early childhood education for at-risk students such as the SPARK program (Dekker & et al., 2002).

This section is leading to the original question - Disproportionate representation of minorities in special education – How bad? The answer is presented in Table 2 in the form of an acrostic exhibit. The “HOW” depicts the traditional image of disproportionate representation of minorities in special education – Horrible, Ongoing, and Wasteful. The “BAD” presents a futuristic image for special education for minorities – Bold, Appropriate, and Dazzling. When special education is made BAD, students will become

Table 2
Disproportionate Representation of Minorities in Special Education – How Bad?
An Acrostic Exhibit

HOW BAD?

????? **Traditional image** ??????

- H – Horrible**, that educators and policy makers cannot make math and justice come together for minorities with disabilities
- O - Ongoing**, that more than 41 years of failed and inappropriate education have been offered to minorities
- W - Wasteful**, that children with potential are regulated to a compromised education and mediocre opportunities to succeed in life

!!!!!!! **Change courses** !!!!!!!

- B - Bold**, educators and policy makers must claim/reclaim victory in meeting the real needs of all children with disabilities
 - A - Appropriate**, teachers must truly meet individual needs – facilitate all types of intelligences (Gardner); capitalize on their interest in rap, hip-hop, country, western, rhythm and blues
 - D - Dazzling**, the classroom must come alive, have children doing the Mohamed Ali shuffle, rope-a-dope, floating like butterflies, and stinging like bees
-

successful in school, other students will be motivated by the achievements of children with disabilities, and many of today's challenges with disproportionate representation will self-correct, resulting in a giant leap in the education of all children.

Summary and Implications

The disproportionate representation of minorities in special education is well documented in the literature. Minority groups most often referred to in this context are African Americans, Latinos, American Natives and Asians. Disproportionate representation means that the percentage of these groups in special education differs significantly from their percentage in the general school population. There is overrepresentation of certain minority groups in high incidence special education categories such as intellectual disability, learning disabilities and emotional disturbance. On the other hand, there is underrepresentation of certain minority groups in the area of gifted education.

Disproportionate representation has plagued the field of special education almost from its inception. A common finding has been that many children with disabilities achieve better academically in the regular class, so their overrepresentation in special education denies many the opportunity to an appropriate education. Unfortunately, to date no strategy or educational intervention has significantly impacted the problem.

In addition to compromised academic achievement, another concern is that special education has a stigmatizing effect on the children and negatively affects their self-esteem. The question becomes why does special education fail in overall effectiveness? Very early after its inception, the issue was raised – What is special about special education? The accepted response was that special education is regular education

plus special education. If special education lived up to this promise, how bad would over representation of minorities in special education be for the respective groups? In fact, if special education were what it is purported to be, the majority group would perhaps seek more opportunity to enroll their children with learning challenges in special education.

This presentation provides the facts on disproportionate representation of minorities in special education. It further examines the impact of such representation on children with disabilities and the discipline. Finally, the issue is raised and explored, is special education living up to its promise? If there is considerable room for improvement, then in what ways? Perhaps the solution to one of the biggest problems in special education is making it the enviable discipline that it is capable of becoming. When this happens, special education for the handicapped will be more than good (compared to regular education), it will be **bad!** - regular education plus special accommodating education.

References

Alliance for Citizens with Disabilities & The Mayor's Alliance for Persons with Disabilities. (n.d.). *Famous persons with disabilities*. Tampa, FL. Retrieved May 17, 2009, from

http://www.tampagov.net/dept_mayor/mayors_alliance/famous_persons/

Cahalane, B.H. (March, 1996). *The disproportionate representation of minorities in rural special education programs and what can be done about it*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Council on Rural Special Education, Baltimore, MD. EDRS document Number ED408119.

Dunn, L.M. (1968). Special education for the mildly retarded—is much of it justifiable?

- Exceptional Children*, 35, 5-22.
- Dekker, L.M., Krou, C.A., Wright, T.D. & Smith, D.M. (April, 2002). *Effective strategies for reducing the overrepresentation of minorities in special education*. Paper presented at the Annual Classroom Action Research Conference, South Bend, IN. EDRS Reproduction No. ED464076.
- Edgar, E. & Polloway, E.A. (Winter, 1994). Education for adolescents with disabilities curriculum and placement issues. *Journal of Special Education*, 27(4), 438-52.
- Improving results for culturally and linguistically diverse students*. (2000). ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. Reston, VA. ERIC/OSERS) Special Project on Interagency Information Dissemination.
- MacMillan, D.L. & et al. (1994). The social context of Dunn: Then and now. *Journal of Special Education*, 27(4), 466-80.
- Morse, W.C. (1994). Comments from a biased viewpoint. *Journal of Special Education*, 27(4), 531-42.
- National Association of Workforce Boards. (n.d.). *Employment of persons with disabilities*. Retrieved May 17, 2009, from <http://www.nawb.org/PRODUCTSSERVICES/NAWBProjects/DisabilityInitiative/Learnin...>
- Pilla, T.V. (1999). *Alaska native and other minorities in the special education programs of four Alaskan school districts*. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, DC. EDRS Reproduction No. ED449957.
- Salzman, A. (November 20, 2005). *Special education and minorities*. Retrieved

November 18, 2008, from

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/20/nyregion/nyregionspecial2/20octspecial.html>

[?_r=1](#).

Skiba, R.J., Simmons, A.B., Ritter, S., Gibb, A.C., Rausch, M.K., Cuadrado, J., & Chung, C. (2008). Achieving equity in special education: History, status, and current challenges. *Exceptional Children*, 74(3), 264-288.

U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *27th Annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Vol. 1.

Williams, E. R. (Spring, 2007). Unnecessary and unjustified: African-American parental perceptions of special education. *Educational Forum*, 71(3), 250-261.