



COLORADO
Department of Education

ESSA Accountability Work Group Decision Point: Minimum N

Decision Point

- What is the minimum number of students that should be used for accountability?

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with §§ 200.12-200.24, §299.17 and with section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include any documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

C. **Minimum Number of Students.** Describe the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with §200.17(a)(3).

Click here to enter text.

Describe the following information with respect to the State's selected minimum number of students:

i. How the State's minimum number of students meets the requirements in §200.17(a)(1);

Click here to enter text.

ii. How other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the State's uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each student subgroup under §200.16(a)(2);

Click here to enter text.

iii. A description of the strategies the State uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA;

Click here to enter text.

iv. Information regarding the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup described in §200.16(a)(2) for whose results schools would not be held accountable in the State accountability system for annual meaningful differentiation under §200.18; and

Click here to enter text.

v. If applicable, a justification, including data on the number and percentage of schools that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup under §200.16(a)(2) in the accountability system, that explains how a minimum number of students exceeding 30 promotes sound, reliable accountability determinations.

Click here to enter text.

Requirements

■ Federal Statute (ESSA)

- Yields statistically reliable information
- Same number for all students and for each disaggregated group
- Does not reveal any personally identifiable information (PII)
- Consistent with FERPA requirements

■ Proposed Rulemaking

- Maximum inclusion of all students and disaggregated groups
- May not exceed 30 students, unless strong justification is provided
- Same number for each indicator
- Number/percentage of students and disaggregated groups of students excluded from school-level accountability determinations

Additional information – N size / minimum n materials from 9/21:
www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/accountabilityworkgroup



Starting Point: What We've Heard

- **Maintain current minimum n size**
- **Consider impact on small rural districts**
- **Consider impact of dividing minority group into each major race/ethnicity**
- **Consider impact on district/school ratings**

Options for Feedback

- **Recommended options**

1. Minimum n of 16 for all indicators
2. Current minimum n sizes (*preferred*)
3. Minimum n of 20 for all indicators

- **Options not currently recommended by the AWG**

- Lowest minimum n size (e.g., 10 students)
- Highest minimum n size (e.g., 30 students)

Option 1

Lower current minimum n for growth to match minimum n for achievement and graduation rate (16 for all indicators)

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses concerns that EL, FRM, MIN, and IEP students may not be getting adequate attention, by including growth for smaller (e.g., more) disaggregated groups• More schools/LEAs will have sufficient data for accountability• Keeps achievement status quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Past analysis indicated N=16 too low for calculating growth• Small systems are vulnerable to impact of a single student: 1 outlier score can strongly impact the average; 1 student represents 6.25% of a group of 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Input regarding whether a n=16 could be considered for growth calculations• Meets proposed federal rulemaking requirements that all indicators use the same minimum n

Option 2 (Preferred)

Maintain current minimum n sizes (16 for achievement and graduation rate; 20 for growth)

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Aligns with current Performance Framework calculationsDoes not increase concerns that EL, FRM, MIN, and IEP students may not get adequate attention, by maintaining low (16) minimum n for achievement, although not growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fewer schools/LEAs will have data for growth accountability, compared to Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Does not meet proposed rulemaking requirements that all indicators use the same minimum nAcknowledges concern that N=20 has proven to be the minimum necessary to ensure stability of growth results

Option 3

Raise current achievement and graduation rate minimum n to 20 match minimum n for growth (20 for all indicators)

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Less vulnerable to impact of a single student or extreme outlier score; a single student has at most a 5% impact on each indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lower number of schools/LEAs will have achievement and grad rate data for accountability• Increases concerns that fewer school and LEAs will be held accountable for disaggregated EL, FRM, MIN, and IEP groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meets proposed rulemaking requirements (same on all indicators)• Acknowledges concern that N=20 has proven to be the minimum necessary to ensure stability of growth results

Not Recommended

- **Lower current minimum n (for example: 10 students)**
 - This option ensures that even more schools/LEAs are held accountable for the performance of disaggregated groups, but raises substantial concerns regarding the stability of growth results, the impact of outliers and single students, and the ability to report results publicly due to concerns regarding personally identifiable information (PII).
 - We cannot have an accountability system without public reporting of the data.
- **Raise current minimum n (for example: 30 students)**
 - This option results in the most stable data, but too many schools/LEAs would not be held accountable for the performance of disaggregated groups.

Decision Point

- How should Colorado disaggregate the performance of minority students in the state?

Requirements

- **Federal Statute (ESSA)**
 - Students from major racial and ethnic groups
- **Proposed Rulemaking**
 - Students from each major racial and ethnic group

Overall Considerations for Race/Ethnicity Disaggregation

- The term “minority” can be inaccurate or misleading
- Students or their parents report all racial/ethnic groups that apply, not primary identification
 - Hispanic identification trumps all categories
 - Anyone who chooses two or more affiliations automatically goes into the “Two or more races” category

Options for Race/Ethnicity Disaggregation

Options	Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use one minority group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with current Performance Frameworks Holds smaller systems without sufficient individual group sizes accountable for the overall minority group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't address concerns that specific racial and ethnic groups may not be getting adequate attention Could mask potential inequitable outcomes or achievement gaps for different race/ethnic groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze data for each race/ethnic group separately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better addresses equitable education concerns Provides schools and districts with access to information for planning purposes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer schools and districts will be held accountable Holds large systems accountable in a different way than smaller systems
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use one minority group for accountability; report disaggregated race/ethnic group data when minimum n achieved (<i>preferred</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides schools and districts with access to information for planning purposes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaggregated groups don't impact accountability calculations (disaggregated group performance reported only)

Input Needed

- Please use this link to respond to the following questions:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JTPQ7KH>
 - 1. What is your role? (Parent, educator, public, hub member)
 - 2. Where are you from? (rural, urban, or suburban setting)
 - 3. Rank order the minimum n options presented.
 - 4. Rank order options presented regarding racial and ethnic group disaggregation.
 - 5. Optional, provide any rationale or considerations for your responses.