

## Title Programs and Services

785-296-5188 785-296-5867 (fax)

120 SE 10th Avenue \* Topeka, KS 66612-1182 \* 785-296-6338 (TTY) \* www.ksde.org

Title III, English Language Acquisition of No Child Left Behind

## **Accountability Update**

## **Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)**

The goals of Title III English Language Acquisition are to ensure that all English Language Learners (ELLs) attain English proficiency and meet challenging state academic standards. To measure progress in meeting these goals, States receiving funds under Title III must develop annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) which include three components:

- 1. Annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English
- 2. Annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency and
- 3. Making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in reading and mathematics for English Language Learners (ELL) as required under Title I.

The first two are based on the Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment (KELPA) results. AMAO #3—AYP—is based on the Kansas reading and mathematics assessments. AYP refers to the percent of students who are at or above standard on the State content assessments. The AYP determination is only applicable when the number of English Language Learners in the district is at least 30 students. AYP is not determined for a subgroup that has less than 30 students.

The State determines the targets for each of the AMAOs. Districts must meet all three AMAOs in order to meet the Title III accountability requirements.

When No Child Left Behind was first enacted, the US Department of Education required each state to develop and submit AMAOS. Since Kansas did not have a common English language proficiency assessment at that time, it was difficult to set the AMAOs. With input from several district ESL coordinators, the AMAOs were set as follows:

- 1. Making progress—K-3 and 4-6 are 20% and 7-12 is 15%
- 2. Attaining proficiency—K-3 and 4-6 are 15% and 7-12 is 10%
- 3. AYP—the targets are the same that are used for Title I accountability. The targets change each year as they move toward 100% in 2013-14. The 2007-2008 district AYP targets were 72.0% in reading and 64.6% in mathematics. The 2008-2009 targets are 76.7% in reading and 70.5% in mathematics.

After two years of administering the Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment (KELPA), a committee from the field came together to review the data and revise the AMAOs relating to making progress and attaining English proficiency. The committee recommended the following changes to the AMAOs:

- 1. Making progress—20% of the K-12 ELLs increase their total scores when comparing the current year to the prior year.
- 2. Attaining proficiency—15% of the K-12 ELLs score "4-Fluent" on the Total Score of the current year's KELPA.
- 3. AYP—no changes

The AMAOs changes were applied beginning with the 2007 KELPA.

AMAO #2 Attaining proficiency may change in 2008-09 due to the proposed interpretations released by the US Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition. If the final interpretations reflect the proposed interpretations, AMAO #2 will use the same criteria Kansas uses to exit a student from state-funded ESOL services. A student is considered proficient and, therefore, exited when he or she scores "4-Fluent" in all domains and the total score on the KELPA for two consecutive years.

Title III specifies that if a district does not meet the AMAOs for 2 consecutive years, it must develop an improvement plan that addresses the factors that prevented it from meeting the objectives. The Kansas State Department of Education is responsible for providing assistance during the development and implementation of the district's improvement plan.

If a district does not meet the AMAOs for 4 consecutive years, certain sanctions may be applied. The state is to implement the following:

- either require the district to modify its curriculum, program and method of instruction or
- determine whether or not the district should continue to receive Title III funds and
- require the district to replace educational personnel relevant to the failure to meet the objectives. (The staff replacement is similar to a Title I requirement when schools are in corrective action or restructuring; however, it is not required in Title I.)