*Original paragraph, page 19, Finding 1(b)*

Low-income students with disabilities, i.e. those students with disabilities who were eligible for free or reduced price lunch, were consistently placed in private special education schools at lower rates than their grade-level peers with disabilities. Although low-income and non-low-income students were placed in collaborative programs at comparable rates, low-income students were placed in private special education schools at approximately half the rate of non-low-income students. When we held other student and town-level characteristics constant in a multilevel multinomial logistic regression model, we found that the odds that a non-low-income student with a disability would be placed in a private special education school were more than five times the odds for a similar low-income student. We observed these patterns of difference between low-income and non-low-income students within as well as between districts, suggesting that the differences were not driven by urbanicity or the availability of services. Further, we found these differences using an indicator of whether the student was ever designated low-income, as defined by free or reduced price lunch eligibility, during the period from 2007-2012 rather than using an indicator of whether the student was low-income in a given year. This suggests that the observed placement differences between low-income and non-low-income students were not the result of a failure of private special education schools to report students’ eligibility for free or reduced priced lunch, as suggested to us by DESE and representatives from private special education schools.

*Revised paragraph (with language changes underlined)*

Low-income students with disabilities, i.e., those students with disabilities who were eligible for free or reduced price lunch, were consistently placed in private special education schools at lower rates than their non-low-income grade-level peers with disabilities. Although low-income and non-low-income students were placed in collaborative programs at comparable rates, low-income students were placed in private special education schools at approximately half the rate of non-low-income students. When we held other student and town-level characteristics constant in a multilevel multinomial logistic regression model, we found that the odds that a non-low-income student with a disability would be placed in a private special education school were, on the whole, approximately twice the odds for a similar low-income student. The magnitude of the modeled differences in odds between the enrollments of low-income and non-low-income students varied when we analyzed relevant subsections of the data organized along students’ disability categories and towns’ rates of sending students to private out-placements. For example, as shown in Table B.4 in Appendix B, among students with high incidence disabilities (learning disabilities and/or communication, neurological, or other health impairments) in high-sending towns, the odds that a non-low-income student would be placed in a private special education school were more than five times the odds for a similar low-income student. Although there were some important town-to-town differences, we observed this pattern of discrepancy between low-income and non-low-income students in nearly all areas, suggesting that the overall lower odds of private school enrollment for low-income students was not driven by urbanicity or the availability of services. Further, we found these differences using an indicator of whether the student was ever designated low-income, as defined by free or reduced price lunch eligibility, during the period from 2007-2012 rather than using an indicator of whether the student was low-income in a given year. This suggests that the observed placement differences between low-income and non-low-income students were not the result of a failure of private special education schools to report students’ eligibility for free or reduced priced lunch, as suggested to us by DESE and representatives from private special education schools.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B.4: Fitted odds ratios from separate multilevel logistic regression models estimating non-low-income, as compared to low-income, students’ enrollment in private special education schools.**  Note: Each cell represents the fitted odds ratio for a subset of students (indicated by disability category in the first column) in either the whole state or a subset of towns (indicated in the top row) from a model in which relevant student and town-level characteristics were taken into account. | | | |
|  | Population: All towns | Subgroup: High-sending towns (greater than 8.5% of students with disabilities attend private schools) | Subgroup: Low-sending towns (fewer than 1.5% of students with disabilities attend private schools) |
| Population: All students with disabilities | 2.2\*\*\* | 3.3\*\*\* | 2.2\*\*\* |
| Subgroup: Students with high incidence disabilities (*learning disabilities, communication, neurological, or other health impairment)* | 3.0\*\*\* | 5.2\*\*\* | 3.9\*\*\* |
| Subgroup: Students with autism | 2.0\*\*\* | 2.0\*\*\* | 3.3\*\*\* |
| Subgroup: Students with emotional disabilities | 1.9\*\*\* | 3.4\*\*\* | 1.5\*\*\* |
| Subgroup: Students with multiple disabilities | 2.7\*\*\* | - | - |
| Subgroup: Students with sensory disabilities (*hearing impairment, vision impairment, deaf/blind*) | 2.7\*\*\* | - | - |
| Subgroup: Students with physical disabilities | 1.3ns | - | - |
| \* *p*<0.05; \*\* *p*<0.01; \*\*\* *p*<0.001 Blank cells are those for which sample sizes were too small for subgroup analyses | | | |