



Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) Overview of Colorado's Process and Procedures

Colorado Department of Education
Office of Federal Programs Administration

September 2012

What are AMAOs?

Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives are:

- Accountability measure for Title III of NCLB
- Used to determine the effectiveness of language instruction educational programs funded by Title III
- Based on State English Language Development Standards and Colorado English Language Assessment for Proficiency (CELApro) data

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

Each State must develop annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for limited English Proficient (EL) children served in a Title III program that measure:

- Children’s development and attainment of English proficiency
- Proficiency in challenging academic achievement standards

Such AMAOs shall include, at minimum, annual increases in the number or percentage of limited English proficient children:

- (i) making progress in learning English
- (ii) attaining 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);

AND

(iii) making adequate progress in Colorado academic standards in Reading and Math as described in section 1111 (b)(2)(B)

NCLB and Title III Waiver

- Through the NCLB 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)
AMAO 1: Making progress in attaining English	English Language Development Standards in reading, writing, speaking and listening.	CELApro, 2011-12; WIDA Access, 2012-13
AMAO 2: Attaining English Proficiency		
AMAO 3: Making adequate growth in reading, writing and math	State Content Standards in reading, writing and math	CSAP/TCAP- reading, writing and math Graduation Rate Participation rate

AMAO 2: Attaining English Proficiency

The percent of English learners scoring Proficient (5) on CELApro Overall was divided by the total number of limited English proficient students enrolled in the district at the time of CELApro testing.

- 2011-12 target = 7%.
- Final determination based on the upper limit of the 95% confidence interval
- Is not calculated if fewer than 30 ELs in district/consortium

AMAOs 1 and 3

- Calculated differently than prior years because of the NCLB Flexibility Waiver.
- Based on student growth from 2011 to 2012, not the percentage increasing one performance levels.
 - AMAO 1 based on CELApro Overall score growth
 - AMAO 3 based on 2011 CSAP to 2012 TCAP reading, writing and math growth, and grad 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.

AMAO 1 – Making Progress

AMAO 1 cohort includes 1st through 12th grade students who:

1. Took CELApro in both 2011 and 2012, anywhere in Colorado
2. Enrolled in their school prior to October 1 or in the district continuously for one full year.

Calculating AMAO 1

- Growth Percentiles were calculated for all students separately by grade span (EMH).
- Adequate Growth Percentiles were calculated for all students separately by grade span (EMH).

Growth Percentiles and Adequate Growth Percentiles available in CEDAR. Directions for accessing:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/documents/growth/InstructionsCELAprogrowthflatfileCDE.pdf>

Calculating AMAO 1

CELApro Median Growth Percentiles (MGPs) and median Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGPs) calculated separately by grade span (EMH).

Separately, each grade span's Median Growth Percentile (MGP) compared to its median Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP).

Calculating AMAO 1

- If the MGP = > AGP, grade span made adequate growth
- This rubric was used to assign points and ratings:

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

Calculating AMAO 1

- If the MGP < AGP, grade span did not make adequate growth
- This rubric was used to assign points and ratings:

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

Did grade span's CELApro MPG meet or exceed its AGP?

Yes, met adequate growth

No, did not meet 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

Calculating AMAO 1

- Sum CELA growth points earned and points eligible across EMH levels. Grade spans with fewer than 20 students not included.
- Divide the points earned by the points eligible to determine the percentage 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	AGP	Met or Exceeded AGP
Elementary (N=138)	62	59	yes
Middle (N=95)	54	58	no
High (N=19)	NA	NA	NA

Elementary 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

Middle did not meet adequate growth

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

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

Calculating AMAO 1

- Comparing the 75% to the table, we see the district fell into the **Meets** category.

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

- Districts/Consortia that scored in the **Meets** or **Exceeds** categories made AMAO 1;
- Districts/Consortia that scored **Approaching** or **Does Not Meet** did not make AMAO 1

Calculating AMAO 3

- Cohort: 3rd–10th grade Els during TCAP testing who:
 - Were enrolled (a) in district for a full year or (b) in school prior to October 1;
 - Had both 2011 CSAP and 2012 TCAP scores in the same content area (reading, writing and math).
- Students who took Lectura/Escritura or CSAPA/CoAlt, or withdrew during the testing period, not included for AMAO 3.

Calculating AMAO 3

- Calculations done separately for Reading, Writing and Math, at the elementary, middle and high grade spans.
- A grade span with $N < 20$ not included in AMAO 3.
- High school graduation rate also factors in 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 (reading, writing and math) and grade span (EMH):
 - The MGP was determined based on Growth Percentiles for every student .
 - The Median AGP was determined based on Adequate Growth Percentiles for every student.
 - The MGP was compared to the median AGP.

Calculating AMAO 3

If $MGP \Rightarrow$ Median AGP, the grade span made adequate growth in the content area and used left scoring guide.

If $MGP < AGP$, the grade span did not make adequate growth in the content area and used right scoring guide.

Yes, 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

No, 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

Calculating AMAO 3: Grad Rate

Grad rates were calculated for the 2008 (7-year), 2009 (6-year), 2010 (5-year), and 2011 (4-year) cohorts when N=16+. The best grad rate was used to determine grad rate points

		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 growth 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.

Calculating AMAO 3

- Divide the points earned by the points eligible and compare the resulting 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 the percent of points earned equals or exceeds 62.5%, LEA made AMAO 3; if the percent of points is less than 62.5%, the 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 LEA.
- If LEA did not make 95% in at least two 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 LEA would not make AMAO 3.

AMAOs 1 and 3 and the DPF (by gradespan)

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			

Counts and ratings are not reported for metrics when the district does not meet the minimum stu

 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 have been in consortium at least two years, SY 2010-11 and 2011-12.
- Student data from eligible districts participating in a consortium SY 2010-11 and 2011-12 were aggregated to determine the Consortium MGPs and Median AGPs.
- Consortium “N” at the grade span must be 20+ for AMAOs 1 and 3, and 30 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

- Districts must submit the “Request for AMAO Review” with the “AMAO Review Excel file.”
- AMAO Request for Review Information found at: www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp
- Requests for Review must be emailed (morganstern_d@cde.state.co.us) or faxed (303-866-6637) to Donna Morganstern

Conditions of Requests for AMAO Review

1. Superintendent must indicate support in writing.
2. It is the LEA's responsibility to demonstrate that the AMAO 1, 2 and/or 3 determinations were 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 October 12, 2012. If you need assistance determining what data to submit, contact Donna Morganstern (morganstern_d@cde.state.co.us) before October 5.

Conditions of Requests for AMAO Review

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

If LEA does not meet AMAO targets?

An LEA that fails to meet one or more AMAOs in any year must:

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

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

If LEA does not meet AMAOs for 2 consecutive years

- *If the LEA fails to make AMAOs for two consecutive years.....the LEA must develop an improvement plan.....*
NCLB, 2001 Section 3122.
- Unified Improvement Plan information can be found at:
www.schoolview.org/UnifiedImprovementPlanning.asp
- Plans will be due as part of the district's Unified Improvement Plan.

If LEA does not meet AMAOs for 4 consecutive years

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

The SEA must provide additional review of the grantee's language instruction education 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 and Accountability page:

www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/danda/index.asp

And also on SchoolVIEW:

www.schoolview.org/SchoolPerformance/index.asp

AMAO Resources

- Sample parent notification letters are available on the Unit of Federal Program Administration, Title III Website at:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp>
- The 2011-12 AMAOs Manual can be found at:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp>
- 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>

Contacts

Unit of Federal Program Administration, Title III

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 Unit

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?