

Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)

Overview of Colorado's Process and Procedures

Colorado Department of Education
Unit of Federal Programs Administration

November 2013

What are AMAOs?

- NCLB Accountability measures for Title III
- Help determine the effectiveness of language instruction programs funded by Title III
- Based on:
 - Colorado English language development standards
 - ACCESS for ELLs proficiency data
 - TCAP participation, Reading, Writing and Math academic growth, high school grad rate.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) – Section 3122 Achievement Objectives and Accountability

States must develop annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs), for limited English proficient students (ELs) served in Title III programs, that measure:

- Progress toward and attainment of English proficiency
- Proficiency on challenging academic achievement standards

Such AMAOs shall include, at minimum, annual increases in the percent of ELs who:

- (i) make progress toward learning English
- (ii) attain English proficiency

by the end of each school year, as determined by a valid and reliable assessment of English proficiency consistent with section 1111(b)(7);

- (iii) make adequate progress on Colorado academic standards in Reading and Math

as described in section 1111 (b)(2)(B)

NCLB and Title III Waiver

- CDE worked with USDE to align AMAO 1 and 3 with state accountability measures.
- AMAO 1 was changed through the amendment process
- AMAO 3 was changed through an addition to the NCLB Waiver

Three Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives, Two Sets of Standards

AMAO	Standard	Assessment(s)
1: Making progress in attaining English	English language development standards for reading, writing, speaking and listening.	CELApro, 2011-12; WIDA ACCESS, 2012-13
2: Attaining English Proficiency		
3: Making adequate growth in reading, writing and math	Colorado reading, writing and math content standards	TCAP Graduation Rate Participation rate

AMAO 2: Attaining English Proficiency

of ELs Proficient (5+) both Overall and in Literacy
#of ELs enrolled in Title III grantee at test time

- 2012-13 target = 11%
- Minimum n=20; no 95% confidence interval
- Calculations did not change due to NCLB waiver
- Altered with change from CELApro to ACCESS
- Not calculated at EMH level

AMAOs 1 and 3 Calculations impacted by NCLB Flexibility Waiver

- AMAO 1 based on ACCESS for ELLs growth percentiles—student growth from 2012 to 2013, not percent increasing one performance level.
- AMAO 3 based on 2012-2013 TCAP reading, writing and math growth, and graduation and participation rates.

AMAOs 1 and 3

- Points earned based on DPF rubrics

Cut-point: The district/consortium earned . . . percent of the points eligible on this indicator	
• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds
• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets
• at of above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching
• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet

- Rating of **Meets** or **Exceeds** - district/consortium made the AMAO.
- But how do we get to this point . . . ?

AMAO 1 – Making Progress

Includes 1st-12th grade ELs who:

- Took CELApro in 2012 and ACCESS in 2013
- Were enrolled in school before October 1 or in district for one full year—coded either:
 - *October New to School=No*
 - *Time in District=12+months*

Calculating AMAO 1

- 2012 (CELA) to 2013 (ACCESS) growth percentiles calculated for eligible students.
- Median Growth Percentiles (MGPs) calculated at EMH level. Note: no AGPs for 2013
- Rubric used to assign points, separately by EMH:

Median Growth Percentile	Rating	Point Value
65-99	Exceeds	2
50-64	Meets	1.5
35-49	Approaching	1
1-34	Does Not Meet	0.5

Calculating AMAO 1

- Sum growth points earned and points eligible across EMH. N<20 not included.
- Divide *points earned* by *points eligible* for % of growth points

$$\frac{\text{pts earned E} + \text{pts earned M} + \text{pts earned H}}{\text{pts eligible E} + \text{pts eligible M} + \text{pts eligible H}}$$

Example of Calculating AMAO 1

Grade Span	MGP	Points earned	Points possible
Elementary (N=138)	68	2	2
Middle (N=95)	44	1	2
High (N=19)	NA	NA	NA

Median Growth Percentile	Rating	Point Value
65-99	Exceeds	2
50-64	Meets	1.5
35-49	Approaching	1
1-34	Does Not Meet	0.5

District earns 2 out of 2 points possible for Elementary and 1 out of 2 points for Middle, for a total of 3 out of 4 possible—75%.

Calculating AMAO 1

- Compare 75% to rubric; district earns **Meets**

Cut-point: The district/consortium earned . . . percent of the points eligible on this indicator	
• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds
• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets
• at of above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching
• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet

- **Meets** or **Exceeds** = made AMAO 1;
- **Approaching** or **Does Not Meet** = did not make AMAO 1

Calculating AMAO 3

- Includes 4th–10th grade ELs who:
 - Were coded *October New to School=NO* or *Time in District=12+ months*.
 - Had both 2012 and 2013 TCAP scores in the same content area (reading, writing and math).
- Not included:
 - Lectura/Escritura/CoAlt scores
 - Students who withdrew during the testing period

Calculating AMAO 3

- Calculated separately for Reading, Writing and Math by EMH.
- If EMH $N < 20$ not included in AMAO 3 for that content area.
- High school grad rate factors into calculation.

Calculating AMAO 3

When all grade spans have 20+ students, this is how the points are distributed, for 40 points total:

Grade Span	Reading	Writing	Math	Grad Rate
Elementary	4 points	4 points	4 points	
Middle	4 points	4 points	4 points	
High	4 points	4 points	4 points	4 points

Calculating AMAO 3

- Separately, by content area (RWM) and grade span (EMH):
 - MGP based on Growth Percentiles for every student.
 - The Median AGP based on Adequate Growth Percentiles for every student.
 - MGP compared to median AGP.

Calculating AMAO 3

If $MGP \geq$ median AGP, grade span made adequate growth (left scoring guide). If $MGP < AGP$, grade span did not make adequate growth (right scoring guide).

met adequate growth

Median Growth Percentile	Rating	Point Value
60-69	Exceeds	4
45-59	Meets	3
30-44	Approaching	2
1-29	Does Not Meet	1

did not meet adequate growth

Median Growth Percentile	Rating	Point Value
70-99	Exceeds	4
55-69	Meets	3
40-54	Approaching	2
1-39	Does Not Meet	1

Graduation Rate

Grad rates calculated for 2009 (7-year), 2010 (6-year), 2011 (5-year), and 2012 (4-year) when N=16+. The best grad rate is used.

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Year of Graduation	2008				75.8
	2009			75.6	
	2010		72.2		
	2011	70.0			

Scoring Guide	Rating	Point Value
Graduation Rate: District/consortium' graduation rate was:		
• At or above 90%	Exceeds	4
• Above 80% but below 90%	Meets	3
• At or above 65% but below 80%	Approaching	2
• Below 65%	Does Not Meet	1

Calculating AMAO 3

- Sum *points earned* across RWM and EMH (N=20+) and grad rate (N=16+).
- Sum *points eligible* across RWM and EMH (N=20+) and grad rate (N=16+), maximum=40.

$$\text{points earned} \div \text{points eligible}$$

Calculating AMAO 3

- Compare the percentage to these values:

Cut-point: The district/consortium earned . . . percent of the points eligible on this indicator	
• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds
• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets
• at of above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching
• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet

- If $\frac{\text{points earned}}{\text{points eligible}} \geq 62.5\%$, made AMAO 3
- If $\frac{\text{points earned}}{\text{points eligible}} < 62.5\%$, AMAO 3 not made.

One last thing: TCAP Participation Rate

- When AMAO 3 was based on AYP, 95% participation rates in reading and math at EMH were among the targets.
- Participation rate included in AMAO 3.
- TCAP participation rate was determined for reading, writing, math and science for each Title III grantee.
- If grantee did not make 95% in 2+ content areas, original AMAO 3 rating (Exceeds, Meets, Approaching, Does Not Meet) dropped one level.
- For example, an original *Meets* result would drop to *Approaching* and the grantee would not make AMAO 3.

AMAOs 1 and 3 and the DPF (by grade span)

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile
Reading	2	4		Approaching	481	68.81	41
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	479	74.74	61
Writing	3	4		Meets	471	54.78	50
Science	3	4		Meets	166	48.8	52
Total	11	16	68.8%	Meets			

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	313	46	31	Yes
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	312	35	44	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	305	40	44	No
English Language Proficiency (CELAPro)	1	2		Approaching	49	41	46	No
Total	7	14	50%	Approaching				


Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	11	20	55%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	168	38	36	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	93	46	37	Yes
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	30	20	59	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	25	57	39	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	82	44	61	No
Mathematics	6	20	30%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	169	32	49	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	92	32	52	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	30	22	67	No
English Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	25	24	54	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	58	47	80	No
Writing	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	162	40	48	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	89	45	48	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	28	24	72	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	25	46	50	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	138	40	60	No
Total	26	60	43.3%	Approaching				

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile
Reading	3	4		Meets	342	74.56	61
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	342	35.38	57
Writing	3	4		Meets	342	53.8	60
Science	2	4		Approaching	168	47.62	47
Total	11	16	68.8%	Meets			

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	328	60	18	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	328	55	89	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	328	55	51	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	10	12	83.3%	Meets				

Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	17	20	85%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	127	62	38	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	107	64	30	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	38	48	95	No
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	32	64	57	Yes
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	106	60	73	No
Mathematics	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	128	60	97	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	107	54	96	No
Students with Disabilities	3	4		Meets	38	60	99	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	32	50	99	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	181	61	99	No
Writing	11	20	55%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	127	52	78	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	107	51	69	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	38	52	99	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	32	53	93	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	145	58	90	No
Total	41	60	68.3%	Meets				

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Rate/Score	Expectation
Graduation Rate: 4yr/5yr/6yr/7yr	2	4		Approaching	204/202/179/201	75.5/73.3/77.1/72.5%	80%
Disaggregated Graduation Rate	1.5	3	50%	Approaching			
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0.5	1		Approaching	79/90/67/80	65.8/63.3	
Minority Students	0.5	1		Approaching	39/44/30/41	71.8/59.1	
Students with Disabilities	0.5	1		Approaching	29/22/16/23	69/50/3	
English Learners	0	0		-	N<16/N<16/N<16/N<16	-	
Dropout Rate	3	4		Meets	1219		
Colorado ACT Composite Score	2	4		Approaching	157		
Total	8.5	15	56.7%	Approaching			

 Pearson_A
 9/27/2012 11:00:01 AM
 AMAO 3, graduation rate. Please not that this is worth 4 points in AMAOs, as opposed to 1 point in the DPF.

AMAOs and Consortia

- District must be in consortium 2+ consecutive years, SY 2011-12 and 2012-13.
- Student data from consortium districts aggregated to determine the Consortium MGPs and Median AGPs.
- Consortium “N” must be 20+ at EMH for AMAOs 1 and 3; 20 overall for AMAO 2.

AMAO 2 Student Level Data

- Available in CEDAR

<https://cdeapps.cde.state.co.us/CDEAccess/login.jsp>

- “AMAO 2 Student Level Report”
 - all records are included in the report

Review Process

- Submit *Request for AMAO Review* with *AMAO Review Excel file*.
- AMAO Request for Review Information found at: www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp
- Email (morganstern_d@cde.state.co.us) or fax (303-866-6637) Requests for Review to Donna Morganstern

Conditions of Requests for AMAO Review

1. Superintendent must indicate support in writing.
2. Grantee responsible for demonstrating AMAO 1, 2 and/or 3 determinations incorrect.
3. Districts can access individual student records included in AMAOs 1 and 2 calculations through CEDAR and see the data used to calculate AMAOs.
4. All review-related data must be submitted by **November 8, 2012**. If you need assistance determining what data to submit, contact Donna Morganstern (morganstern_d@cde.state.co.us).

Conditions of Requests for AMAO Review

5. No changes or updates will be made to the student biographical data in CDE data warehouse as a result of review process. Review results will not alter baseline and subsequent year data in CDE data warehouse.
6. Districts must have participated in SBD for ACCESS and TCAP. Districts that did not participate in ACCESS or TCAP SBD are not eligible for AMAO review. SBD is an integral part of the process to ensure clean data for making accurate AMAO determinations.

If Grantee does make AMAOs

Grantee that doesn't meet 1+ AMAOs must:

- Inform parents of ELs by letter, within 30 days of public notice, that LEA did not make AMAOs.
- The letter must be in understandable format and, to the extent practicable, in language parents can understand.

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp>

If Grantee does not make AMAOs for 2 consecutive years

- *LEA must develop an improvement plan.....*
(NCLB, 2001 Section 3122)
- Unified Improvement Plan information:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/-Accountability/UnifiedImprovementPlanning.asp>
- Plans due as part of the district's Unified Improvement Plan.

If LEA does not make AMAOs for 4 consecutive years

Title III law (Section 3122(b)(4)) requires the State to take additional action.

CDE must conduct additional review of the grantee's language instruction program and provide technical assistance on any reform that should take place regarding the education of ELs.

Title III Accountability Report

Results will be posted on the Office of Federal Programs, Data, Program Evaluation and Reporting (DPER) page

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tiii/amaos>

and on SchoolVIEW

<http://www.schoolview.org/performance.asp>

AMAO Resources

Title III website, for sample parent notification letters and the 2012-13
AMAOs Manual

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tiii/amaos>

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language
Instruction Educational Programs

<http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/>

US Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition

<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/index.html>

Unit of Federal Program Administration

Title III Office

Program Questions

Morgan Cox
303.866.6784

cox_m@cde.state.co.us

Genevieve Hale
303.866.6618

hale_g@cde.state.co.us

Data Questions

Donna Morganstern
303.866.6209

morganstern_d@cde.state.co.us

Language, Culture and Equity Office

Liliana Graham

graham_l@cde.state.co.us

Unit of Student Assessment

villalobos-pavia_h@cde.state.co.us

CEDAR questions

CEDAR@cde.state.co.us

Questions?