

# Understanding District AMAO Data Files

## **Table 1: Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) Summary**

This table presents the details of the three AMAO standards by district and school by grade level. “Total” columns are the number of students (denominator) the percentages are based upon.

**AMAO 1** Measures the percentage of students making progress on the WLPT-II in learning English for two successive years (two WLPT-II annual test scores). Percentages that do not meet AMAO 1 targets are highlighted in **RED** font.

Grade	Point Gains
K-2	21
3-5	14
6-8	8
9-12	5

**AMAO 1 Target:** 70% of students making the following gains in composite scale scores by grade span.

**AMAO 2** Measures the percentage of students attaining English proficiency by scoring a Level 4 – Transitional on the annual WLPT-II for the most recent year (2008-09). *The target percentage transitioning is based upon initial placement level and length of participation in TBIP.* Percentages that do not meet AMAO 2 targets are highlighted in **RED** font.

initial placement level	Percent Expected to Transition Each Year		
	Years in Program		
	Less than 1 year	1 - 2 years	3 or more years
Lev 1	0%	8%	11%
Lev 2	0%	13%	15%
Lev 3	23%	27%	13%

**AMAO 2 Targets**

The total deviation is computed by subtracting the percentage actually transitioning from the target percentage and adding across all cells that contain 10 or more students. This total deviation score should equal or exceed 0%.

**AMAO 3** Measures the percentage of students meeting Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) targets in the Limited English cell on the annual state assessment (2009 WASL reading and math). Percentages that do not meet AMAO3 targets are highlighted in **RED** font.

Grade	Percent Meeting	
	Reading	Math
3-5	76.1%	64.9%
6-8	65.1%	58.7%
10-12	74.3%	62.4%

**AMAO 3 Targets:** Adjusted percentages meeting standard in 2009 by grade spans.

**NOTE: Percentages shown in Table 1 are the unadjusted (raw) values and do not account for any of the below.**

Unadjusted percentages lower than these targets may meet AYP after adjustment for:

1. Safe Harbor provisions if the percentage of students not making AYP in that school declined by at least 10% from the previous year.
2. Computing the 99<sup>th</sup> percent upper confidence interval score.
3. Including or excluding former ELLs in the calculation.
4. Excluding students not continuously enrolled since Oct. 1<sup>st</sup>.
5. If less than 30 students took the 2009 WASL in any grade span, and special education students scoring at Level 2 on the WASL Basic are not counted as meeting standard in AYP.
6. Some low percentages may also meet AYP as the result of successful appeals for a variety of reasons.

## **Table 2: WASL Performance by English Language Proficiency**

This table presents the percentage of students meeting state standards on the 2008-09 WASL reading and math and the 2008-09 WLPT-II by level and school. Results are for those grades taking the WASL (grades 3-5, 6-8, and 10). Statewide results and district/school non-ELL student results are provided for comparison purposes.

## **Table 3: Annual WLPT-II Levels and Percent of ELLs Meeting 2009 WASL Standards**

This table presents the number of students by school and grade completing the annual WLPT-II the percentage of these at each level. It also presents the percentage at each level that met the AYP targets for reading and math for those grades taking the WASL (grades 3-5, 6-8, and 10). State and district totals are provided for comparison purposes.

## **Table 4: ELL Primary Language Spoken and ELD Program Model**

This table presents the number of ELL students at each school and grade who speak one of the eight most frequent language groups and the number of students in each English Language Development program model in use.

**NOTE: These data are based upon values entered by school districts into the Bilingual Database.**