



**COLORADO**

Department of Education

**ESSA Accountability Work Group  
Decision Point:  
Minimum N**

# Public Survey Respondents

- ❑ 87% (59) educators
  - ❑ 21% (14) members of public
  - ❑ 6% (4) parents
  - ❑ 4% (3) members of Hub Committee
- 
- ❑ 34% (23) suburban
  - ❑ 34% (23) urban
  - ❑ 31% (21) rural

# What minimum n should Colorado use for accountability?

## ■ Option 1 (n = 16)

- Hub: 0 out of 18 votes
- Public: 36.2% of respondents, average rating of 2.1

## ■ Option 2 (n = 16/20)

- Hub: 13 out of 18 votes
- Public: 23.2% of respondents, average rating of 2.0

## ■ Option 3 (n = 20)

- Hub: 1 out of 18 votes (2 indicated as 2<sup>nd</sup> choice)
- Public: 40.6% of respondents, average rating of 1.9

# Comments from Public Survey

- Rural districts do not get the data they need to make decisions and allocate resources
- Recommend higher n size to minimize outsized effects of a single student
- Raising minimum n size will make data useless for smaller, rural schools
- Hiding the results (by having a high minimum n requirement) is not appropriate; more appropriate to aggregate across noisy measures or over time to achieve greater stability
- Smaller n size makes more students have value overall
- Rural schools need accountability and public visibility
- Less confusing if the number of participants is consistent
- Reporting valid growth is most important
- Important to produce valid data, which is harder to do with a smaller n size; prefer a lack of data to misleading data
- Too many schools can mask students behind a high minimum n
- Reliability is most important
- Consider how to reduce troubling trend of parent opt-out
- Propose grouping students who disaggregation has not yet been measured

# Comments from Hub Committee Members

- Do what is statistically sound, and pushback on Feds if needed
- Prefer 1<sup>st</sup> option (n = 16) unless 20 is needed for growth stability, then go with 3<sup>rd</sup> option (n = 20)
- How many schools/districts would have data?
- Pushback on Feds, but if required to use same minimum n, go with 1<sup>st</sup> option
- Option 2 is the best fit statistically
- Believe growth is more important than achievement, prefer option 3
- How much more stable/reliable/valid is minimum n of 20 compared to 16 for growth and achievement?

# Recommendation/Feedback

- Final feedback/recommendations based on survey data, hub committee feedback, and final regulations?

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

- **Option 1 (Use one minority group)**
  - Hub: 0 out of 18 votes
  - Public: 11.6% of respondents, average rating of 2.3
- **Option 2 (Analyze data for each major racial/ethnic groups separately)**
  - Hub: 4 out of 18 votes
  - Public: 26.1% of respondents, average rating of 2.3
- **Option 3 (Use one minority group for accountability, but report disaggregated data when available)**
  - Hub: 8 out of 18 votes
  - Public: 60.9% of respondents, average rating of 1.4

# Comments from Public Survey

- Some schools have many cultures and ethnicities, and although data disaggregation is important, if we count the same student multiple times depending on the diversity of the family, it could help or hurt scores
- Option 2 (analyze separately) is too complicated for schools that have several ethnicities to be accounted for
- Option 2 seems complicated for schools with over 30 countries represented
- Classification of “minority” is becoming increasingly difficult and its basis should be primarily a socio-economic indicator
- Important to look at each racial/ethnic group when possible; the races/ethnicities labeled as “minority” are not really the minority a lot of times
- Racial groups should match the ratios in their communities; if they are analyzed differently based on their ethnicity it feels like racism even if the intent is to honor all races
- If we have too many data points, it becomes data overload and the whole thing is disregarded
- Students with disabilities should be disaggregated by disability so the state can develop resources and supports specific to each disability; recommend districts report their data to a statewide database for disaggregation
- Consider analyzing data for racial/ethnic groups that reach a threshold of the overall population (e.g., over 10% or 20% of the population)



# Comments from Hub Committee Members

- New census group?
- Concerned that grouping racial/ethnic groups would result in individual groups getting lost
- Lose too much info/data by grouping
- How many schools/districts would have data?
- Seems ideal to analyze each group separately, but not practical
- Fewer schools/LEAs would be held accountable analyzing each group separately
- ESSA is clear that states must disaggregate by each major racial/ethnic groups
- Option 2 (analyze separately) is best for all schools with decision making at local level to support students
- How do we define “major” racial/ethnic groups?
- White, Hispanic, and all other for accountability
- Majority/minority – perception issues?
- If allowed, option 3 (minority, with disaggregated reporting) seems best
- Prefer option 3; might be one area the state pushes back on
- Disaggregate data when n size is large enough, but otherwise group as minority for small schools/districts; pushback on USDE
- Use a hybrid; use disaggregated groups when sufficient numbers of students are present, but a minority roll-up if more than x students/groups would be otherwise excluded

# Recommendation/Feedback

- Final feedback/recommendations based on survey data, hub committee feedback, and final regulations?