The background of the page features a large, faint watermark of the official seal of the California Department of Education. The seal is circular and contains the text "DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION" at the top and "OF CALIFORNIA" at the bottom. The central emblem depicts a sunburst rising behind a lamp of knowledge, with a quill pen in a vase to the right and a stack of books with a pencil and ruler in the foreground. A five-pointed star is positioned on the right side of the seal.

**2007-08  
Title III Accountability Report  
Information Guide**

**September 2008**

Prepared by the  
Policy and Evaluation Division  
California Department of Education

## Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction .....	1
Title III AMAOs .....	1
Assessments Used to Determine the AMAOs .....	2
AMAO 1 – Percent of ELs Making Annual Progress in Learning English .....	3
AMAO 2 – Percent of ELs Attaining English Proficiency on CELDT .....	5
AMAO 3 – Meeting AYP Requirements for the EL Subgroup at the LEA or Consortia Level .....	7
Consequences of Not Meeting the AMAOs .....	8
Appeals Process .....	9
Sample 2007-08 Title III Accountability Report .....	10
Explanatory Notes for the 2007-08 Title III Accountability Report .....	11

## Introduction

This guide is designed to help educators, policymakers, and interested members of the public understand the 2007-08 Title III Accountability reports. Title III of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 provides supplemental funding to local educational agencies (LEAs) and consortia of LEAs to implement programs designed to help English learners (ELs) and immigrant students attain English proficiency and meet the state's academic and content standards. Title III requires that each state:

- Establish English language proficiency standards
- Conduct an annual assessment of English language proficiency
- Define two annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for increasing the percentage of EL students making progress in learning English and attaining English proficiency
- Include a third AMAO relating to meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the EL subgroup at the LEA or consortium level
- Hold Title III funded LEAs and consortia accountable for meeting the three AMAOs (NCLB Section 3122)

Title III permits the direct funding of LEAs that qualify for a grant award of \$10,000 or more. LEAs that do not qualify for a \$10,000 grant award must form a consortium with other LEAs so that together they qualify for a grant award of at least \$10,000. LEAs that are members of a consortium do not receive a separate Title III Accountability Report. The results for each consortium are aggregated up to the consortium level as required by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition.

## Title III AMAOs

An AMAO is a performance objective, or target, that Title III subgrantees must meet each year for its ELs. All LEAs and consortia receiving a Title III-Limited English Proficient (LEP) grant are required to meet the two English language proficiency AMAOs and a third academic achievement AMAO based on AYP information. Both English language proficiency AMAOs are calculated based on data from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).

## Assessments Used to Determine the AMAOs

### Title III AMAOs for English Learners

AMAO	Assessment
English Language Proficiency AMAO 1: Percent Making Annual Progress in Learning English	CELDT
English Language Proficiency AMAO 2: Percent Attaining English Proficiency	CELDT
Academic Achievement AMAO 3: Meeting AYP Requirements for the EL Subgroup at the LEA or Consortia Level	CST, CAPA, CAHSEE

The CELDT is California's state test of English language proficiency. The CELDT is required to be administered within 30 calendar days upon initially enrolling in a California public school to all students whose home language is not English. The first administration of the CELDT is used to determine if a student is fluent-English proficient or an EL. ELs are required to take the CELDT each year during the annual assessment window of July 1 to October 31, until they are reclassified as fluent-English proficient (R-FEP). Throughout this guide the 2007 Annual CELDT refers to the CELDT administered during the annual testing window of July 1 through October 31, 2007. The prior year CELDT refers to the CELDT administered during the 2006-07 school year. For some students the prior year CELDT will have been an initial test that was administered at the time the student enrolled in a California public school.

The CELDT assesses the domains of listening and speaking in kindergarten and first grade. The test for students in grades two through twelve covers four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Students receive an overall performance level score and performance level scores for each of the domains tested.

### CELDT Score Types

K and Grade 1	Grades 2-12
Overall Performance Level	Overall Performance Level
Domain Performance Level	Domain Performance Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listening</li> <li>• Speaking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listening</li> <li>• Speaking</li> <li>• Reading</li> <li>• Writing</li> </ul>

There are five performance levels on the CELDT: Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced, and Advanced; and four grade spans of the test (kindergarten through grade two, grades three through five, grades six through eight, and grades nine through twelve). Each grade span test includes content tailored to the appropriate grade levels and aligned with the English language development (ELD) standards. Beginning with Form F (2006-07 edition) of the CELDT, there is a common scale for the CELDT from kindergarten through grade twelve.

A student is defined as English proficient on the CELDT if **both** of the following criteria are met:

- Overall performance level of Early Advanced or Advanced  
**AND**
- Each domain performance level at the Intermediate level or above

Students are considered for reclassification when they are at the English proficient level on the CELDT; however, scoring English proficient on the CELDT is not sufficient for reclassification. When reclassification decisions are made, information from the California Standards Test (CST), teacher evaluations, and parent consultation is also considered.

The third AMAO relating to meeting AYP requirements for the EL subgroup is based on data from the CST, the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA), and/or the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). For more information on AYP requirements, go to the AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/>.

### **AMAO 1 – Percent of ELs Making Annual Progress in Learning English**


AMAO 1 reflects the percentage of ELs making annual progress on the CELDT. There are three ways for ELs to meet the annual growth target on the CELDT depending upon what level they were at on the prior year CELDT. ELs at the Beginning, Early Intermediate, and Intermediate levels are expected to gain one performance level. ELs at the Early Advanced or Advanced level who are not yet English proficient are expected to achieve the English proficient level on the CELDT. ELs at the English proficient level are expected to maintain that level.

**Annual Growth Target on CELDT**

<b>Previous Year CELDT Overall Performance Level</b>	<b>Annual Growth Target</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beginning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Intermediate Overall</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Intermediate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intermediate Overall</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intermediate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Advanced Overall</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Advanced or Advanced, but not at the English proficient level. One or more domains (reading, writing, speaking, listening) is below Intermediate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieve the English proficient level. (Overall proficiency level needs to remain at Early Advanced or Advanced level and all domains need to be at the intermediate level or above.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Advanced or Advanced and at the English proficient level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain English proficient level</li> </ul>

The percent of annual CELDT testers within each LEA or consortium that are expected to meet the annual growth target each year are shown in the graph below. The starting point for 2003-04 was set on the original CELDT using a process similar to setting the starting point for Title I AYP. Using this process, 51 percent of students within each LEA were expected to meet the annual growth target. Based on baseline data from 2001 and 2002 CELDT results, approximately 80 percent of LEAs would meet this target. The ending target was set at the 75th percentile of the LEA distribution. In September 2007, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved new targets for 2006-07 to 2013-14 that were aligned to the new CELDT performance level cut scores and the new common scale as shown below.

**Targets for AMAO 1**



## **AMAO 2 – Percent of ELs Attaining English Proficiency on CELDT**


AMAO 2 measures the percent of ELs in a defined cohort at a given point in time, who have attained the English proficient level on the CELDT as defined on the top of page 3. The cohort for AMAO 2 contains those students who could reasonably be expected to have reached English language proficiency at the time of the 2007 annual CELDT administration.

Four groups of students are combined into the AMAO 2 cohort:

- All ELs who were at the Intermediate level overall the prior year (2006-07)
- ELs at the Early Advanced or Advanced levels overall who were not English proficient the prior year (2006-07)
- ELs at the Beginning or Early Intermediate level overall in the prior year (2006-07) who were enrolled in U.S. schools before July 1, 2003
- ELs at the Beginning or Early Intermediate level overall in the prior year (2006-07), who entered U.S. schools after June 30, 2003, and who met the English proficient level on the 2007 annual CELDT.


The flowchart on page 6 shows the definition of the AMAO 2 cohort.

### Definition of AMAO 2 Cohort





In September 2007, the SBE approved new targets for 2006-07 to 2013-14 that were aligned to the new CELDT performance level cut scores and the new common scale as shown below.



### AMAO 3 – Meeting AYP Requirements for the EL Subgroup at the LEA or Consortia Level

AMAO 3 holds the Title III LEAs and consortia accountable for meeting targets for the EL subgroup that are required of all LEAs, schools, and subgroups under NCLB. The academic achievement targets specify the percent of ELs that must score at the proficient or advanced level in English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics on State assessments used to determine AYP.

#### 2008 AYP Targets for the EL Subgroup

Type of LEA	Targets		
	Participation Rate ELA and Mathematics	Percent Proficient ELA	Percent Proficient Mathematics
Unified districts, county offices of education, high school districts (with grades 2-8 and 9-12)	95.0%	34.0%	34.6%
Elementary districts, charter elementary and middle schools	95.0%	35.2%	37.0%
High school districts, charter high schools (with grades 9-12)	95.0%	33.4%	32.2%
Title III consortia	95.0%	34.0%	34.6%

In order to meet AMAO 3, the LEA or consortia must meet the 2008 AYP participation rate and percent proficient targets in ELA and mathematics for the EL subgroup.

The AYP calculations for the EL subgroup include R-FEP students who have not scored proficient or above on the CST in ELA three times after being reclassified. Refer to the *2008 Adequate Yearly Progress Information Guide* on the AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/> for more specific information on AYP requirements at the LEA level and specific details of the EL subgroup.

## **Consequences of Not Meeting the AMAOs**

If a Title III LEA or consortia does not meet any one or more of the three AMAOs in any year, it must:

- Inform the parents of all ELs in the LEA or the consortia as a whole, that the AMAOs have not been met

This notification should be provided within 30 days of the public release of the Title III Accountability reports. A sample parent notification letter is available in English and Spanish on the Title III Accountability Technical Assistance Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/acct.asp>.

If a Title III funded LEA or consortia does not meet the AMAOs for two consecutive years (2006-07 and 2007-08), it must also:

- Develop an improvement plan that will ensure that the AMAOs are met

The improvement plan shall specifically address the factors that prevented the LEA or consortia from achieving the AMAOs.

Those LEAs and consortia<sup>1</sup> that do not meet the AMAOs for two consecutive years will be notified by the California Department of Education (CDE) and further information concerning the development of the improvement plan will be provided.

If the LEA does not meet the AMAOs for four consecutive years (2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08):

- The state shall require the LEA to modify its curriculum, program, and method of instruction

LEAs that are identified as not meeting AMAOs for four consecutive years will be notified by the CDE of further action that needs to be taken.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2006-07 is the first year that accountability has been aggregated to the consortium level.

## **Appeals Process**

If a Title III LEA or consortium believes that there has been a calculation error in the computation of AMAOs 1 and 2, they should contact the Evaluation, Research and Analysis Unit of the Policy and Evaluation Division (PED) regarding an appeal. Appeals of the AYP information used in AMAO 3 must be filed with the PED at the CDE. More information on AYP appeals may be found on the AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/>.

Submitting an AMAO appeal does not relieve LEAs or consortia leads of the obligation to notify parents within 30 days of the public release of the Title III Accountability Report or to take other actions as specified.

## Sample 2007-08 Title III Accountability Report



### 2007-08 Title III Accountability Report

California Department of Education  
Policy and Evaluation Division  
Release Date: September 4, 2008

Select another year:

LEA: Sand Dunes Unified

County: Ocean

CD Code: 7512345

[Click here for school information](#)

The Title III Accountability Report indicates the status of each local educational agency (LEA) in meeting the three Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

#### AMAO 1 – Percent of Students Making Annual Progress in Learning English

Number of 2007 Annual CELDT Takers	316
Number / Percent with Required Prior CELDT Scores	296 / 94%
Number in Cohort Meeting Annual Growth Target	165
Percent Meeting AMAO 1 in LEA	55.7%
2007-08 Target	50.1%
<b>Met Target for AMAO 1</b>	<b>Yes</b>

#### AMAO 2 – Percent of Students Attaining English Proficiency on CELDT

Number of 2007 Annual CELDT Takers in Cohort	154
Number in Cohort Attaining English Proficient Level	68
Percent Meeting AMAO 2 in LEA	44.1%
2007-08 Target	28.9%
<b>Met Target for AMAO 2</b>	<b>Yes</b>

#### AMAO 3 – Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level

##### English-Language Arts

Met Participation Rate for English Learner Subgroup	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above for English Learner Subgroup	No

##### Mathematics

Met Participation Rate for English Learner Subgroup	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above for English Learner Subgroup	No

**Met Target for AMAO 3** **No**

For more details on Title III accountability, refer to the Title III Accountability Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/>.

\* If less than 85 percent of the 2007 Annual CELDT test takers have the required prior CELDT scores, the results may be invalid and should be interpreted with caution. If less than 65 percent of the 2007 CELDT takers have prior year scores, no values will be printed for AMAOs 1 and 2.

## **Explanatory Notes for the 2007-08 Title III Accountability Report**

This section describes what is contained in each item of the 2007-08 Title III Accountability Report.

### **LEA/Consortium Lead**

This line shows the name of the LEA or the consortium lead that receives the Title III grant award. There is one Title III Accountability Report for each consortium. An LEA may be a school district, county office of education (COE), or a direct funded charter school. Direct funded charter schools that receive Title III funds will receive a Title III Accountability Report. Annual CELDT takers from direct funded charter schools will be removed from the sponsoring district or COE.

### **AMAO 1 – Percent of Students Making Annual Progress in Learning English**

AMAO 1 shows the percent of ELs in an LEA or consortia who met the annual growth target on the CELDT.

### **Number of 2007 Annual CELDT Takers**

This is the number of ELs who took the annual CELDT during the testing window of July 1, 2007, to October 31, 2007, and whose tests were submitted to the test contractor for scoring before the deadline for submission of annual tests. It does not include students who took their first CELDT test as an initial test taker in 2007 or the scores of ELs whose tests were submitted and scored after the annual testing deadline. ELs from direct funded charter schools are removed from the results of the sponsoring district or COE.

### **Number/Percent with Required Prior CELDT Scores**

This is the number and the percent of 2007 annual CELDT test takers that have the required prior year CELDT scores needed to compute the AMAOs.

In order to calculate the AMAOs, the following data elements are needed:

- A prior (Form F) performance level for the overall test.
- If the prior (Form F) performance level for the overall test is at the Early Advanced or Advanced level and the student was in grade two through grade twelve when tested, the performance level scores for the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are required to determine if the student was at the English proficient level for the AMAOs. If the student was in kindergarten or first grade, the domain scores for listening and speaking are needed.

If less than 65 percent of 2007 annual CELDT test takers have the required prior CELDT scores, the results will not be considered valid and no values will be reported for AMAOs 1 and 2. In cases where no values are reported, the LEA or consortia is considered to have not met AMAOs 1 and 2.

If the percent of 2007 annual CELDT test takers with prior year scores is between 65 and 85 percent, the results will be flagged and should be interpreted with caution. In these LEAs and consortia, the results may have been different if a greater proportion of annual test takers had been included in the calculations. State and federal laws require all ELs be tested annually on the CELDT.

### **Number in Cohort Meeting Annual Growth Target**

This is the number of ELs in the AMAO 1 cohort who met the annual growth target.

### **Percent Meeting AMAO 1**

This is the percent of ELs in the AMAO 1 cohort in this LEA or consortia who met the annual growth target. It is derived as follows:

$$\text{Percent meeting AMAO 1} = \frac{\text{Number in cohort meeting annual growth target}}{\text{Number with required prior CELDT scores}}$$

The final result is displayed to the tenths decimal place with the following rounding rule. If the hundredths decimal place is fifty or more, the tenths decimal place is increased by one.

### **2007-08 Target**

This is the 2007-08 target for AMAO 1 for all Title III LEAs and consortia. It specifies the percent of ELs in the AMAO 1 cohort that must meet or exceed their annual growth target.

### **Met Target for AMAO 1**

There are two possible values for meeting the target:

- “Yes” – LEA or consortia met the target for AMAO 1
- “No” – LEA or consortia did not meet the target for AMAO 1

### **AMAO 2 – Percent of Students Attaining English Proficiency on CELDT**

AMAO 2 measures the percent of ELs in a defined cohort, who have attained English proficiency on the CELDT at a given point in time.

**Number of 2007 Annual CELDT Takers in Cohort**

The cohort for AMAO 2 contains those students who could reasonably be expected to have reached English language proficiency at the time of the 2007 annual CELDT administration. See page 5 of this Guide for more information about which students are included.

**Number in Cohort Attaining English Proficient Level**

This is the number of ELs in the AMAO 2 cohort that reached the English proficient level in 2007.

**Percent Meeting AMAO 2**

This is the percent of ELs in the AMAO 2 cohort for this LEA or consortia that reached the English proficient level in 2007.

Percent meeting AMAO 2 =  $\frac{\text{Number in cohort attaining English proficient level}}{\text{Number of annual CELDT takers in the cohort}}$

The final result is displayed to the tenths decimal place with the following rounding rule. If the hundredths decimal place is fifty or more, the tenths decimal place is increased by one.

**2007-08 Target**

This is the 2007-08 target for all Title III LEAs and consortia on AMAO 2. It specifies the percent of the cohort for AMAO 2 that must meet the English proficient level at the time of the 2007 annual CELDT.

**Met Target for AMAO 2**

There are two possible values for meeting the target:

- “Yes” – LEA or consortia met the target for AMAO 2
- “No” – LEA or consortia did not meet the target for AMAO 2

**AMAO 3 – Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup**

AMAO 3 measures whether the EL subgroup for the LEA or consortia met the 2008 AYP participation rate and percent proficient requirements. Refer to the *2008 Adequate Yearly Progress Information Guide* on the AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/> for more specific information about the calculation of AYP.

## **English-Language Arts**

### **Met Participation Rate for the English Learner Subgroup**

There are three possible values:

- “Yes” – LEA or consortia met the participation rate for the EL subgroup
- “No” – LEA or consortia did not meet the participation rate for the EL subgroup
- “--” – LEA or consortia did not meet the minimum group size for the EL subgroup and no value is reported

### **Met Percent Proficient or Above for the English Learner Subgroup**

There are three possible values:

- “Yes” – LEA or consortia met the percent proficient for the EL subgroup
- “No” – LEA or consortia did not meet the percent proficient for the EL subgroup
- “--” – LEA or consortia did not meet the minimum group size for the EL subgroup and no value is reported

## **Mathematics**

### **Met Participation Rate for the English Learner Subgroup**

There are three possible values:

- “Yes” – LEA or consortia met the participation rate for the EL subgroup
- “No” – LEA or consortia did not meet the participation rate for the EL subgroup
- “--” – LEA or consortia did not meet the minimum group size for the EL subgroup and no value is reported

### **Met Percent Proficient or Above for English Learner Subgroup**

There are three possible values:

- “Yes” – LEA or consortia met the percent proficient for the EL subgroup
- “No” – LEA or consortia did not meet the percent proficient for the EL subgroup



- “--” – LEA or consortia did not meet the minimum group size for the EL subgroup and no value is reported

### **Met Target for AMAO 3**

There are two possible values for meeting the target:

- “Yes” – LEA or consortia received a Yes on all four components of AMAO 3. If the LEA or consortia did not meet the minimum group size and no values were reported they will be considered to have met AMAO 3
- “No” – LEA or consortia did not meet one or more of the four components of AMAO 3