The Center for Learner Equity

FAST FACTS

CRDC 2021-2022 ANALYSIS

Access and Opportunities for Students with Disabilities

APRIL 2025

This brief summarizes data from the 2021–22 collection of the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC)—released in early 2025—for information on access and opportunities for students with disabilities.

IT MARKS THE SIXTH TIME CLE has analyzed data from the CRDC, the primary benchmark of America's ongoing work to build an education system that serves all students. As our public school systems continue recovery from an unprecedented period of interrupted learning due to the pandemic, these data provide an important snapshot of the persistent challenges to access and opportunity for students with disabilities that must be addressed in the coming years.[1]

About the Civil Rights Data Collection

In 1968, four years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act, the US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare collected the first version of what would become the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC). Throughout the following 56 years, the CRDC has expanded to include all the nation's public schools and dramatically evolved its technical sophistication and relevance to policymakers and practitioners alike.

The CRDC first disaggregated data on students with disabilities in 1973, predating the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). IDEA and the CRDC have always worked together, the CRDC supplementing data collected under IDEA with context on the broader work of building an equitable education system for students with disabilities of all races, genders, and life experiences. Continued data collection helps researchers, educators, and policymakers determine if students with disabilities are being served and, ultimately, informs better decision-making by families.

The unique challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic have led to a new first for the CRDC: data collected in two consecutive years, providing an important resource for understanding how schools are bouncing back from the challenges brought by school closures. Changes in how the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) cleans and validates data in the CRDC have led to changes in our methodology, described in greater detail in Appendix B.

[1] Center on Reinventing Public Education. (2024). *The state of the American student: Fall 2024.* https://crpe.org/the-state-of-the-american-student-2024/

Executive Summary

CRDC data paint a complex picture of how students with disabilities are treated in both traditional public schools and charter schools. While traditional public schools continue to enroll a greater overall percentage of students with disabilities, charter schools are making progress more quickly on important issues like reducing unfair disciplinary practices and increasing access to college and career preparation programs. Still, the data also show the significant work both sectors must continue to do to ensure U.S. public education fulfills its promise of building equal opportunities for all students. In addition to student achievement, access and opportunity are essential tentpoles of an education system that works for all students, and the CRDC remains the best form of public accountability on those critical goals.

Key Findings

During the 2021–22 school year:

- **About one in seven American public school students (13.9%) were identified as having a disability** under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), similar to 2020–21, including 14.1% of students in traditional public schools and 11.8% of students in charter schools.
- **The proportion of students with disabilities who were multilingual learners continued to grow** in 2021–22, representing 13.2% of students with disabilities in traditional public schools and 14.9% of students with disabilities in charter schools.
- Rates of inequitable disciplinary practices directed at students with disabilities largely returned to pre-pandemic levels. **Students with disabilities were twice as likely to be suspended or arrested as their non-disabled peers, and experienced dramatically higher rates of restraint and seclusion.**
- **High school students with disabilities had two to six times less access to programs supporting college preparation** across both traditional public and charter schools in 2021–22, including Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual enrollment classes. Gaps between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers are down slightly compared to 2020–21 levels.

Selected Recommendations

- **For educators:** Focus on practices that increase access for all students with disabilities and clarify identification and assessment practices.
- **For school leaders:** Actively increase access for students with disabilities, address inequitable student disciplinary policies, and critically evaluate policies that restrict access to high level coursework.
- **For charter school authorizers:** Continually review enrollment, discipline, and school climate data on students with disabilities as routine parts of oversight and encourage innovative practices to increase student access.
- **For state policymakers:** Invest in programs that increase access and reduce inequitable disciplinary outcomes like evidence-based behavioral interventions, technical assistance on college preparatory coursework, and weighted charter school lotteries for students with disabilities.

To Congressional leadership and the current leadership of the U.S. Department of Education: CRDC is a source of reliable and essential information without peer in the United States. Educators, education leaders, and the general public cannot benefit from these data without the federal government's investment of staff and resources to ensure data collection takes place, schools receive technical assistance supporting their responses, and that data are cleaned, high-quality, and transparently shared with the public. We urge Congress, the Department, and states to protect this investment and keep deploying the resources needed for its administration.

Enrollment

Ensuring equitable educational experiences for students with disabilities starts with ensuring they have the same opportunities and choices as their non-disabled peers. While data like the CRDC cannot necessarily show whether families of students with disabilities have meaningful public school choices, it can highlight potential concerns about whether and under what circumstances students with disabilities can access public school choice via charter schools.

As we have found in years past, traditional public schools continue to serve a greater proportion of students with disabilities than charter schools. However, national averages hide a more complex story. Substantial differences between states suggest that state policies, charter school authorizer practices, and schools themselves all play important roles in ensuring that charter schools are expected and prepared to educate all students and that families of students with disabilities are afforded the information and access they need to ensure their children can succeed in all kinds of schools. These data suggest the need to understand better the impact of state and local policies and practices on the availability of school choice for students with disabilities.

Key Findings

- About one in seven American public school students (13.9%) was identified as having a disability under the **Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).**
  - In traditional public schools, 14.1% of students were served under IDEA, unchanged since 2020–21.
  - In charter schools, 11.7% of students were served under IDEA, up 0.2% since 2020–21.
- Students with disabilities can also receive accommodations under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 in addition to or instead of IDEA. In 2021–22, 3.9% of students were eligible under **Section 504.**
  - In traditional public schools, 4.0% of students were eligible under Section 504, a 0.7% increase since 2020–21.
  - In charter schools, 3.6% of students were eligible under Section 504, a 0.6% increase since 2020–21.
- The CRDC's increase in the number of students with disabilities was significantly smaller than those reported in other sources, such as those reported under Section 618 of IDEA.[2] This may be due to the delay in releasing CRDC data or unusual rates of missing data in this year's CRDC. See Appendix B for more information.
- For the 43 states with charter schools, variations in enrollment rates of students with disabilities between traditional public schools and charter schools continued to be substantial. In 29 states, a higher percentage of students in traditional public schools were identified as students with disabilities compared with charter schools (from 1.37% to 8.93% difference). In five states, a higher percentage of students in charter schools were identified as students with disabilities compared with traditional public schools (from 0.66% to 2.66% difference). In nine states, enrollment was relatively similar (within 1%) between traditional public and charter schools.

[2] Cortiella, C. (2025, January 27). *Number of School Age IDEA-eligible Students Increases 3 Percent in 2023.* Our Kids Count. https://www.advocacyinstitute.org/blog/?p=1366

Table 1. Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by School Sector

State	% SWD - TPS	SWD Count - TPS	% SWD - Charter	SWD Count - Charter	Difference in SWD Proportion (TPS - Charter)
Alabama	15.63%	111,930	6.69%	167	8.93%
Alaska	14.03%	16,761	10.60%	812	3.43%
Arizona	12.53%	110,862	9.67%	21,689	2.86%
Arkansas	13.32%	58,936	11.02%	4,529	2.30%
California	12.56%	647,658	11.64%	76,440	0.92%
Colorado	12.43%	89,578	7.96%	10,378	4.47%
Connecticut	15.65%	75,224	10.59%	1,101	5.06%
Delaware	16.46%	19,952	9.86%	1,696	6.60%
District of Columbia	15.10%	7,322	17.67%	6,093	-2.57%
Florida	14.82%	357,481	9.83%	35,379	4.99%
Georgia	12.79%	207,574	10.87%	8,630	1.93%
Hawaii	11.33%	18,158	9.82%	1,025	1.51%
Idaho	11.16%	31,225	9.79%	2,561	1.37%
Illinois	14.26%	244,150	14.95%	9,289	-0.68%
Indiana	15.64%	150,514	15.47%	7,288	0.17%
Iowa	12.92%	62,621	11.63%	10	1.29%
Kansas	15.41%	70,877	13.01%	383	2.41%
Kentucky	15.55%	100,356	NA	NA	NA
Louisiana	12.61%	71,372	12.17%	10,184	0.44%
Maine	19.47%	31,541	20.85%	516	-1.38%
Maryland	11.66%	99,169	11.30%	2,718	0.37%
Massachusetts	17.86%	149,222	17.24%	8,699	0.61%
Michigan	13.85%	170,813	10.07%	15,199	3.77%
Minnesota	16.02%	125,896	15.49%	9,716	0.53%
Mississippi	13.00%	55,258	8.54%	252	4.46%
Missouri	13.46%	113,490	9.67%	2,409	3.79%
Montana	13.67%	19,890	NA	NA	NA
Nebraska	15.38%	48,631	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	12.16%	50,054	9.21%	5,917	2.96%
New Hampshire	17.46%	28,154	10.93%	528	6.54%
New Jersey	16.25%	202,761	10.19%	5,794	6.07%
New Mexico	16.59%	45,538	14.67%	3,982	1.92%
New York	18.75%	431,201	16.34%	27,429	2.41%
North Carolina	12.04%	165,073	10.04%	13,220	1.99%
North Dakota	13.57%	15,450	NA	NA	NA

Continues on the next page

State	% SWD - TPS	SWD Count - TPS	% SWD - Charter	SWD Count - Charter	Difference in SWD Proportion (TPS - Charter)
Ohio	15.11%	234,237	15.77%	17,849	-0.66%
Oklahoma	16.91%	103,597	14.20%	8,071	2.70%
Oregon	14.16%	71,558	11.50%	5,126	2.66%
Pennsylvania	17.90%	272,076	20.56%	33,402	-2.66%
Rhode Island	15.19%	18,807	12.18%	1,357	3.01%
South Carolina	13.48%	95,437	11.19%	5,461	2.29%
South Dakota	14.95%	20,698	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	12.59%	115,476	9.38%	3,960	3.20%
Texas	11.88%	570,963	8.74%	36,895	3.15%
Utah	12.14%	73,409	13.56%	10,473	-1.42%
Vermont	17.58%	13,286	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	13.29%	164,443	15.22%	194	-1.92%
Washington	13.11%	139,456	12.25%	494	0.86%
West Virginia	17.65%	44,376	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	14.64%	109,246	12.33%	5,746	2.31%
Wyoming	15.04%	13,894	12.44%	80	2.60%

Enrollment Characteristics

Students with disabilities are not a monolith: in addition to the wide variety of learning disabilities, speech and language impairments, and other differences contained in that broad label, each student also brings with them a unique set of life experiences informed by their race, ethnicity, gender, and other forms of identity. Achieving equity is a balance between ensuring that identification and service provision practices focused on students with disabilities do not discriminate against any group of students and ensuring that those practices do not over-represent any particular group and indirectly contribute to further segregation.

Understanding the characteristics of students with disabilities enrolling in particular schools is an important first step in a broader conversation about ensuring equity for all students, regardless of their background.

Key Findings

- Enrollment of students with disabilities by **race** (Table 2) and **gender** (Table 3) did not change significantly since 2020–21.
  - Black students comprised 27.3% of students with disabilities in charter schools and 16.6% of students with disabilities in traditional public schools. Differences in enrollment rates are comparable to the representation of Black students in charter schools overall.
  - Latine students comprised 33.7% of students with disabilities in charter schools and 27.5% of students with disabilities in traditional public schools. Differences in enrollment rates are comparable to the representation of Latine students in charter schools overall.
  - As has been true historically, boys were identified for special education services at a far higher rate than girls. Boys comprised 63.6% of students with disabilities in charter schools and 65.4% of students with disabilities in traditional public schools. New for this CRDC, a small portion of schools reported data on non-binary students.
- Enrollment of students with disabilities who are "dual identified" as **multilingual learners** (Table 4) steadily increased, in line with broader increases in the number of multilingual learners across the country. We use the term "multilingual learners" to refer to the student group identified in the CRDC as "students with limited English proficiency."
  - Overall, 13.3% of students with disabilities were identified as multilingual learners (an increase of 1.5%), and 12.0% of students overall were identified as multilingual learners (an increase of 1.4%).
  - In charter schools, 14.9% of students with disabilities were identified as multilingual learners (an increase of 1.7%), and 13.3% of all students were identified as multilingual learners (an increase of 1.8%).
  - In traditional public schools, 13.2% of students with disabilities were identified as multilingual learners (an increase of 1.5%,) and 11.9% of all students were identified as multilingual learners (an increase of 1.4%).

Table 2. Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Race by School Sector

			White	Black	Latine
Traditional Public Schools	2021	Overall	46.70%	14.10%	27.70%
		IDEA	46.80%	16.60%	27.50%
	2020	Overall	47.30%	14.30%	27.40%
		IDEA	47.40%	16.80%	27.10%
Charter Schools	2021	Overall	29.50%	24.40%	35.90%
		IDEA	30.80%	27.30%	33.70%
	2020	Overall	30.60%	24.70%	34.90%
		IDEA	33.50%	27.60%	33.00%

Table 3. Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Gender by School Sector

			Male	Female	Non-binary
Traditional Public Schools	2021	Overall	51.40%	48.60%	0.02%
		IDEA	65.40%	34.60%	0.01%
	2020	Overall	51.50%	48.50%	n/a
		IDEA	65.90%	34.10%	n/a
Charter Schools	2021	Overall	49.80%	50.10%	0.03%
		IDEA	63.60%	36.40%	0.03%
	2020	Overall	49.70%	50.30%	n/a
		IDEA	63.80%	36.20%	n/a

Table 4. Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Multilingual Learner Status by School Sector

		SWDs who are MLLs	All MLLs	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	13.20%	11.90%	1.30%
	2020	11.70%	10.50%	1.20%
Charter Schools	2021	14.90%	13.30%	1.60%
	2020	13.20%	11.50%	1.70%
Overall	2021	13.30%	12.00%	1.30%
	2020	11.80%	10.60%	1.20%

Climate and Discipline

Historically, students with disabilities have experienced disciplinary actions like suspensions, mechanical and physical restraints, referrals to law enforcement, and seclusion at more than two times the rate of their non-disabled peers.[3] This unacceptable reality presents a major barrier to ensuring students with disabilities are learning and thriving at school.

Our briefs on the 2020–21 CRDC, presented last year, showed major reductions in the use of these practices across all student populations, likely because of pandemic-related school closures.

Unfortunately, as CLE anticipated, those declines have not been sustained. While progress was made relative to 2018 rates (i.e., the last pre-pandemic dataset), rates of suspension, restraint, arrest, referrals, and seclusion largely returned to pre-pandemic levels in 2021–22. Most troublingly, the stubbornly higher instances of these practices on students with disabilities compared to their non-disabled peers continue to threaten access and opportunities for a large group of American students.

Key Findings

- ✔ In general, rates of disproportionate application of disciplinary practices against students with disabilities are down slightly since 2017-18 but up significantly over pandemic-affected levels in 2020–21.
- ✔ In **suspensions,** students with disabilities across school sectors were suspended at twice the rate of students without disabilities in 2021–22.
  - 7.5% of students with disabilities in traditional public schools experienced one or more in-school suspensions (Table 5), compared to 4.2% of students without disabilities in the same school sector. Meanwhile, 3.0% of students with disabilities in charter schools experienced one or more in-school suspensions, compared to 1.7% of students without disabilities in the same sector.
  - 9.3% of students with disabilities in traditional public schools experienced one or more out-of-school suspensions (Table 6), compared to 4.4% of students without disabilities in the same school sector. Meanwhile, 7.3% of students with disabilities in charter schools experienced one or more out-of-school suspensions, compared to 3.8% of students without disabilities in the same sector.
  - State-level data on suspensions in both traditional public schools and charter schools is presented in Appendix A.
- ✔ While rates of **referrals to law enforcement** (Table 7) and **arrests** (Table 8) shrank in 2021–22 relative to 2017-18, they dramatically increased over 2020–21 levels and remain much higher in traditional public schools than in charter schools.
  - In traditional public schools, 0.88% of students with disabilities were referred to law enforcement, more than twice the rate of students without disabilities (0.39%) in the same sector. In charter schools, 0.20% of students with disabilities were referred to law enforcement, more than twice the rate of students without disabilities (0.08%) in the same sector.
  - In traditional public schools, 0.14% of students with disabilities were arrested, twice the rate of students without disabilities (0.07%) in the same sector. In charter schools, 0.02% of students with disabilities were referred to law enforcement, more than twice the rate of students without disabilities (0.01%) in the same sector. Across both sectors, these numbers represent 8,961 students with disabilities and 25,803 students without disabilities in the included schools alone.

[3] Losen, D. J., & Martinez, P. (2020). *Lost opportunities: How disparate school discipline continues to drive differences in the opportunity to learn.* Palo Alto, CA/Los Angeles, CA: Learning Policy Institute; Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project, UCLA

- Students with disabilities were twice as likely to experience use of **mechanical restraints** (Table 9), twenty times more likely to experience use of **physical restraints** (Table 10), and fifteen times more likely to experience **seclusion** (Table 11) as students without disabilities. While relative rates of these practices appear small, they represent educational exclusion for thousands of students.
  - In traditional public schools, 0.04% of students with disabilities were subjected to mechanical restraints, more than twice the rate of students without disabilities (0.02%) in the same sector. In charter schools, less than 0.01% of students in both groups were subjected to mechanical restraints.
  - In traditional public schools, 0.81% of students with disabilities were subjected to physical restraints, compared to 0.04% of students without disabilities in the same sector. In charter schools, 0.31% of students with disabilities were subjected to physical restraints, compared to 0.34% of students without disabilities in the same sector.
  - In traditional public schools, 0.31% of students with disabilities were subjected to seclusion, compared to 0.02% of students without disabilities in the same sector. In charter schools, 0.08% of students with disabilities were subjected to seclusion, compared to 0.01% of students without disabilities in the same sector.
- Advocacy to abolish **corporal punishment** (Table 12) in schools and resulting bans by districts and states continue to significantly reduce the use of this practice for both students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.
  - In traditional public schools, 0.15% of students with disabilities were subjected to corporal punishment, a third of the rates in the 2017-18 CRDC. In charter schools, 0.03% of students with disabilities were subjected to corporal punishment, a quarter of the rates in the 2017-18 CRDC.

Table 5. In-School Suspensions of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	7.50%	4.20%	3.30%
	2020	2.90%	1.50%	1.40%
	2018	8.30%	4.70%	3.60%
Charter Schools	2021	3.00%	1.70%	1.30%
	2020	0.70%	0.40%	0.30%
	2018	4.40%	2.50%	1.90%

Table 6. Out-of-School Suspensions of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	9.30%	4.30%	5.00%
	2020	2.90%	1.10%	1.80%
	2018	9.30%	4.10%	5.20%
Charter Schools	2021	7.30%	3.80%	3.50%
	2020	1.40%	0.70%	0.70%
	2018	9.90%	4.80%	5.10%

Table 7. Referrals to Law Enforcement of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	0.88%	0.39%	0.49%
	2020	0.28%	0.05%	0.23%
	2018	0.93%	0.38%	0.55%
Charter Schools	2021	0.20%	0.08%	0.12%
	2020	0.05%	0.02%	0.03%
	2018	0.31%	0.11%	0.20%

Table 8. Arrests of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	0.14%	0.07%	0.07%
	2020	0.04%	0.02%	0.02%
	2018	0.22%	0.09%	0.13%
Charter Schools	2021	0.02%	0.01%	0.01%
	2020	<0.01%	<0.01%	0.00%
	2018	0.05%	0.02%	0.03%

Table 9. Mechanical Restraint of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	0.04%	0.02%	0.02%
	2020	0.01%	<0.01%	0.01%
	2018	0.02%	0.01%	0.01%
Charter Schools	2021	<0.01%	<0.01%	0.00%
	2020	<0.01%	<0.01%	0.00%
	2018	0.01%	<0.01%	0.01%

Table 10. Physical Restraint of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	0.81%	0.04%	0.77%
	2020	0.44%	0.02%	0.42%
	2018	0.86%	0.03%	0.83%
Charter Schools	2021	0.32%	0.03%	0.29%
	2020	0.14%	0.01%	0.13%
	2018	0.48%	0.04%	0.44%

Table 11. Seclusion of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	0.31%	0.02%	0.29%
	2020	0.18%	0.01%	0.17%
	2018	0.32%	0.01%	0.31%
Charter Schools	2021	0.08%	0.01%	0.07%
	2020	0.05%	<0.01%	0.05%
	2018	0.17%	0.01%	0.16%

Table 12. Corporal Punishment of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	0.15%	0.13%	0.02%
	2020	0.11%	0.02%	0.09%
	2018	0.45%	0.31%	0.14%
Charter Schools	2021	0.03%	0.02%	0.01%
	2020	<0.01%	<0.01%	0.00%
	2018	0.12%	0.08%	0.04%

Preparation for College and Career

As the global economy continues to evolve, access to opportunities after high school—whether through college, trade school, or the job market—depends on the resources available to students while they still attend high school. While the CRDC does not provide data on student achievement, its data on student participation in college-level coursework indicates their relative access to grade-level content throughout their educational journeys and predicts their ability to achieve their goals in adult life as professionals, learners, and citizens.

In 2021–22, both traditional public schools and charter schools were making meaningful progress in increasing enrollment in college-level coursework for students with disabilities, shrinking the gap in access with their non-disabled peers. Still, given the low absolute numbers of students with disabilities participating in these programs, both school sectors have a long way to go before access to college and career preparation programs can be considered available to all.

Key Findings

- ✔ While gaps are closing, students with disabilities continued to experience significantly less enrollment than their non-disabled peers in the three primary programs high schools use to provide college-level coursework: **Advanced Placement** (AP; Table 13), **International Baccalaureate** (IB; Table 14), and **dual enrollment** programs (Table 15).
  - In traditional public schools using these programs, students not identified under the IDEA were more than six times more likely to enroll in AP courses, twice as likely to enroll in IB courses, and more than twice as likely to enroll in dual enrollment courses.
  - In charter schools using these programs, students not identified for services under IDEA were more than twice as likely to enroll in AP courses, twice as likely to enroll in IB courses, and more likely to enroll in dual enrollment courses.
  - Gaps in all three programs were smaller in charter schools than in traditional public schools.
- ✔ Students with disabilities had less overall participation in **SAT and ACT** college admissions assessments (Table 16), although the gap was significantly smaller in charter schools than in traditional public schools.
  - In traditional public schools, 11.6% of high school students with disabilities took either or both of the SAT and the ACT, compared to 20.2% of their non-disabled peers. The difference was 8.6%.
  - In charter schools, 11.1% of high school students with disabilities took either or both the SAT and the ACT, compared to 15.9% of their non-disabled peers. The difference was 4.8%.
  - In 2021–22, participation by all students remained below 2018 levels, likely due to an ongoing public debate about using those assessments in college admissions.

Table 13. Participation in Advanced Placement Courses of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	2.80%	18.20%	-15.40%
	2020	2.80%	20.90%	-18.10%
Charter Schools	2021	5.40%	14.10%	-8.70%
	2020	4.40%	14.80%	-10.40%

Table 14. Participation in International Baccalaureate Courses of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	0.50%	1.00%	-0.50%
	2020	0.30%	1.20%	-0.90%
Charter Schools	2021	0.50%	1.00%	-0.50%
	2020	0.50%	1.00%	-0.50%

Table 15. Participation in Dual Enrollment Courses of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	4.10%	11.40%	-7.30%
	2020	3.40%	11.50%	-8.10%
Charter Schools	2021	2.60%	7.60%	-5%
	2020	2.60%	7.80%	-5.20%

Table 16. Participation in SAT/ACT Tests of Students with and without Disabilities by School Sector

		IDEA	Non-IDEA	Difference
Traditional Public Schools	2021	11.60%	20.20%	-8.60%
	2020	9.60%	19.20%	-9.60%
	2018	12.00%	24.80%	-12.80%
Charter Schools	2021	11.10%	15.90%	-4.80%
	2020	8.90%	13.20%	-4.30%
	2018	11.70%	17.30%	-5.60%

Conclusions and Recommendations

Data from the 2021–22 CRDC data, released in early 2025, describe an education system that had, in some ways, "returned to normal" in both positive and negative ways. While data from the previous CRDC showed some unusual departures from trends in enrollment, school climate, and access to college preparation, 2021–22 data returned to many of the long-term trends observed for at least a decade. These trends are an important reminder that building learning environments where all children can thrive is an ongoing journey requiring leadership and support across all levels of the education ecosystem, from individual educators to members of Congress. Persistent challenges with access and opportunities for students with disabilities demand our collective attention.

To act on this important data source, our recommendations include:

✔ **For educators:**

- Build knowledge of the unique assets and instructional needs of students with disabilities "dualidentified" as multilingual learners.
- Use evidence-based assessment tools to ensure a student's English language proficiency is not misunderstood as a disability.
- Increase access to college preparatory coursework for students with disabilities by ensuring all students have access to grade-level standards and materials across their educational careers and examine potential gatekeeping that may be limiting access to college preparation pathways.

✔ **For school leaders:**

- Monitor and act on enrollment rates of students with disabilities at the school and program level. To increase access for students with disabilities, examine recruitment practices at the school and program level, train staff on how to interact with families curious about school programming, and improve the scope and quality of existing specialized services and instruction.
- Eliminate policies promoting restraint and seclusion as a response to student distress. Address the root causes of inequitable disciplinary practices through policy changes (i.e., prohibit removals for discretionary misconduct like "wilful disobedience") and improve the fidelity of alternative practices, like positive behavioral interventions and supports and restorative justice. Prohibit corporal punishment as a tool in school policy and eliminate its practice among school staff if it is still legal in your state.
- Ensure students with disabilities have equitable access to advanced coursework by critically evaluating the processes that allow students access to college-level coursework and actively promoting advanced coursework for all students.

✔ For charter school authorizers:

- Monitor differences in enrollment of students with disabilities between charter schools in your portfolio and encourage voluntary measures to increase enrollment of students with disabilities, like weighted lotteries. Invest in staff capacity, prioritize the needs of students with disabilities during initial authorization, and hold schools to high standards for meeting the needs of students with disabilities.[4]
- Prioritize charter discipline and school climate data as an important, routine component of your oversight. Monitor for significant increases in overall removal rates and disproportionate removal rates of specific student subgroups, especially students with disabilities.
- Promote innovative opportunities to increase the availability of college preparatory coursework and partnerships in your charter portfolio on par with traditional districts in your region, such as building cross-school dual enrollment or advanced coursework programs.

✔ For state policymakers:

- Incorporate data regarding enrollment of students with disabilities into standard charter school performance measures (e.g., annual reports). Address enrollment disparities of students with disabilities between charters and traditional public schools through policy reforms, including revising charter school authorizing laws, legislation that allows enrollment preferences and weighted lotteries for students with disabilities, and revisions to state funding formulas that ensure charter schools have equal access to funding for educating students with disabilities.[5]
- Continue investments in efforts that support schools with implementing evidence-based behavior interventions in lieu of removals and that monitor for significant disproportionality in discipline, such as guidance and technical assistance. Ensure these technical assistance efforts equally reach traditional public and charter schools.
- Provide resources to high schools, both traditional public schools and charter schools, to increase access to college preparatory coursework for student subgroups, including students with disabilities, including guidance, technical assistance, or other supports. Ensure alignment between K-12 schools and institutions of higher education on the importance of including students with disabilities in dual enrollment programs and ways to support them for success.

[4] The Center for Learner Equity. (2024). Equity-minded charter school authorizing for students. https://www.centerforlearnerequity.org/top-10-resources/charter-school-equity-growth-quality-and-sustainability-study/

[5] The Center for Learner Equity. (2024). State actions to improve education access and outcomes for students with disabilities in charter schools. https://www.centerforlearnerequity.org/top-10-resources/charter-school-equity-growth-quality-and-sustainability-study/

Appendix A: Suspension Rates of Students With and Without Disabilities by School Sector and State

	Traditional Public Schools				Charter Schools			
State	In-School: IDEA	In-School: Non-IDEA	Out-of-School: IDEA	Out-of-School: Non-IDEA	In-School: IDEA	In-School: Non-IDEA	Out-of-School: IDEA	Out-of-School: Non-IDEA
Alabama	9.25%	6.49%	8.77%	5.73%	0.00%	0.34%	9.58%	5.71%
Alaska	4.36%	2.54%	7.67%	3.50%	0.99%	0.61%	4.19%	1.34%
Arizona	6.16%	4.01%	8.26%	5.02%	2.42%	1.26%	4.71%	2.47%
Arkansas	13.97%	8.99%	11.83%	6.12%	6.65%	3.96%	10.73%	4.89%
California	1.32%	0.51%	6.58%	2.80%	0.51%	0.27%	2.62%	1.26%
Colorado	6.14%	2.93%	10.99%	5.08%	4.95%	1.73%	6.09%	2.66%
Connecticut	8.34%	3.54%	8.40%	3.07%	3.00%	1.86%	12.44%	5.60%
Delaware	8.51%	4.45%	15.77%	6.44%	8.90%	2.88%	15.51%	4.56%
District of Columbia	2.84%	1.35%	9.44%	4.74%	2.18%	1.22%	9.39%	4.36%
Florida	10.07%	5.73%	11.70%	5.35%	3.38%	1.37%	6.76%	3.02%
Georgia	14.55%	7.67%	13.40%	6.29%	4.74%	2.26%	7.65%	3.13%
Hawaii	1.91%	0.98%	6.92%	3.26%	1.07%	0.44%	2.34%	0.75%
Idaho	5.41%	2.51%	4.78%	2.28%	2.85%	0.93%	4.96%	1.76%
Illinois	6.90%	3.59%	6.91%	3.05%	3.93%	2.39%	9.15%	5.72%
Indiana	7.55%	4.06%	12.40%	5.50%	5.01%	4.32%	15.02%	11.88%
Iowa	7.88%	3.29%	13.22%	3.70%	10.00%	1.32%	20.00%	0.00%
Kansas	8.56%	5.25%	9.18%	4.83%	0.78%	0.55%	1.57%	0.62%
Kentucky	10.79%	9.03%	8.25%	4.90%	--	--	--	--
Louisiana	14.22%	7.49%	16.21%	7.45%	4.39%	2.65%	13.27%	6.83%
Maine	4.41%	1.91%	7.65%	2.70%	2.13%	0.87%	7.17%	1.53%
Maryland	1.37%	0.58%	8.71%	3.55%	0.99%	0.61%	6.73%	3.48%
Massachusetts	3.23%	1.23%	6.88%	2.41%	4.94%	2.04%	11.28%	4.04%
Michigan	4.24%	2.27%	11.56%	5.68%	2.89%	1.48%	12.56%	7.98%
Minnesota	4.12%	1.89%	7.45%	2.66%	3.55%	2.32%	8.49%	3.96%
Mississippi	13.30%	8.72%	14.48%	9.11%	1.19%	0.81%	13.10%	6.30%
Missouri	13.36%	7.55%	10.86%	4.73%	11.62%	10.19%	20.13%	13.72%
Montana	8.33%	4.26%	6.98%	3.24%	--	--	--	--
Nebraska	8.86%	3.96%	11.36%	4.13%	--	--	--	--
Nevada	8.19%	5.62%	15.26%	8.79%	3.23%	1.29%	2.96%	1.31%
New Hampshire	7.84%	3.36%	10.38%	3.72%	1.70%	0.53%	3.98%	2.05%
New Jersey	4.60%	2.21%	6.52%	3.15%	5.25%	2.67%	14.67%	6.51%

Continues on the next page

	Traditional Public Schools				Charter Schools			
State	In-School: IDEA	In-School: Non-IDEA	Out-of-School: IDEA	Out-of-School: Non-IDEA	In-School: IDEA	In-School: Non-IDEA	Out-of-School: IDEA	Out-of-School: Non-IDEA
New Mexico	5.95%	3.58%	9.19%	5.07%	1.18%	0.67%	5.02%	2.78%
New York	5.16%	2.85%	5.64%	2.74%	3.22%	2.36%	9.57%	6.11%
North Carolina	13.79%	7.59%	16.46%	7.54%	2.87%	1.41%	7.72%	3.74%
North Dakota	5.24%	2.65%	6.32%	2.35%	--	--	--	--
Ohio	6.75%	3.45%	12.24%	5.40%	2.06%	2.37%	11.47%	7.77%
Oklahoma	9.89%	6.60%	9.45%	4.95%	1.10%	1.25%	1.73%	1.68%
Oregon	5.32%	2.72%	8.09%	3.43%	1.31%	0.45%	3.04%	0.83%
Pennsylvania	5.76%	2.71%	9.12%	4.07%	1.69%	0.96%	5.88%	4.84%
Rhode Island	4.89%	2.50%	6.52%	3.27%	5.08%	1.29%	7.96%	3.66%
South Carolina	16.63%	10.67%	18.79%	10.05%	4.60%	3.06%	6.68%	3.64%
South Dakota	9.90%	4.89%	7.33%	2.83%	--	--	--	--
Tennessee	8.07%	5.88%	7.31%	3.87%	4.52%	1.83%	11.34%	4.76%
Texas	13.42%	7.02%	7.85%	3.61%	6.75%	3.06%	9.88%	4.06%
Utah	3.18%	1.33%	5.06%	2.08%	3.50%	1.13%	6.38%	2.52%
Vermont	5.76%	2.24%	7.96%	2.52%	--	--	--	--
Virginia	8.88%	4.71%	10.67%	4.72%	3.61%	2.04%	8.76%	2.87%
Washington	3.65%	1.69%	6.16%	2.37%	2.63%	1.02%	6.28%	1.78%
West Virginia	10.60%	5.70%	10.87%	6.03%	--	--	--	--
Wisconsin	5.35%	2.18%	11.57%	4.31%	2.49%	0.80%	9.48%	5.36%
Wyoming	6.91%	4.33%	8.82%	3.36%	0.00%	0.71%	8.75%	2.13%

Appendix B: Detailed Methodology

This year's briefs are the sixth time CLE has analyzed data from the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC). Collected biannually since 1968, the CRDC represents the U.S. Department of Education's most substantial effort to understand data related to students' educational opportunities throughout K-12 schooling, particularly for historically marginalized student populations. For the first time, the Department collected a CRDC data collection two years in a row after the COVID-19 pandemic, which created a one-year delay in the previous data collection. Data from the 2021–22 CRDC were released in January 2025.

CLE's briefs use CRDC data to understand the overall state of access and opportunity for students with disabilities in both traditional public and charter schools. This report describes the methodological decisions necessary to produce the findings in this brief, particularly decisions made on variable use, data cleaning, and how to report findings.

Data Cleaning

The 2021–22 CRDC collected information from 98,010 schools. Of these schools, 7,721 were identified as charter schools. However, schools may have data missing from the final report because of privacy-related data suppression, technical issues, or because OCR flagged the data as suspect. These values were cleaned from the data. Six steps were used to clean the data to remove these schools:

STEP 1

First, we checked for schools where the total enrollment of males and females were missing. CRDC reports student populations separated by gender rather than a single total. New for this year, CRDC also allows schools to report students identifying as non-binary. Because most schools did not report data in this category, "males" and "females" were used to determine if enrollment data was properly reported. 1,866 schools were removed during this step for missing either male or female enrollment. The CRDC variable names used in this step were:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F

STEP 2

Next, we reclassified two schools where schools were identified as charter schools in states without charter school laws or operational charter schools. Montana and North Dakota reported one school each as a charter. These schools were re-categorized as non-charter schools. The CRDC variable names used in this step were:

- LEA_STATE
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER

STEP 3

Next, we checked for schools with missing values (-5 or -6) on variables related to school sector. No schools were re-categorized. The CRDC variable names used in this step were:

- SCH_STATUS_SPED
- SCH_STATUS_MAGNET
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- SCH_STATUS_ALT

STEP 4

Next, we removed schools where the total enrollment of males and females, the total enrollment under IDEA of males and females, and the total enrollment under Section 504 of males and females were suppressed. No schools were removed. The CRDC variable names used in this step were:

- TOT_ENR_F
- TOT_ENR_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_ENR_504_M
- SCH_ENR_504_F

STEP 5

Next, we checked for schools that reported having more students with disabilities than the total number of students. No schools were removed at this step. The CRDC variable names used in this step were:

- TOT_ENR_F
- TOT_ENR_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F

STEP 6

Finally, we removed 844 schools that reported their LEA state as Puerto Rico. The CRDC variable name used in this step was the following: LEA_STATE_NAME.

Missing data were categorized slightly differently between the 2020–21 CRDC and the 2021–22 CRDC. "For the 2020–21 CRDC, OCR applied data quality suppressions to mask data that was internally inconsistent or had other signs of error or poor quality. OCR elected not to engage in data quality suppressions in the CRDC's public-use data file for the 2021–22 school year."[6] Whereas in the 2020–21 CRDC, we removed 1,386 schools for suppressed enrollment data, and no enrollment data were suppressed in 2021–22, the 2021–22 CRDC included 1,866 schools with missing enrollment data where no schools were removed for that reason last year.

After cleaning all the data, 95,280 schools were included. Of those, 7,685 were charter schools, and 87,595 were traditional public schools.

Non-Binary Students

After the data were cleaned, we returned to the variables describing the enrollment of non-binary students (denoted throughout the data set using the gender suffix "X") to calculate total enrollment. Information on non-binary students was collected for the first time in the 2021–22 data set.

Of the 95,280 schools in our cleaned data set, 90,075 skipped reporting data on non-binary students, and one school's data was not recorded due to a processing failure. Additionally, some schools suppressed enrollment of non-binary students across some or all enrollment categories (2,850 schools in total student enrollment, 1,128 schools in enrollment of students eligible for services under IDEA, and 865 schools in enrollment of students eligible for services under Section 504). Because we use these data primarily to calculate enrollment irrespective of student gender, all these missing and suppressed values were converted to zeros.

While enrollment data by race and multilingual learner status also includes separate categories for non-binary students, other data in our analyses were reported only for "male" and "female" students.

IDEA and 504 Enrollment

This year's data submitted to the CRDC had unique reporting issues related to the total enrollment of students eligible for services under IDEA or Section 504. In IDEA enrollment, 2,239 schools (2.3%) skipped reporting data or did not report due to a data entry error experienced by the CRDC data system. We conducted our data analyses by removing schools with missing IDEA enrollment, a data set of 93,041 schools.

In 504 enrollment, 19,761 schools (20.7%) skipped reporting data or did not report due to a data entry error experienced by the CRDC data system. No schools were removed from the previous CRDC for these reasons. For only our analysis of the proportion of students eligible for services under Section 504, we used a version of the data set excluding schools with missing 504 enrollment, a data set of 75,519 schools. Because of the high level of missing data in this data set, we encourage caution when interpreting this information.

[6] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. (2025). *Data Snapshot: Civil Rights Data Quality from Start to Finish.* U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. https://www.ed.gov/media/document/crdc-quality-informational-snapshot-january-2025-109165.pdf

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

To analyze the demographics of students in different school settings, the following CRDC variables were used to calculate the enrollment of students by race/ethnicity and sector:

- TOT_ENR_F
- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_X
- SCH_ENR_AM_F
- SCH_ENR_AM_M
- SCH_ENR_AM_X
- SCH_ENR_AS_F
- SCH_ENR_AS_M
- SCH_ENR_AS_X
- SCH_ENR_BL_F
- SCH_ENR_BL_M
- SCH_ENR_BL_X
- SCH_ENR_HI_F
- SCH_ENR_HI_M
- SCH_ENR_HI_X
- SCH_ENR_HP_F
- SCH_ENR_HP_M
- SCH_ENR_HP_X
- SCH_ENR_TR_F
- SCH_ENR_TR_M
- SCH_ENR_TR_X
- SCH_ENR_WH_F
- SCH_ENR_WH_M
- SCH_ENR_WH_X
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_AM_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_AM_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_AM_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_AS_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_AS_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_AS_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_BL_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_BL_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_BL_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_HI_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_HI_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_HI_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_HP_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_HP_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_HP_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_TR_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_TR_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_TR_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_WH_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_WH_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_WH_X
- LEA_STATE

Since the CRDC disaggregates variables by gender, the variables were aggregated to create total enrollment counts by race/ethnicity and student group. Once all the totals were calculated, the data were checked for missing race/ethnicity information by subtracting the sum of all race/ethnicity variables from overall student enrollment. Across categories, between zero and five schools did not report data due to system errors; data from these categories was removed.

Next, the data were aggregated based on sector. For state-level analyses, the data were also aggregated by the LEA state. Variables with missing or suppressed values were ignored when aggregating. To determine proportions, the enrollment of students by race/ethnicity was divided by the total student enrollment of their respective student group.

In line with emergent best practice, we use the term "Latine" to refer to students identified in the CRDC as "Hispanic and Latino students of any race." While we recognize that no single signifier is perfect, the term "Latine" is intended to include non-binary and gender non-confirming individuals while also respecting the linguistic conventions of Spanish.[7]

[7] Gonzales, E. (2023, October 24). *Why We're Saying "Latine."* Chicago History Museum. https://www.chicagohistory.org/why-were-saying-latine/

Enrollment of Multilingual Learners

The following variables were used to calculate the enrollment of students by multilingual learner status:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- TOT_ENR_X
- TOT_ELENR_F
- TOT_ELENR_M
- TOT_ELENR_X
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_X
- SCH_IDEAENR_EL_F
- SCH_IDEAENR_EL_M
- SCH_IDEAENR_EL_X
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

14,685 schools were missing data on enrollment of multilingual learners, significantly higher than in previous years. Data from these schools were removed from the analysis of this student group. Because of the high level of missing data, results should be interpreted with caution.

The variables were aggregated to create the total enrollment of students and the number of multilingual learner students by student group. The data were aggregated based on sector. Variables that had missing or suppressed values were ignored when aggregating. To find proportions, the enrollment of students by English proficiency was divided by the total student enrollment of their respective student groups.

We use the term "multilingual learners" to refer to the student group identified in the CRDC as "students with limited English proficiency." Advocacy organizations have promoted this term as a more asset-based description of what students bring to classrooms, and it has also been adopted by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA).[8] It also adds important precision: in important respects, all students are "English learners," and many students from all backgrounds may have limited English proficiency. As with all attempts at categorization, we recognize that this category contains a variety of student backgrounds, assets, and needs.

[8] Snyder, S., Fenner, D. S., Smith, S., & Singh, J. (2023). *Terminology to Describe Multilingual Learners: Labels and Their Implications.* SupportED. https://supported.com/wp-content/uploads/Terminology-for-Multilingual-Learners_SupportEd_3.22.23.pdf

School Discipline and Engagement of Law Enforcement

Variables in these categories were managed similarly to previous analyses:

- ✔ First, the variables were aggregated to create the total enrollment of students and the number of students by the student group.
- ✔ Next, the enrollment of students without disabilities was calculated by subtracting the enrollment of students with disabilities from the total student enrollment. This allowed an analysis of students without disabilities in each case.
- ✔ Lastly, all the data were aggregated based on sector and state. Variables that had missing or suppressed values were ignored when aggregating. To find proportions, the number of students who had experienced each outcome was divided by the total student enrollment of their respective student groups.

As mentioned above, these variables did not include reporting categories for non-binary students.

Suspension

The following variables were used to calculate the number of students who received suspensions:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_ISS_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_ISS_IDEA_M
- TOT_DISCWDIS_SINGOOS_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_SINGOOS_IDEA_M
- TOT_DISCWDIS_MULTOOS_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_MULTOOS_IDEA_M
- TOT_DISCWODIS_ISS_F
- TOT_DISCWODIS_ISS_M
- TOT_DISCWODIS_SINGOOS_F
- TOT_DISCWODIS_SINGOOS_M
- TOT_DISCWODIS_MULTOOS_F
- TOT_DISCWODIS_MULTOOS_M
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

The number of students who received one or more out-of-school suspensions was calculated by summing the number of students who received only one and more than one out-of-school suspension.

Referrals to Law Enforcement

The following variables were used to calculate the number of students referred to law enforcement:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_REF_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_REF_IDEA_M
- TOT_DISCWODIS_REF_F
- TOT_DISCWODIS_REF_M
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

School-Related Arrests

The following variables were used to calculate the number of students who received a school-related arrest:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_ARR_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_ARR_IDEA_M
- TOT_DISCWODIS_ARR_F
- TOT_DISCWODIS_ARR_M
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

Restraint

The following variables were used to calculate the number of students subjected to mechanical or physical restraint:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_RS_IDEA_MECH_F
- TOT_RS_IDEA_MECH_M
- TOT_RS_IDEA_PHYS_F
- TOT_RS_IDEA_PHYS_M
- TOT_RS_NONIDEA_MECH_F
- TOT_RS_NONIDEA_MECH_M
- TOT_RS_NONIDEA_PHYS_F
- TOT_RS_NONIDEA_PHYS_M
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

Seclusion

The following variables were used to calculate the number of students subjected to seclusion and the number of instances of seclusion:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_RS_IDEA_SECL_F
- TOT_RS_IDEA_SECL_M
- TOT_RS_NONIDEA_SECL_F
- TOT_RS_NONIDEA_SECL_M
- SCH_RSINSTANCES_SECL_IDEA
- SCH_RSINSTANCES_SECL_WODIS
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

Corporal Punishment

The following variables were used to calculate the number of students who received corporal punishment:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_CORP_IDEA_F
- TOT_DISCWDIS_CORP_IDEA_M
- TOT_DISCWODIS_CORP_F
- TOT_DISCWODIS_CORP_M
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

For this analysis, the data were filtered to only include schools in states where corporal punishment is permissible before being aggregated based on sector.

Preparation for College and Career

Variables in these categories were managed similarly to previous analyses:

- ✔ First, the variables were aggregated to create the total enrollment of students and the number of students by the student group.
- ✔ Next, the enrollment of students without disabilities was calculated by subtracting the enrollment of students with disabilities from the total student enrollment. This allowed an analysis to be conducted on students without disabilities in each case.
- ✔ Lastly, all the data were aggregated based on sector and state. Variables that had missing or suppressed values were ignored when aggregating. To find proportions, the number of students who participated in each program was divided by the total student enrollment of their respective student group.

As mentioned above, these variables did not include reporting categories for non-binary students.

Grade Heuristic

To distinguish high schools from non-high schools, we used a two-part heuristic:

1. Schools that did not include at least one grade between grades 9-12 were removed.
2. Schools that included any grade between grades PK-5 were removed.

These cut-off points were selected to maximize the number of schools serving grades 9 through 12 in the dataset while ensuring that schools serving K through 5 students were not classified as high schools. Schools that include all grades K-12 were not treated as high schools for this analysis.

AP Course Participation

The following variables were used to determine AP course participation:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_APENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_APENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_APENR_M
- TOT_APENR_F
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

Dual Enrollment

The following variables were used to determine dual enrollment participation:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_DUALENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_DUALENR_IDEA_M
- TOT_DUAL_F
- TOT_DUAL_M
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

International Baccalaureate

The following variables were used to determine International Baccalaureate (IB) participation:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_IBENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_IBENR_IDEA_F
- TOT_IBENR_M
- TOT_IBENR_F
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

SAT/ACT Participation

The following variables were used to determine SAT/ACT participation:

- TOT_ENR_M
- TOT_ENR_F
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_M
- SCH_ENR_IDEA_F
- SCH_SATACT_IDEA_M
- SCH_SATACT_IDEA_F
- TOT_SATACT_F
- TOT_SATACT_M
- SCH_STATUS_CHARTER
- LEA_STATE

The Center for
Learner Equity

About the Center for Learner Equity (CLE)

CLE is a nonprofit organization dedicated to ensuring that students with disabilities have equitable access to high-quality public education. CLE provides research, policy analysis, coalition building, and technical assistance to a variety of stakeholders nationwide.

Mission

We are committed to catalyzing student success and eradicating the complex, pervasive, and systematic barriers that prevent students with disabilities from accessing school choice, educational opportunities, quality support, and inclusive environments.

Vision

All students with disabilities are respected, learning, and thriving.

Acknowledgments

Chase Nordengren and Jennifer Coco from the Center for Learner Equity contributed to the brief, with review feedback from Amanda Fenton, Laura Kaloi, Lauren Morando Rhim, and Gretchen Stewart.