**Instructions for Calculating AMAOS 2012-13**

AMAOs are performance objectives or targets for English Learners, which Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) such as districts and consortia that receive Title III sub-grants must meet each year. Districts must have been in their consortium for both 2011-12 and 2012-13 to be included for 2012-13 AMAOs. Data from districts participating in a consortium for 2011-12 and 2012-13 are aggregated to calculate the consortium’s 2012-13 AMAOs. At the LEA/consortium level, there must be 20+ ELs in the grade span (EMH) to calculate AMAOs 1 and 3 (16+ for graduation rate), and 20+ students overall to calculate AMAO 2.

LEAs receiving Title III sub-grants are required to meet two English proficiency AMAOs, based on student performance on the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs, and an academic achievement AMAO, based on academic growth on state Reading, Writing and Math assessments, and graduation and participation rates.

Note that calculations for AMAOs 1 and 2 have changed from previous years.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **English Language Proficiency AMAOs** |  **Measure** |
| AMAO 1: Percent of students making adequate progress in learning English | ACCESS Growth |
| AMAO 2: Percent of students attaining English proficiency | ACCESS Overall and Literacy sub-scale Status |
| **Academic Achievement AMAO** |  |
| AMAO 3: Meeting LEA level DPF sub-indicator requirements for the EL disaggregated group at the elementary, middle and high school grade spans, as well as graduation and participation rates | TCAP GrowthTCAP Participation RateGraduation Rate |

# WIDA ACCESS for ELLs

# AMAO 1 – English Learners (ELs) Making Annual Progress in Learning English

The AMAO 1 calculation changed in 2011-12, based on Colorado’s NCLB Flexibility Wavier. Before the waiver, making AMAO 1 required that a target percentage of ELs improved at least one English assessment performance level from the prior year’s testing.

The current method for calculating AMAO 1 involves determining Growth Percentiles for all students with two consecutive years of English language assessment scores, using the same methodology as the Colorado Growth Model for CSAP/TCAP. Growth Percentiles are numbers (1-99) that represent students’ relative growth compared to other students with similar performance histories.

Once a Growth Percentile is calculated for every student with two consecutive English assessment scores, it is possible to calculate the Median Growth Percentile (MGP), which represents the typical rate of growth for the group. This MGP provides a measure of the district’s relative effectiveness in teaching English to English learners.

## AMAO 1 Cohort

The AMAO 1 cohort includes 1st-12th grade students who took CELApro in 2011-12 and WIDA ACCESS in 2012-13, anywhere in the state of Colorado, who were enrolled in the school prior to October 1 or continuously in the district for one full year.

## AMAO 1 Calculations

If you’d like to re-create the results, the following directions will walk you through the process.

1. Access Growth Percentiles for all students who were enrolled in the school prior to October 1 or continuously in the district for one full year and have Overall CELApro scores for 2011-12 and Overall ACCESS scores for 2012-13, separately by grade span (EMH). Student-level Growth Percentiles are available in CEDAR.
2. Determine the Median Growth Percentile for each grade span (EMH). Compare each grade span’s Median Growth Percentile (MGP) to the scoring guide below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |

1. Determine how many ACCESS growth points each grade span earned based on its Median Growth Percentile
2. For example, if a grade span’s MGP was between 60 and 64, it will “earn” 1.5 of the 2 points possible and receive a ***Meets***. However, if the grade span’s MGP was 34 or less, it will earn only 0.5 points and a **Does not Meet** rating.
3. Total the number of Points Earned across EMH levels and the number of Points Eligible.
4. Divide the Points Earned by the Points Eligible to determine the district/consortium percentage of points. Compare this value to the table below and note the corresponding indicator Rating.
5. Districts/Consortia that score in the ***Meets*** or ***Exceeds*** categories made AMAO 1. Those that score ***Approaching*** or ***Does Not Meet*** did not make AMAO 1

|  |
| --- |
| **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** |

#

# AMAO 2 – Percentage of English Learners Attaining Proficiency (ACCESS Overall Performance Level 5 and Literacy Performance Level 5)

AMAO 2 is the target percentage of ELs scoring at Level 5 Overall and Level 5 for the Literacy sub-test. AMAO 2 is not calculated separately by grade span (EMH) like AMAOs 1 and 3.

## AMAO 2 Cohort:

The AMAO 2 cohort includes all students who were enrolled in your district/consortium during the 2012-13 ACCESS testing window, including those who were not continuously enrolled for a full year. Students who withdrew from the LEA before or during the testing window are not included. The AMAO 2 target for 2013 is 11 percent

Students who did not receive an Overall proficiency score because they did not complete the assessment or answer enough questions to warrant a score are included. LEAs are accountable for AMAO 2 if there are 20+ students in the EL group. Students’ scores will be assigned to the districts in which they tested in 2013. Note that not all AMAO 2 students will be included in AMAO 1 calculations.

## AMAO 2 Calculations

* + - 1. Calculate the Denominator
	1. Start with all 2012-13 ACCESS and ACCESS alternate records.
	2. Exclude any students with test invalidation code 6 (withdrew before completion).
	3. If more than one record has the same SASID, use only the highest score.
1. Calculate Numerator: include all students who had an overall ACCESS proficiency score of 5 and Literacy sub-score of 5.
2. Divide the Numerator by the Denominator.

# AMAO 3 – English Learners Group Making Sufficient Academic Growth

AMAO 3 holds Title III LEAs accountable for their EL students making sufficient academic progress in Reading, Writing and Math, and toward postsecondary readiness as measured by graduation rate. Similar to AMAO 1, 2012-2013 AMAO 3 calculations are based on the Colorado Growth Model, as approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

Prior to 2011-2012, AMAO 3 required that any EL disaggregated groups of 30 or more, at the district level by EMH, make all AYP targets: CSAP Reading and Math participation, performance and an “other indicator,” which was the percent advanced at the elementary and middle grade spans, and graduation rate at the high school level. Because Colorado has an NCLB flexibility waiver, AMAO 3 requirements have been aligned with our state required District Performance Frameworks and are based on academic growth in Reading, Writing and Math, as well as TCAP participation and graduation rates.

## AMAO 3 Cohort

Similar to AMAO 1, AMAO 3 is calculated at the grade span (EMH) and then rolled up to the district/consortium overall. For Reading, Writing and Math Growth, only EL students enrolled in the school prior to October 1 or continuously enrolled in the district for one full year and who took TCAP Reading, Writing and Math in both 2012 and 2013 are included; students taking Lectura, Escritura or CSAPA/CoAlt are not included at this time. Academic growth is included in AMAO 3 only if there were 20 or more eligible students for that content area at that grade span.

## Calculating AMAO 3

Conduct the following calculations separately for Reading, Writing and Math, at the elementary, middle and high school grade spans. Use Growth Percentiles for all ELs who enrolled in the school prior to October 1 or were continuously enrolled in the district for one full year. Exclude students who enrolled after October 1 and were not continuously enrolled in the district for one full year, took Lectura/Escritura or CoAlt, or withdrew from the district during the testing period.

* + - 1. Calculate the elementary Reading Median Growth Percentile.
			2. Access the Adequate Growth Percentiles for all elementary students who were enrolled continuously for a full year in the district/consortium. Exclude students who enrolled after October 1, were not enrolled continuously in district for one full year, took Lectura or CoAlt Reading, or withdrew from the district during the testing period.
			3. Calculate the elementary Reading Median Adequate Growth Percentile. Compare the elementary Reading Median Growth Percentile (MGP) and Median Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP).
	1. If the MGP is equal to or greater than the Median AGP, then the elementary students made adequate growth. Use the scoring guide on the left below for ***met adequate growth***.
	2. If the MGP is less than the AGP, the district did not make adequate growth in reading at the elementary level. Use the scoring guide on the right below for ***did not meet adequate growth***
		+ 1. Using the appropriate scoring guide, determine how many points the district earned for elementary Reading, out of the points available.

**Did district/consortium grade span meet adequate growth?**

**NO, did not meet adequate growth**

**YES, met adequate growth**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Median Growth Percentile** | **Rating** | **Point Value** |
|  60-69 | Exceeds | 2 |
| 45-59 | Meets | 1.5 |
| 30-44 | Approaching | 1 |
| 1-29 | Does Not Meet | 0.5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Median Growth Percentile** | **Rating** | **Point Value** |
| 70-99 | Exceeds | 2 |
| 55-69 | Meets | 1.5 |
| 40-54 | Approaching | 1 |
| 1-39 | Does Not Meet | 0.5 |

* + - 1. Repeat steps 2 through 4 separately for middle school and high school Reading.
			2. Sum the number of Reading Points Earned across the grade spans as well as the number of Reading Points Eligible.
			3. Repeat steps 2 through 6 separately for Writing and Math.
			4. Graduation rates are calculated for the 2009 (7-year), 2010 (6-year), 2011 (5-year), and 2012 (4-year) cohort, for any cohorts with N=16+. The best one of these four graduation rates is used and compared to the table below to determine how many points it is worth. Graduation rate data are reported on the District Performance Frameworks.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***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 |

* + - 1. Sum the Points Earned and the Points Eligible across grade spans for all three content areas and graduation rate.
			2. Divide the number of points earned by the number of points eligible.



If the percentage of Points Earned falls below 62.5, then the district/consortium has not made AMAO 3. If a district/consortium’s percentage of Points Earned attains a ***Meets*** or ***Exceeds rating***, then the grantee has made AMAO 3, as long as it does not fail to meet two or more required 2013 TCAP participation rates. If the district/consortium fails to meet two or more participation rates, its AMAO 3 rating falls one category.

## Calculate EL Participation in 2013 TCAP and CoAlt Reading, Writing, Math and Science

* + - 1. Calculate the Reading Participation denominator by counting all 3rd – 10th grade EL students in the district/consortium, regardless of EMH, who were enrolled at the time of testing including any expelled students. Do not include students who withdrew during the testing period.
			2. Calculate the Reading Participation numerator by counting all 3rd – 10th grade EL students who were enrolled at the time of testing, took TCAP or CoAlt Reading and received a valid score, or students who were unable to test due to language. Also include students who were eligible to take, and received a valid score on, the Spanish language version of TCAP Reading (Lectura). Students considered eligible to take Lectura in place of TCAP Reading were limited English proficient (NEP and LEP) 3rd and 4th graders who have been continuously enrolled in a U.S. school for less than three years.
			3. Divide the numerator by the denominator. If the percentage of students participating is equal to or greater than 94.5%, the district/consortium made the Reading Participation target.
			4. Repeat steps 1 through 3 above for Writing (including Escritura), Math and Science.
			5. If a district/consortium has two or more participation rates below 94.5%, their AMAO 3 indicator rating, based on growth in Reading, Writing, Math and graduation rate, drops one level. For example, an original ***Meets*** determination would drop to ***Approaching*** and, as a result, the district/consortium would not make AMAO 3.
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