



Title III accountability policies and outcomes for K-12: annual measurable achievement objectives for English language learner students in Southeast Region states





Title III accountability policies
and outcomes for K–12: annual
measurable achievement objectives
for English language learner students
in Southeast Region states

March 2011


Prepared by

Kimberly S. Anderson

SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Kathleen Dufford-Meléndez

SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro



Issues & Answers is an ongoing series of reports from short-term Fast Response Projects conducted by the regional educational laboratories on current education issues of importance at local, state, and regional levels. Fast Response Project topics change to reflect new issues, as identified through lab outreach and requests for assistance from policymakers and educators at state and local levels and from communities, businesses, parents, families, and youth. All Issues & Answers reports meet Institute of Education Sciences standards for scientifically valid research.

March 2011

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-06-CO-0028 by Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast administered by the SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Anderson, K.S., and Dufford-Meléndez, K. (2011). *Title III accountability policies and outcomes for K–12: annual measurable achievement objectives for English language learner students in Southeast Region states*. (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2011–No. 105). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

This report is available on the regional educational laboratory website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

Title III accountability policies and outcomes for K–12: annual measurable achievement objectives for English language learner students in Southeast Region states

This report overviews key elements of the Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) in the Southeast Region states for 2007/08: number and type of Title III subgrantees, English language proficiency assessments used, and state and subgrantee performance in meeting AMAO accountability targets.

This report details Title III accountability policies and outcomes for K–12 English language learner (ELL) students for school year 2007/08 in the six Southeast Region states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina) under the Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) provision of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The AMAO provision of Title III is an accountability mechanism designed specifically for ELL students. It applies to states and their subgrantees (educational entities, usually districts that serve ELL students) that receive federal Title III funds to improve programs and education outcomes for ELL students. Title III formula grants are disbursed to all U.S. states and territories.

The three AMAOs are:

- AMAO 1: The number or percentage of students served by Title III demonstrating progress in English language proficiency.
- AMAO 2: The number or percentage of students served by Title III that attain full English language proficiency.
- AMAO 3: Whether the ELL student subgroup made adequate yearly progress in academic achievement, as required by Title I of NCLB.

States can define the details of their AMAOs and set their annual targets through school year 2013/14. Each year they must report whether the state as a whole met its AMAO targets and how many of its subgrantees did so.

This report responds to state education agency requests for information on Title III AMAO policies in the Southeast Region and is intended to help state education agency staff as they revise and implement their required accountability policies for monitoring the

achievement of students not yet fluent in English.

This study is driven by five research questions:

- How many and what type of Title III subgrantees did each state have in 2007/08?
- What English language proficiency assessments did each state use?
- How did each state define AMAO 1, and what accountability determinations did each state report?
- How did each state define AMAO 2, and what accountability determinations did each state report?
- How did each state define AMAO 3, and what accountability determinations did each state report?

The report is based on publicly available documents.

Key findings include:

- All six states had district subgrantees. In two states, all the subgrantees were districts. In four states, some subgrantees were consortia (groups of districts that joined together to pool their funds). In one state, one subgrantee was a charter school.
- The six states used five different English language proficiency assessments. Two states used Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs); the other four states each used

a different assessment. All the tests assessed students in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing; one state also assessed comprehension. The assessments varied by the types of composite scores (combined domain scores) reported and by the overall fluency levels reported (how they divided the continuum of language acquisition from no English proficiency to fluency).

- All six states' AMAO 1 definitions entailed measuring the annual change in English language proficiency assessment scores (comparing 2007/08 with 2006/07). There were three differences in these definitions. For calculations, states either grouped all students together or grouped them into cohorts established according to varying criteria. States differed in the assessment scores they used and the level of increase required to constitute progress. States set different targets for the percentage of students that had to show progress in order for the state and subgrantees to meet AMAO 1. All states but Mississippi, and varying numbers of subgrantees within each state, reported meeting AMAO 1.
- All six states' AMAO 2 definitions involved comparing 2007/08 assessment scores with those required to meet the state's definition of proficiency. There were three differences in these definitions. For calculations, states either grouped all students together or grouped them into cohorts established according to varying criteria. States differed in the assessment scores they used and the score required to constitute proficiency. States set different targets for the percentage of students

that had to reach proficiency in order for the state and subgrantees to meet AMAO 2. All six states, and varying numbers of subgrantees within each state, reported meeting AMAO 2.

- All six states' AMAO 3 definitions were based on the state's definition of adequate yearly progress as established for Title I. The state achievement tests and targets for assessing adequate yearly progress were those used for the student population as a whole, including the ELL student subgroup; each state had its own tests and targets. To trigger a Title I determination of adequate yearly progress for the ELL student subgroup, the number of ELL students in a district had to meet each state's established minimum. The number of subgrantees in the states that met this

requirement varied. Of the six states' subgrantees receiving such determinations, the number that met AMAO 3 varied.

Five states did not report AMAO 3 results for districts that did not receive adequate yearly progress determinations; one state reported these districts as meeting AMAO 3 by default.

Given these variations in the numbers and types of subgrantees across states, the English language proficiency assessments they used, how AMAOs were defined, and the targets they set, the 2007/08 AMAO 1, 2, and 3 determinations reported different indicators across states. Common interpretations of the results, and thus comparisons among states, are not possible.

March 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Why this study?	1
Context for understanding Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	4
Findings	5
How many and what type of Title III subgrantees did each state have?	6
What English language proficiency assessments did each state use?	6
How did each state define AMAO 1, and what accountability determinations did each state report?	7
How did each state define AMAO 2, and what accountability determinations did each state report?	10
How did each state define AMAO 3, and what accountability determinations did each state report?	12
Study limitations	16
Appendix A Data sources and methodology	17
Appendix B Data organization protocol	19
Appendix C U.S. Department of Education 2008 revised interpretations of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001	21
Appendix D Enrollment of English language learner students and first language	22
Appendix E State profiles	23
Appendix F Features of instruction models, 2007/08	44
Notes	46
References	48
General references	48
State-specific resources used in document review	51
Boxes	
1 Key terms	2
2 U.S. Department of Education 2008 revised interpretations of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001	3
3 Data sources and methodology	5
4 AMAO 2: Grouping students, defining proficiency, and setting targets	14
Tables	
1 Entities receiving Title III funding, by state, 2007/08	6
2 English language proficiency assessment instruments used, by state, 2007/08	7
3 English language proficiency assessment scoring, by state, 2007/08	8
4 Methods of grouping English language learner students to calculate AMAO 1 performance, by state, 2007/08	9

5	AMAO 1 definitions of student progress, by state, 2007/08	9
6	AMAO 1 state and subgrantee percentage threshold targets for progress toward proficiency, 2007/08	10
7	AMAO 1 accountability determinations, by state, 2007/08	11
8	Methods of grouping English language learner students to calculate AMAO 2 performance, by state, 2007/08	11
9	AMAO 2 definitions of English proficiency, by state, 2007/08	12
10	AMAO 1 state and subgrantee percentage threshold targets for proficiency, 2007/08	13
11	AMAO 2 accountability determinations, by state, 2007/08	13
12	Minimum number of students in subgroup needed to trigger Title I adequate yearly progress reporting, by state, 2007/08	14
13	Assessments used to measure progress toward Title I adequate yearly progress targets, by state, 2007/08	15
14	AMAO 3 accountability determinations, by state, 2007/08	16
D1	Enrollment of English language learner students and students receiving Title III services, by state, 2007/08	22
D2	Languages most commonly spoken by K–12 English language learner students, by state, 2007/08	22
E1	English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in Alabama, 2007/08	23
E2	Title III subgrantees in Alabama, 2007/08	23
E3	Grade spans, tiers, and language domains assessed by ACCESS for ELLs in Alabama, 2007/08	23
E4	Types of scores generated by ACCESS for ELLs in Alabama, 2007/08	24
E5	Proficiency cohorts for AMAO 1 calculations in Alabama, 2007/08	24
E6	Definitions of student progress toward AMAO 1 in Alabama, 2007/08	24
E7	AMAO 1 target and determinations in Alabama, 2007/08	25
E8	AMAO 2 targets and determinations in Alabama, 2007/08	25
E9	Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Alabama, 2007/08	26
E10	Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Alabama, 2007/08	26
E11	Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Alabama, 2007/08	26
E12	Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Alabama, 2007/08	26
E13	AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Alabama, 2007/08	26
E14	English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in Florida, 2007/08	27
E15	Title III subgrantees in Florida, 2007/08	27

E16	Grade spans and language domains assessed by the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment in Florida, 2007/08	27	
E17	Types of scores generated by the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment in Florida, 2007/08	28	
E18	AMAO 1 targets and determinations in Florida, 2007/08	28	
E19	AMAO 2 targets and determinations in Florida, 2007/08	28	
E20	Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Florida, 2007/08		29
E21	Assessment used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Florida, 2007/08	29	
E22	Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Florida, 2007/08	29	
E23	Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Florida, 2007/08	29	
E24	AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Florida, 2007/08	30	
E25	English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in Georgia, 2007/08		30
E26	Title III subgrantees in Georgia, 2007/08	31	
E27	Proficiency cohorts for AMAO 1 calculations in Georgia, 2007/08	31	
E28	AMAO 1 target and determinations in Georgia, 2007/08	31	
E29	AMAO 2 target and determinations in Georgia, 2007/08	32	
E30	Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Georgia, 2007/08		32
E31	Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Georgia, 2007/08	32	
E32	Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Georgia, 2007/08	32	
E33	Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Georgia, 2007/08	32	
E34	AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Georgia, 2007/08	33	
E35	English language students and students receiving Title III services in Mississippi, 2007/08		33
E36	Title III subgrantees in Mississippi, 2007/08	34	
E37	Grade spans and language domains assessed by the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test in Mississippi, 2007/08	34	
E38	Types of scores generated by the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test in Mississippi, 2007/08		34
E39	AMAO 1 targets and determinations in Mississippi, 2007/08	35	
E40	AMAO 2 targets and determinations in Mississippi, 2007/08	35	
E41	Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Mississippi, 2007/08		36
E42	Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Mississippi, 2007/08	36	

E43	Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Mississippi, 2007/08	36	
E44	Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Mississippi, 2007/08	37	
E45	AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Mississippi, 2007/08	37	
E46	English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in North Carolina, 2007/08	38	
E47	Title III subgrantees in North Carolina, 2007/08	38	
E48	Grade spans and language domains assessed by the IDEA English Language Proficiency Test in North Carolina, 2007/08	38	
E49	Types of scores generated by the IDEA English Language Proficiency Test in North Carolina, 2007/08	39	
E50	AMAO 1 target and determinations in North Carolina, 2007/08	39	
E51	AMAO 2 target and determinations in North Carolina, 2007/08	39	
E52	Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress test in North Carolina, 2007/08	39	
E53	Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in North Carolina, 2007/08	40	
E54	Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in North Carolina, 2007/08	40	
E55	Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in North Carolina, 2007/08	40	
E56	AMAO 3 accountability determinations in North Carolina, 2007/08	40	
E57	English language students and students receiving Title III services in South Carolina, 2007/08	41	
E58	Title III subgrantees in South Carolina, 2007/08	41	
E59	Grade spans and language domains assessed by the English Language Development Assessment in South Carolina, 2007/08	42	
E60	Types of scores generated by the English Language Development Assessment in South Carolina, 2007/08	42	
E61	AMAO 1 target and determinations in South Carolina, 2007/08	42	
E62	AMAO 2 target and determinations in South Carolina, 2007/08	42	
E63	Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in South Carolina, 2007/08	43	
E64	Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in South Carolina, 2007/08	43	
E65	Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in South Carolina, 2007/08	43	
E66	Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in South Carolina, 2007/08	43	
E67	AMAO 3 accountability determinations in South Carolina, 2007/08	43	

This report overviews key elements of the Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) in the Southeast Region states for 2007/08: number and type of Title III subgrantees, English language proficiency assessments used, and state and subgrantee performance in meeting AMAO accountability targets.

WHY THIS STUDY?

This report details Title III accountability policies and outcomes for K–12 English language learner (ELL) students for school year 2007/08 in the six Southeast Region states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina; for definitions of key terms, see box 1). It intends to inform the work of states as they revise these required accountability policies—known as annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO)—for monitoring the achievement of students not yet fluent in English.

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 specifies two accountability provisions for ELL student academic achievement: Title III AMAOs and Title I adequate yearly progress reports. The Title III AMAO provision is the accountability mechanism for states and their subgrantees that receive Title III funds (No Child Left Behind 2001, 2002a, 2008b). The Title I adequate yearly progress provision is the general accountability mechanism for all students, including ELL students.

Title III formula grants are disbursed annually to state education agencies, which provide subgrants to eligible entities—typically districts—that serve ELL students. Title III funds are meant to improve programs and education outcomes for ELL students, so that they can attain English proficiency, develop high academic attainment in English, and meet the same state academic content and achievement standards that all children are expected to meet (No Child Left Behind 2002a). State education agencies use these funds to establish English language proficiency standards and assessments for ELL students, provide professional development for educators and technical assistance to subgrantees, monitor subgrantees' use of the funds, and report annually on the status of the AMAOs.¹ Subgrantees use the funds to develop and improve instructional programs for ELL students. These programs may include one or more methods of instruction grounded in scientific research. Subgrantees also use the funds to provide professional development for teachers and to annually assess

BOX 1

Key terms

Adequate yearly progress. Title I requires that states set adequate yearly progress targets in three areas: student participation in state academic assessments; student achievement in reading/English language arts and math (at a minimum), measured in grades 3–8 and once in high school (states set targets toward 100 percent proficiency by 2014); and a “second academic indicator,” typically the attendance rate for elementary and middle schools and the graduation rate for high schools. Schools and districts failing to make adequate yearly progress for multiple years face specific consequences, from offering students alternative learning opportunities to school restructuring.

Adequate yearly progress subgroups. Students are classified into subgroups based on English language learner (ELL) status, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status (determined by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch), and special education status. States, districts, and schools must report whether they meet adequate yearly progress targets for all students and for each student subgroup that meets the minimum size established by the state to generate valid statistical calculations.

Annual measurable achievement objective (AMAO) 1 (English language learner [ELL] student progress in English). The first AMAO outlined in the accountability section of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001. States and their subgrantees receiving Title III funds must report

annually whether they achieve their growth targets for the number or percentage of students demonstrating progress in English proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

AMAO 2 (ELL student English proficiency). The second AMAO outlined in the accountability section of Title III of NCLB. States and their subgrantees receiving Title III funds must report annually whether they achieve their growth targets for the number or percentage of students that attain full English proficiency.

AMAO 3 (adequate yearly progress for ELL student academic achievement). The final AMAO outlined in the accountability section of Title III of NCLB. States and their subgrantees receiving Title III funds must report annually whether they make adequate yearly progress as required by Title I of NCLB. Whereas AMAOs 1 and 2 relate specifically to English language proficiency (and are based on an English language proficiency assessment), adequate yearly progress is a measure of student academic achievement in the content areas and is based on state content area academic assessments.

English language learner (ELL) students (also referred to as *limited English proficient students* in Title III legislation). Students whose native language is not English and whose difficulties in English limit their ability to perform proficiently on the state’s achievement test, to successfully participate in classes in which only English is spoken, and to participate fully in society.

English language proficiency assessment. Tests of English language proficiency used annually by states. Title III states that these assessments must provide valid and reliable measurements of ELL student proficiency in the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. NCLB establishes requirements for how states, districts, and schools spend federal funds to maintain and improve public education.

Subgrantee. Eligible entities, typically individual districts and groups of districts that pool funds and share resources (consortia), that receive Title III funds from their state. Subgrantees use the funds to develop and improve instructional programs for ELL students, provide professional development to teachers of ELL students, and annually assess ELL students’ English proficiency.

Title I. A federal grant program for states, districts, and schools that serve high percentages of students from low-income households, from pre-K through high school. Funds can support programs and accountability measures.

Title III. A federal grant program for state education agencies to support the education of ELL students. State education agencies provide subgrants to eligible entities, usually districts, that serve ELL students. States support and monitor subgrantees’ use of the funds.

ELL student English proficiency (No Child Left Behind 2002a,c,d; U.S. Department of Education 2003).

States can define the details of their AMAOs and set the annual targets through school year 2013/14. Each year, states must report whether the state as a whole met the targets and how many of its subgrantees did so. The AMAOs are:

- AMAO 1: The number or percentage of students served by Title III demonstrating progress in English language proficiency.
- AMAO 2: The number or percentage of students served by Title III that attain full English language proficiency.
- AMAO 3: Whether the ELL student subgroup made adequate yearly progress in academic achievement, as required by Title I of NCLB.

This report addresses five research questions:

- How many and what type of Title III subgrantees did each state have in 2007/08?
- What English language proficiency assessments did each state use?
- How did each state define AMAO 1, and what accountability determinations did each state report?
- How did each state define AMAO 2, and what accountability determinations did each state report?
- How did each state define AMAO 3, and what accountability determinations did each state report?

The first two questions concern background information needed to understand AMAO policies. The last three address AMAO policies and reported determinations for the 2007/08 school year. At the time of data collection, 2007/08 was the most

recent school year for which data on policies and corresponding determinations were available for all six states. (The data sources are presented in appendix A.) Some of the English language proficiency tests were new in the states at the time of data collection, so multi-year trends could not be studied.

State education agency staff in the Southeast Region requested this report to provide a multistate perspective as they work to meet their AMAOs. Because AMAOs are new under NCLB, many states have found establishing their AMAO policies to be a challenge (American Institutes for Research 2010a,b). In 2008, the U.S. Department of Education published new Title III interpretations, clarifying AMAO requirements (box 2; Federal Register 2008; National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009a). All states have since had to review their AMAO policies to ensure compliance.

The numbers and types of Title III subgrantees, the English language proficiency assessments they use, and how AMAOs are defined vary by state, making it impossible to draw common interpretations across states or compare state

The numbers and types of Title III subgrantees, the English language proficiency assessments they use, and how AMAOs are defined vary by state

BOX 2

U.S. Department of Education 2008 revised interpretations of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

In October 2008, the U.S. Department of Education published revised interpretations of Title III, with updated requirements for state English language proficiency assessments and annual measurable achievement objectives (Federal Register 2008). These revised interpretations responded to questions from the field in recent years (U.S. Department of Education 2008). A summary of all 10 revised interpretations, adapted from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (U.S. Department of Education 2008), is in appendix C.

determinations. Therefore, this report describes, but does not compare, AMAO policies and determinations for school year 2007/08 to inform efforts of state education agency staff to help their school districts achieve the objectives.

CONTEXT FOR UNDERSTANDING TITLE III ANNUAL MEASURABLE ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES

Many states' K–12 ELL student populations have grown in recent years. Nationally, ELL student enrollment increased 57 percent over 1995–2005 (Maxwell 2009). Public schools educated 4.7 million ELL students in 2007/08, almost 10 percent of national public school enrollment (American Institutes for Research 2010a). Of these 4.7 million, 4.4 million (94 percent) were enrolled in districts receiving Title III funds in 2007/08 (American Institutes for Research 2010b). For fiscal year 2008, the federal government awarded states \$78.1 million in Title III funds (U.S. Department of Education n.d.a).

Increases in the number of ELL students are expected to continue, with immigrant and ELL students projected to account for most of the growth in the U.S. school-age population over the next decade (Fry 2008). The Southeast Region in particular is recognized as a new immigrant destination (Anderson 2009; Zúñiga and Hernandez-Leon 2005). It already has the second-largest K–12 ELL student population in the country after the West Region (Meyer, Madden, and McGrath 2004). (See appendix D for data on ELL enrollment and languages spoken by ELL students in the Southeast Region states in 2007/08.)

ELL students across the country have lagged behind national averages in achievement. The results of the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)—“the nation’s report card”—show wide disparities (National Assessment of Educational Progress 2009). On the NAEP math test,

just 12 percent of grade 4 ELL students scored at or above proficiency, compared with 38 percent of all students in the country. In grade 8, just 5 percent of ELL students scored at or above proficiency, compared with 33 percent of all students (National Center for Education Statistics 2009a). On the NAEP reading test, just 6 percent of grade 4 ELL students scored at or above proficiency, compared with 32 percent of all students. And in grade 8, just 3 percent of ELL students scored at or above proficiency, compared with 30 percent of all students (National Center for Education Statistics 2009b).

Given such wide disparities in achievement, improving education outcomes for ELL students has become a vital policy concern for states and an increasing challenge for districts (American Institutes for Research 2010b,c). To address lagging achievement, many states and districts have increased efforts to train teachers of ELL students and to launch new ELL instruction initiatives (Honowar 2009).

Although all 50 states implement AMAOs, this type of accountability was new for states under Title III of the NCLB Act (American Institutes for Research 2010a). Thus, as states set out to make the complex sequence of decisions underlying the development of their AMAO policy, little information was available to support them. One initial challenge for states was selecting an English language proficiency assessment to measure ELL student progress (AMAO 1) and proficiency (AMAO 2). NCLB requires that state English language proficiency assessments measure growth over time and align with state academic content standards. Before NCLB, many states either used an English language proficiency assessment designed only for student placement (that is, not for measuring growth over time) or did not have an English language proficiency assessment at all (American Institutes for Research 2010a).

A second challenge for states was how to define ELL student progress and proficiency (American Institutes for Research 2010a; Linqunti and George 2007; Linqunti 2007; Cook et al. 2008).

One initial challenge for states in developing their AMAO policies was selecting an English language proficiency assessment to measure ELL student progress and proficiency

States had to decide how much annual improvement in English proficiency is required to “make progress” and what scores on the English language proficiency assessment would be used to determine progress and to establish “proficiency,” as well as estimate the time students needed to reach this point.² The findings in this report detail how the six Southeast Region states dealt with these complexities.

The methodology for this study involved organizing and presenting information from multiple publicly available documents from each state (box 3). (The methodology is described in detail in appendix A; state profiles are in appendix E.)

FINDINGS

This section describes the key elements of the Title III AMAOs in the Southeast Region states for school year 2007/08:

- *Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees.* States varied in the type and number of Title III subgrantees reported in 2007/08. Subgrantees included districts, consortia (groups of districts that join together to pool funds and share resources), and a charter school (North Carolina). The number of subgrantees varied from 23 in Mississippi to 85 in North Carolina. States made subgrants to these entities based on how many ELL students they served (the minimum award was \$10,000; U.S. Department of Education n.d.b).
- *English language proficiency assessments used.* Five different English language proficiency assessments were used across the six states. The assessments differed in their format, language domains assessed, and scores generated.
- *Definition of and accountability determinations for AMAO 1.* The six states differed in how they grouped students for calculations,

BOX 3

Data sources and methodology

This report draws on the following types of documents:

- Consolidated state accountability workbooks (documents outlining each state’s plan for meeting the requirements for state accountability systems under the No Child Left Behind [NCLB] Act of 2001).
- Consolidated state performance reports (the annual reporting tool for each state to report data on its implementation of the various components of NCLB).
- State English language proficiency assessment information.

- State-reported annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) policy documents and determinations data.

Most documents were accessed through state education agency websites. Some documents were sent to the researchers by state Title III staff. State staff were informed of the study’s purpose and how the data were to be used.

Once the source documents for each state were gathered, a protocol was used to organize each state’s information on the number and type of Title III subgrantees, the English language proficiency assessments used, how students were counted in calculations of determinations, the parameters used to define each AMAO, the annual targets, and the actual reported determinations for subgrantees and

for the state in 2007/08. (A copy of the protocol is in appendix B.) In a few cases, a state had inconsistencies across its source documents. (For example, the number of subgrantees meeting one of the AMAOs, as reported in a state’s consolidated state performance report, did not match that in the state’s determinations data, as posted on the state education agency website.) In such cases, researchers contacted the state education agency Title III director to resolve the inconsistency.

This methodology has several limitations. The report describes AMAOs in just six states for one year; its findings may not reflect other states or the same states in other years. Some states have changed their AMAO policies since data collection was completed. These changes have been noted in endnotes. Additional changes might have been made since the report was written.

how they defined student progress, whether they set single or multiple targets, and the targets set. In addition, the definition of student progress depended on English language proficiency assessments that differed across the six states. All states but Mississippi reported meeting AMAO 1. Varying numbers of subgrantees in each state met AMAO 1.

- *Definition of and accountability determinations for AMAO 2.* The six states differed in how they grouped students for calculations, how they defined student proficiency, whether they set single or multiple targets, and the targets set. In addition, the definition of student proficiency depended on English language proficiency assessments that differed across the six states. All six states reported meeting AMAO 2. Varying numbers of subgrantees in each state met AMAO 2.
- *Definition of and accountability determinations for AMAO 3.* Each state defined AMAO 3 based on its definition of adequate yearly progress under Title I. States differed in the minimum number of students that subgrantees needed to calculate adequate yearly progress for the ELL student subgroup, the academic content area assessments used and grade levels included, and the targets set. Varying numbers of subgrantees receiving adequate yearly progress

ELL student subgroup determinations made adequate yearly progress. Five states did not report an AMAO 3 determination for district subgrantees that did not receive an adequate yearly progress ELL student subgroup determination; one state reported these districts as meeting AMAO 3 by default.

How many and what type of Title III subgrantees did each state have?

The number of subgrantees ranged from 23 in Mississippi to 85 in North Carolina (table 1). Four states (Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina) had consortia subgrantees. In four states (Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina), at least 72 percent of all districts had access to Title III funds; in Alabama, 40 percent of districts had access, and in Mississippi, 15 percent did. (See appendix E for a description of each state's subgrantee information.)

What English language proficiency assessments did each state use?

Five different English language proficiency assessments were used in the six Southeast Region states in 2007/08 (table 2).

Each assessment had different tests for different grade spans: K (or pre-K)–2, 3–5, 6–8, and 9–12.

TABLE 1

Entities receiving Title III funding, by state, 2007/08 (number, unless otherwise noted)

State	Title III subgrantees	District subgrantees	Consortium subgrantees	Districts represented in the consortia	Charter school subgrantees	Districts with access to Title III funding	Total districts	Districts with access to Title III funding (percent)
Alabama	51	49	2	4	0	53	131	40
Florida	48	48	0	0	0	48	67	72
Georgia	81	80	1	83	0	163	185	88
Mississippi	23	23	0	0	0	23	152	15
North Carolina	85	82	2	14	1	96	115	83
South Carolina	44	37	7	30	0	67	85	79

Source: Authors' review of state documents on AMAO subgrantee and determinations.

TABLE 2

English language proficiency assessment instruments used, by state, 2007/08

State	Assessment	Year first used	Assessment developer (website)
Alabama	ACCESS for ELLs	2005	World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium (www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS/index.aspx)
Florida	Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment	2006	Educational Testing Service (www.ets.org)
Georgia	ACCESS for ELLs	2006	World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium (www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS/index.aspx)
Mississippi	Stanford English Language Proficiency Test ^{a,b}	2004	Pearson Education ^c (www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8429-206)
North Carolina	IDEA English Language Proficiency Test ^b	2005	Ballard and Tighe (www.ballard-tighe.com)
South Carolina	English Language Development Assessment	2005 (grades 3–12), 2006 (grades K–2)	Council of Chief State School Officers Limited English Proficiency State Consortium for Assessment and Student Standards, in collaboration with the American Institutes for Research, the Center for the Study of Assessment Validity and Evaluation at the University of Maryland, and Measurement Incorporated (http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Assessment/old/assessment/programs/elda/elda.html)

ACCESS for ELLs is Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners.

a. Mississippi used a version of the test modified expressly for the state (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010).

b. Mississippi and North Carolina joined the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium and adopted the ACCESS for ELLs assessment in 2008/09 (WIDA Consortium 2008, 2009c).

c. Mississippi acquired its assessment materials from Harcourt Assessment, Inc. in 2007/08 (Y. Gilbert, Title III State Coordinator, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Mississippi Department of Education 2007).

Source: Authors' review of state documents on English language proficiency assessment.

ACCESS for ELLs, used in Alabama and Georgia, included different versions of the test for students at different proficiency levels for each grade span (tier).

Student scores on the English language proficiency assessments displayed both similarities and differences. All the assessments generated separate domain scores for listening, speaking, reading, and writing; the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test also generated a comprehension domain score (table 3), and all generated composite scores (scores derived from combinations of domain scores). A composite score for listening/speaking provides information on a student's general oral language skills; a composite score for reading/writing provides information on a student's general literacy skills. But not all the

assessments generated the same composites. Five of the states' assessments generated an overall, or total, composite score that combined all domains. Additionally, all the assessments assigned students an English proficiency level, but how these levels divided the continuum of growth from no proficiency to the level approximating a native English speaker differed (the names and numbers of the levels varied). (See appendix E for a description of each state's English language proficiency assessments.)

How did each state define AMAO 1, and what accountability determinations did each state report?

The components of the AMAO 1 definitions of growth in the number or percentage of students demonstrating progress in English proficiency in

TABLE 3
English language proficiency assessment scoring, by state, 2007/08

State	Assessment	Language domain scores	Composite scores	Proficiency levels
Alabama	ACCESS for ELLs	Listening, speaking, reading, writing	Oral language (listening/speaking), literacy (reading/writing), comprehension (listening/reading), overall	1: Entering 2: Beginning 3: Developing 4: Expanding 5: Bridging 6: Reaching
Florida	Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment	Listening, speaking ^a , reading, writing	Oral language (listening/speaking), total	1: Beginner 2: Low intermediate 3: High intermediate 4: Proficient
Georgia	ACCESS for ELLs	Listening, speaking, reading, writing	Oral language (listening/speaking), literacy (reading/writing), comprehension (listening/reading), overall	1: Entering 2: Beginning 3: Developing 4: Expanding 5: Bridging 6: Reaching
Mississippi	Stanford English Language Proficiency Test	Listening, speaking, reading, writing, comprehension	Oral language (listening/speaking, or "social" score for students at prereading levels), total	1: Preproduction 2: Early production 3: Emergent 4: Intermediate 5: High intermediate 6: Transitional
North Carolina	IDEA English Language Proficiency Test	<i>Kindergarten</i> Reading/writing Listening/speaking <i>Grades 1–12</i> Listening, speaking, reading, writing	Comprehension (listening/reading)	1: Novice low 2: Novice high 3: Intermediate low 4: Intermediate high 5: Advanced 6: Superior
South Carolina	English Language Development Assessment	Listening, speaking, reading, writing	Comprehension (listening/reading), overall	0–1: Prefunctional 2: Beginning 3: Intermediate 4: Advanced 5: Fluent English proficient

Access for ELLs is Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners.

a. Students received separate raw scores for the listening and speaking domains. The two scores were then combined to yield a listening/speaking score and proficiency level. Listening/speaking, reading, and writing (which receive both scale scores and proficiency levels) are the domains used for Florida's AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 targets.

Source: Authors' review of state English language proficiency assessment documents.

listening, speaking, reading, and writing differed by state. The states differed in how they grouped students for calculations, how they defined student progress, whether they set single or multiple targets, and the targets set. The states used five different English language proficiency assessments, against which they defined progress. As a result, determinations cannot be interpreted consistently across states, precluding comparisons.

State definitions. To define AMAO 1, states first determined how to group students for calculations (table 4). Three states (Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina) counted all ELL students as one group. The other three (Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi) placed students in cohorts, organized either by how long students had spent in a language instruction program or by English language proficiency assessment score the previous

year. (In Alabama, the cohorts were organized by performance and grade span; in Georgia, by seven performance bands based on the previous year's ACCESS for ELLs scores.) Appendix E details the states' cohort organization.

States defined progress based on improvement in English language proficiency assessment scores in

2007/08 from those in 2006/07 (table 5). Students had to increase their score by at least one proficiency level in at least one language domain or increase their overall composite score. In Alabama and Georgia, students were required to achieve a certain minimum increase in their overall composite score, based on their cohort placement. (The actual minimum increase amounts required

TABLE 4

Methods of grouping English language learner students to calculate AMAO 1 performance, by state, 2007/08

State	All students counted together	Students counted by cohort based on		
		Previous year's English language proficiency assessment score	Previous year's English language proficiency assessment score and grade level	Number of years enrolled in a language instruction program
Alabama			✓	
Florida	✓			
Georgia ^a		✓		
Mississippi				✓
North Carolina	✓			
South Carolina	✓			

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Students were included in AMAO 1 calculations in 2007/08 only if present for the "full academic year" (present at both the fall and spring full-time equivalent attendance counts), the same mechanism used to determine state education funding for local school systems. After 2007/08, Georgia eliminated the full academic year requirement from its AMAO 1 determinations (Georgia Department of Education 2009).

Source: Authors' review of state AMAO policy documents.

TABLE 5

AMAO 1 definitions of student progress, by state, 2007/08

State	By language domain score		By overall composite score
	Increase score on English language proficiency assessment at least one level from previous year on any language domain	Increase score on English language proficiency assessment at least one level from previous year or reach proficient on every language domain	Increase overall composite score on English language proficiency assessment from previous year
Alabama			✓
Florida		✓ ^a	
Georgia			✓
Mississippi	✓ ^b		✓
North Carolina	✓		
South Carolina			✓

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. For domains that received both a scale score and a proficiency level (listening/speaking, reading, and writing).

b. Students were also considered to have made progress if they increased their overall score on the English language proficiency assessment. Students already at the transitional level (the highest proficiency level) the previous year were required to maintain that level.

Source: Authors' review of state AMAO policy documents.

for each state's cohorts are in appendix E.) In Mississippi, all students were required to increase their score by at least one level in a language domain or on the test as a whole; targets for the percentage of students expected to make progress were set for the state and subgrantees at the cohort level.

After determining how to group students for calculating AMAO 1 performance and defining student progress, states defined progress for the state and subgrantees and set annual targets. In all cases, the targets were the same for the state and subgrantees (table 6). Four states set a single target for the percentage of students served by Title III who were required to make progress toward proficiency for each subgrantee and the state, one state set separate targets for each language domain, and one set separate targets for the cohorts of students they had established. The percentage targets differed across states.

Reported accountability determinations. All states but Mississippi met their AMAO 1 targets, which differed across states (table 7).

How did each state define AMAO 2, and what accountability determinations did each state report?

AMAO 1 reports on student progress toward full English proficiency; AMAO 2 reports on students reaching full proficiency. States and their Title III subgrantees must report annually whether they achieve their targets for growth in the number or percentage of students that attain full English proficiency (AMAO 2). Together, AMAOs 1 and 2 provide accountability for increasing proficiency over time and reaching the “finish line” of fluency approximating that of a native English speaker.

As in AMAO 1, differences across states—in how they grouped students for calculations, how they defined proficiency for students, whether they set single or multiple targets, the targets they set, and the ways they assessed English language proficiency—make comparison across states impossible. Therefore, this section simply reports the findings.

State definitions. To define AMAO 2 in 2007/08, states first determined how to group students for

TABLE 6

AMAO 1 state and subgrantee percentage threshold targets for progress toward proficiency, 2007/08 (percent of students)

State	One target for all students	Separate targets by language domain	Separate targets by student cohort
Alabama	48.5		
Florida		Listening/speaking: 70 Writing: 54 Reading: 56	
Georgia	47.0 ^a		
Mississippi ^b			Two years in a language instruction program cohort: 68 Three years or more in a language instruction program cohort: 80
North Carolina	60.0		
South Carolina	20.0		

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Georgia gave a “second look” to subgrantees that did not meet the AMAO target outright. If subgrantees had a higher percentage of students making progress than they did the previous year, they were considered to have made progress (Georgia Department of Education 2008c). In 2009, Georgia modified its AMAO 1 policy to remove this second-look provision (Georgia Department of Education 2009).

b. AMAO 1 cohorts were not established for students in a language instruction program for just one year because two years of data were needed to calculate progress.

Source: Authors' review of state AMAO policy documents.

TABLE 7

AMAO 1 accountability determinations, by state, 2007/08

State	Students reported as making progress (percent)	Did state meet AMAO 1?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 1	
			Number	Percent
Alabama	55.4	Yes	44	86
Florida	Listening/speaking: 79 Writing: 63 Reading: 67	Yes	43	90
Georgia	64.1	Yes	78	96
Mississippi ^a	Not available	No	23	100
North Carolina	84.1	Yes	85	100
South Carolina	37.2	Yes	44	100

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Mississippi established two cohort targets, but it did not report separate results. Seven subgrantees met AMAO 1 based on a cross-cohort index. The state considered any subgrantee with fewer than 40 English language learner students to have met AMAO 1 by default; 16 subgrantees fell into this category. See appendix E for details.

Source: Authors' review of state federal reporting documents and AMAO subgrantee and determinations data.

calculations (table 8). Georgia and South Carolina counted all ELL students in a single group. Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and North Carolina organized students into cohorts based on how long the students had been in language instruction programs. (Florida also grouped students by grade spans.) Three of the four states using cohorts established only one cohort (students with five or more years in Alabama and North Carolina,

students with three or more years in Florida).³ Mississippi grouped all students into cohorts for students with one year, two years, or three years or more of English language instruction. A single determination was then made across the three cohorts, using a “cross-cohort index.”

States defined student proficiency based on current year English language proficiency assessment

TABLE 8

Methods of grouping English language learner students to calculate AMAO 2 performance, by state, 2007/08

State	Cohorts by years in a language instruction program				
	All counted together	One cohort: students with five years or more	One cohort: students with three years or more	Three cohorts: 1 year, 2 years, 3 years or more	Cohorts also organized by grade span (K–2, 3–5, 6–8, 9–12)
Alabama		✓			
Florida			✓		✓
Georgia	✓				
Mississippi				✓	
North Carolina ^a		✓ ^b			
South Carolina	✓				

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. North Carolina's state policy included only students who had been served for five years or more “in U.S. schools”; other states' definitions of cohorts used the phrase “in a language instructional program.”

b. Credit was given for students attaining proficiency in less than five years.

Source: Authors' review of state AMAO policy documents.

scores (table 9). Four states (Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina) defined proficiency with an overall composite score; two states (Florida and North Carolina) required students to attain a minimum score on multiple language domains.

After determining how to group students for calculating and defining proficiency, states set their annual targets for the percentage of students served by Title III that had to achieve proficiency for each subgrantee and the state to meet AMAO 2. Three states set one target; three set multiple targets (table 10). Multiple targets were set for each subgrantee and for the state separately, by grade spans, or by the number of years students had been served in a language instruction program.

Reported accountability determinations. All six states met their AMAO 2 target in 2007/08 (table 11; for illustrations of how this determination was made, see box 4).

How did each state define AMAO 3, and what accountability determinations did each state report?

Whereas states have to define AMAOs 1 and 2 “from scratch” for Title III accountability, AMAO 3 adopts the adequate yearly progress accountability measure from Title I. AMAOs 1 and 2 relate specifically to English language proficiency

and the English language proficiency assessment; adequate yearly progress is a measure of student academic achievement in content areas and is based on state content area academic assessments.

AMAO 3 requires states to report whether the state and its subgrantees made adequate yearly progress for ELL students according to state-set targets required by Title I. States, districts, and schools receiving Title I funds must report annually on whether they meet the targets for all students and for each student subgroup. Subgroups are established for adequate yearly progress by ELL status, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status (students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch), and special education status. States, districts, and schools are held accountable for achieving adequate yearly progress targets for subgroups that meet the state’s minimum size for generating valid statistical calculations (table 12).

Each subgrantee (and the state) with access to Title III funds that met its state’s minimum ELL student subgroup size was responsible for reporting adequate yearly progress for ELL students in 2007/08. Thus, although the adequate yearly progress *targets* reported here were not specific to the English language learner student subgroup (they applied to all students and to each subgroup under Title I), the AMAO 3 *determinations* reported here were the adequate yearly progress

TABLE 9

AMAO 2 definitions of English proficiency, by state, 2007/08

State	One score: reaching a certain proficiency level or overall composite score on English language proficiency assessment	Multiple scores: reaching certain scores on all language domains of English language proficiency assessment
Alabama	✓	
Florida		✓
Georgia	✓	
Mississippi	✓	
North Carolina		✓
South Carolina	✓	

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Authors’ review of state AMAO policy documents.

TABLE 10

AMAO 1 state and subgrantee percentage threshold targets for proficiency, 2007/08 (percent of students)

State	Single target	Multiple targets		
		Targets by state/subgrantee	Target by grade span cohort	Target by years student was served in language instruction program
Alabama		The state target was that 100 percent of English language learner students would attain proficiency in five years or less. Each subgrantee had its own target, set by taking as a baseline their percentage of the previous year. Each subgrantee was expected to increase performance annually, with goal of reaching 100 percent by 2013/14.		
Florida			K–2: 23 3–5: 8 6–8: 7 9–12: 7	
Georgia ^a	5.0			
Mississippi				1 year: 37 2 years: 45 3 years or more: 52
North Carolina	17.0			
South Carolina	0.5			

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Georgia also had a “second academic indicator” criterion for determining whether a district subgrantee met AMAO 2. Subgrantees that did not meet the target outright but whose performance was above the state average that year for the percentage of their students exiting English language learner services were classified as having met AMAO 2 (Georgia Department of Education 2008c).

Source: Authors’ review of state AMAO policy documents.

TABLE 11

AMAO 2 accountability determinations, by state, 2007/08

State	Students reported as reaching proficiency (percent)	Did state meet AMAO 2?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 2	
			Number	Percent
Alabama	18	Yes	43	84
Florida	K–2: 32 3–5: 19 6–8: 21 9–12: 18	Yes	33	69
Georgia	13	Yes	73	90
Mississippi	Not applicable	Yes	19 ^a	83
North Carolina	19	Yes	38	45
South Carolina	8	Yes	44	100

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Three subgrantees met AMAO 2 based on the cross-cohort index (see box 4); 16 met it by default (based on having fewer than 40 English language learner students). See the Mississippi state profile in appendix E for details.

Source: Authors’ review of state federal reporting documents and AMAO subgrantee and determinations data.

BOX 4

AMAO 2: Grouping students, defining proficiency, and setting targets

Some examples can help connect the three steps states take to move from defining AMAO 2 to reporting determinations. For instance, to be considered fluent in English in Florida, students with three or more years in an English language instruction program were expected to reach the score of proficient on all English language proficiency assessment domains. The targets were set as the percentage of students in each grade level cohort with three or more years in an English language instruction program who must reach proficiency: 23 percent in K-2, 8 percent in grades 3-5, 7 percent in grades 6-8, and 7 percent in grades 9-12.

The state reported that the following percentages were achieved: 32

percent in K-2, 19 percent in 3-5, 21 percent in 6-8, and 18 percent in 9-12, exceeding the target in each case. Hence, the state was reported as meeting AMAO 2. Florida also reported that 33 of its 48 subgrantees (69 percent) met their grade cohort targets for the percentage of students reaching proficiency, and so met AMAO 2.

To be considered proficient in Mississippi, students had to reach a single score set according to the number of years in an English language instruction program: 37 percent for the one-year cohort, 45 percent for the two-year cohort, and 52 percent for the three-years-or-more cohort. Results were not separated by these cohorts, however. For each subgrantee (and for the state), a single determination was made across the three cohorts, based on a “cross-cohort index.” Just as for AMAO 1, subgrantees made AMAO 2 either based

on the cross-cohort index or by default (for subgrantees with fewer than 40 English language learner students). Hence, combining the 3 subgrantees that made AMAO 2 based on the cross-cohort index and the 16 that made it by default yields 19 subgrantees that were reported as making AMAO 2.

When all subgrantees’ student data were aggregated (so that the state-wide number of students exceeded the 40-student minimum), the state met the three cohort targets and so was reported as meeting AMAO 2 (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Y. Gilbert, Title III State Coordinator, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c).

TABLE 12

Minimum number of students in subgroup needed to trigger Title I adequate yearly progress reporting, by state, 2007/08

State	Minimum sample size of subgroup
Alabama	40 students.
Florida	30 students and more than 15 percent of school population, or 100 students regardless of percentage of school population. For example, a school in which 40 of 500 students were English language learner students would not meet the minimum sample size, because 40 is more than 30 but less than 15 percent of 500. A school with 100 English language learner students meets the minimum regardless of the school population.
Georgia	40 students or 10 percent of students enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11, whichever is greater, or 75 students regardless of percentage of school population in grades 3-8 and 11. For example, a school of 410 students has a subgroup minimum sample size of 41 (10 percent of 410). A school with 75 English language learner students meets the minimum regardless of the school population.
Mississippi	40 students.
North Carolina	40 students or 1 percent of students tested, whichever is greater.
South Carolina	40 students.

Source: Authors’ review of state federal reporting documents.

determinations for the ELL subgroup in states and their district subgrantees that received Title III funds.

AMAO 3 definitions differed by state. The states differed in the minimum subgroup size required for calculating an adequate yearly progress subgroup calculation (see table 12). They differed in their academic content area assessments and (in high school) in the grades and courses included in calculations (table 13). States also set different targets, so common interpretations or comparisons cannot be made across states.

State definitions. Adequate yearly progress targets comprise student participation rates in state academic assessments, student academic achievement targets, and “second academic indicators” (No Child Left Behind 2002e).⁴ These components and their associated targets apply to all students and subgroups, including ELL students.

For student participation rate, the target is set by NCLB legislation. All states require that 95 percent or more of their students participate in at least the reading/language arts and math state academic assessments to meet the target.⁵

For student achievement, states must establish measures of progress and annual targets toward having all students proficient in at least reading/language arts and math by 2013/14. Adequate

yearly progress determinations must be reported for grades 3–8 and one grade in high school.

Second academic indicators, required by Title I as the third measure of success, are typically the attendance rate for elementary and middle schools and the graduation rate for high schools. See appendix E for details on each state’s second academic indicators, targets, and reported results.

Reported accountability determinations. Only two states—Alabama and Mississippi—met AMAO 3 (table 14). Determination of progress toward AMAO 3 is made in the following way, taking North Carolina as an example. In North Carolina, 96 districts had access to Title III funds—84 with enough ELL students to trigger an adequate yearly progress subgroup determination. These districts had to meet the state’s adequate yearly progress targets for ELL student subgroup participation in content area assessments, academic achievement, and second academic indicators. To meet AMAO 3 in reading/language arts, 43.2 percent of ELL grade 3–8 students in the 84 districts had to show proficiency on the end-of-course assessment, and 38.5 percent of high school students had to show proficiency on the English I and writing assessments; in math, 77.2 percent of ELL students in the 84 districts had to show proficiency on the end of grade assessment in grades 3–8, and 68.4 percent had to show proficiency on the high school math assessment. North Carolina reported that

TABLE 13
Assessments used to measure progress toward Title I adequate yearly progress targets, by state, 2007/08

State	Grades 3–8 ^a	High school
Alabama	Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test	Grade 11: Alabama High School Graduation Exam
Florida	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test	Grades 9–10: Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test
Georgia	Criterion-Referenced Competency Test	Grade 11: Georgia High School Graduation Test
Mississippi	Mississippi Curriculum Test	End-of-course assessments in algebra and English II
North Carolina	End-of-grade assessments	Grade 10: math (Algebra I end-of-course assessment) English I: end-of-course assessments Grade 10: writing assessment
South Carolina	Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test	Grades 9–12: High School Assessment Program

a. States used an alternate assessment for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Source: Authors’ review of state federal reporting documents.

TABLE 14
AMAO 3 accountability determinations, by state, 2007/08

State	Did state meet AMAO 3?	Districts with enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination		Number of districts without enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination
		Number meeting AMAO 3	Percent meeting AMAO 3	
Alabama	Yes	32	100	21
Florida	No	0	0	0
Georgia	No	46	92	113
Mississippi	Yes	23 ^a	100 ^a	^a
North Carolina	No	7	8	12
South Carolina	No	26	68	29

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. See explanation of determinations reporting for Mississippi in appendix E.

Source: Authors' review of state federal reporting documents and AMAO subgrantee and determinations data.

7 of the 84 districts (8 percent) met these targets. Twelve districts did not have enough ELL students to require an adequate yearly progress subgroup determination, so no AMAO 3 determination was reported.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

This report has several limitations. Because of the many variations in state definitions of the AMAOs, both targets and results reported have different meanings in each state, making comparisons across states impossible. The report therefore simply describes the various states' performance.

The report describes AMAOs in just six states for one year—a snapshot that may not reflect the situation in other states or in these states in other years. The report does not provide context on the AMAOs (for example, on how or why the states crafted their policies) or address the merits of AMAO policies. Some state AMAO policies have changed since data collection. Changes known to

the authors are noted in endnotes and table notes. Further changes might not be reflected.

Further research could explore how and why states define their AMAOs as they do. Second, it could examine trends in state AMAO definitions and determinations across multiple years. Such descriptive information could increase understanding of how states build and implement accountability amid the varying practical complexities of ELL student education and accountability—complexities that include differences in ELL student demographics, such as location, first language, and concentrations, and diverse policy contexts (diverse state parameters for program funding and language instruction program models, different human resource and capacity issues, and other intersecting state policy issues). Such research could also increase knowledge of state practices in ELL student accountability that could inform national policy endeavors (for example, the Common Core Standards Initiative and the next reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; American Institutes for Research 2010a; Working Group on ELL Policy 2010).

APPENDIX A DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

Study data were organized using a data organization protocol (see appendix B) and collected for school year 2007/08, the most recent year for which data on both annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) policies and reported determinations were available for all six Southeast Region states at the time of data collection.

Constructing the data organization protocol

Researchers first identified—on state education agency websites, the U.S. Department of Education website, and other sites—the information sources for the states’ AMAO policies and accountability determinations. These sources included Title III AMAO policies, descriptions of English language proficiency assessments, lists of Title III subgrantees, adequate yearly progress workbooks, consolidated state performance reports, and Title III AMAO determinations data. Reviewing these documents revealed common elements in the structure and content of the AMAO policies and determinations reporting. All the documents indicated the numbers and types of Title III subgrantees in the state, the English language proficiency assessments used, how students were grouped for calculations, the parameters used to define each AMAO, the annual targets, and the reported determinations for subgrantees and the states. The protocol was developed to systematically organize this information for each state from the resource documents.

Changes to states’ AMAO policies (such as a change in the English language proficiency assessment used) since 2007/08 were also recorded, though an exhaustive search for policy changes was not conducted. Changes were noted in the applicable sections of the protocol (and are reported as notes in the findings section and in table notes) to reinforce that this study examined information for only one school year.

Collecting the data

After the source documents were gathered, emails were sent to state Title III directors to confirm that all the correct and relevant documents for their state had been collected. Where information was not available through online searches, Title III directors were asked to provide it. These state staff were informed about the study’s purpose and how the data were to be used.

The principal investigator and the second researcher independently completed a draft protocol for one state; it was then reviewed and discussed. Discrepancies were resolved by referring back to the original state documents and agreeing on the source, information, and level of detail. The protocol was adjusted as necessary to capture information on all elements. The process was then repeated for the other five states. Where questions or discrepancies could not be resolved by consulting the source documents (for example, when two source documents for a state had different information on the same element), state Title III directors were contacted for clarification. Their responses were incorporated into each state’s protocol. Through this process, consensus was reached for all elements in each protocol.

Analyzing the data

The finalized protocol for one state was used to develop a narrative profile describing the information corresponding to each research question. After the narrative was discussed, a third reviewer read it against the information in the state protocol, flagging questions or noting where clarification was needed. The profile was revised based on these reviews. Using this profile as a model, the researchers divided the rest of the states and drafted their profiles. All the drafts were then reviewed collaboratively by the two researchers and revised as necessary.

The principal investigator reviewed the profiles and drafted descriptive statements and tables

showing the information that relates to each research question. These draft statements and tables were discussed, and questions were answered by consulting the state profiles. A third reviewer read the draft statements and tables, asking questions and making suggestions for clarity. The findings were then finalized.

Once the state profiles were prepared, they were sent to the state's Title III director, who reviewed the information and provided feedback. After receiving feedback from all six states, any necessary changes were incorporated.

APPENDIX B DATA ORGANIZATION PROTOCOL

The following information was gathered for each Southeast Region state.

Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees

Element 1: How Title III subgrantees are defined in the state and the number

1. Local education agencies, number of local education agency subgrantees
2. Consortia, composition of consortia, number of consortia subgrantees
3. Number of subgrantees in state

English language proficiency assessment

Element 1: English language proficiency assessment

1. Name of assessment
2. Developer of assessment and website URL

Element 2: Assessment grade span tests, tiers, and language domains tested

1. Tiers, explanation of tiers
2. Grade spans
3. Language domains tested

Element 3: Student scores reported

1. Domains
2. Composite or overall/total score, explanation of how score was calculated
3. Proficiency levels

AMAO 1 progress definition

Element 1: How students are counted in calculations

1. Grouped together
2. Placed in cohorts
 - a. By number of years receiving English language instruction services
 - b. By performance band
 - c. By grade span
 - d. Other

Element 2: How progress toward English proficiency is defined for students

1. Single score on assessment
 - a. Score on any one domain
 - b. Composite score or overall/total score
2. Multiple scores

Element 3: How progress is measured for the state and subgrantees

1. Single target percentage of students increasing proficiency level
2. Multiple targets (for example, by language domain score or cohort)
3. Additional criteria (for example, “second look” in Georgia)

Element 4: AMAO 1 percentage targets

AMAO 2 proficiency definition

Element 1: How students are counted in calculations

1. Grouped together
2. Place in cohorts
 - a. By number of years receiving English language instruction services
 - b. By performance band

- c. By grade span
- d. Other

Element 2: How reaching proficiency in English is defined for students

- 1. Single score on assessment
 - a. Score on any one domain
 - b. Composite or overall/total score
- 2. Multiple scores

Element 3: How reaching proficiency in English is defined for the state and subgrantees

- 1. Single percentage of students reaching proficiency
- 2. Multiple targets (for example, subgrantee, grade levels, years receiving Title III services)
- 3. Other criteria (for example, “second indicator” in Georgia)

Element 4: AMAO 2 percentage targets

AMAO 3 Adequate yearly progress definition

Element 1: Minimum number of students required to calculate English language learner (ELL) subgroup

- 1. Minimum sample size
- 2. Additional criteria (for example, percentage of total enrollment)

Element 2: Assessments used, grades, and courses with Title I adequate yearly progress targets

Element 3: Adequate yearly progress targets

- 1. Participation

- 2. Achievement for reading/language arts and math
- 3. Second academic indicators

AMAO 1 reported determinations

- 1. Percentage of students that made progress or description of other outcome (for example, Mississippi’s cross-cohort index)
- 2. Did state meet AMAO 1? Yes/No
- 3. Number of subgrantees meeting AMAO 1
- 4. Percentage of subgrantees meeting AMAO 1

AMAO 2 reported determinations

- 1. Percentage of students that reached proficiency or description of other outcome (for example, Mississippi’s cross-cohort index)
- 2. Did state meet AMAO 2? Yes/No
- 3. Number of subgrantees meeting AMAO 2
- 4. Percentage of subgrantees meeting AMAO 2

AMAO 3 reported determinations

- 1. Did state meet AMAO 3? Yes/No
- 2. Number and percentage of districts with enough ELL students to generate an adequate yearly progress determination that met AMAO 3
- 3. Number of districts with access to Title III funds without enough ELL students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress determination
- 4. Other notes

APPENDIX C
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION 2008
REVISED INTERPRETATIONS OF TITLE III OF
THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

In October 2008, the U.S. Department of Education revised its interpretations of No Child Left Behind Title III, making the following changes (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009a):

- States must annually assess all English language learner (ELL) students for English proficiency in the language domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. (Scores on domains may not be “banked” from one year to the next.)
- States have some flexibility in how they structure the English language proficiency assessments. Assessments may provide separate scores in each language domain, a single composite score, or both, as long as the assessment is valid and reliable for meaningfully assessing student progress and proficiency.
- States must include all ELL students served by Title III in Title III accountability. The only exceptions are ELL students who have not participated in two administrations of the states’ annual English language proficiency assessment (annual measurable achievement objective [AMAO] 1) and ELL students excluded from adequate yearly progress determinations under normal Title I rules (AMAO 3).
- States have flexibility in determining progress in English proficiency. At a minimum, AMAO 1 must include all ELL students served by Title III with two measures on the state’s annual English language proficiency assessment. If a student does not have two measures from which to determine progress, the state may propose an alternative, valid, and reliable method for calculating progress.
- States have flexibility in defining English proficiency for accountability under Title III but are strongly encouraged to use the same definition they use to exit students from the ELL student subgroup under Title I.
- States may use a minimum subgroup size for Title III accountability (the minimum number of ELL students served needed to trigger the reporting requirement), but it must be the same as that approved under Title I. (States may apply minimum sample size to the ELL student subgroup in general, not to separate cohorts of ELL students established in AMAO policies.)
- States may use the adequate yearly progress determination for the ELL student subgroup under Title I for Title III AMAO 3 accountability.
- States may establish separate AMAO targets for ELL student cohorts, based on how long (for example, number of years) the students have had access to Title III language instruction services.
- States have flexibility in making accountability determinations for Title III consortia. States can decide whether to treat consortia that consist of more than one district as a single entity or as separate entities for accountability.
- States must implement corrective actions as required under Title III for every district for every year. States must annually inform their districts when they do not meet AMAO targets, communicate this information to parents of ELL students, and implement required technical assistance and consequences.

**APPENDIX D
ENROLLMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
LEARNER STUDENTS AND FIRST LANGUAGE**

TABLE D1
Enrollment of English language learner students and students receiving Title III services, by state, 2007/08

State	English language learner students			Number of students receiving Title III services	Number of Title III students taking state English language proficiency assessment
	Number enrolled in K-12	Percentage of total enrollment	Percentage growth in K-12 enrollment, 1995/96-2005/06		
Alabama	19,508	3	263	16,816	16,816
Florida	268,207	10	60	161,445	117,771
Georgia	79,894	5	252	65,815	60,129
Mississippi	5,428	1	73	4,664	2,683
North Carolina	114,620	8	346	113,011	101,713
South Carolina	29,907	4	688	27,244	28,129

Source: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b; American Institutes for Research 2010b; authors' analysis of state federal reporting documents.

TABLE D2
Languages most commonly spoken by K-12 English language learner students, by state, 2007/08

State	Languages
Alabama	Spanish, Korean, Arabic, Vietnamese, Russian
Florida	Spanish, Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Vietnamese, Arabic, Chinese, French
Georgia	Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean, other African languages, Chinese
Mississippi	Spanish, Vietnamese, Arabic, Cantonese, Chinese
North Carolina	Spanish, Hmong, Vietnamese, Arabic (Egyptian), Korean
South Carolina	Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Arabic

Note: Languages are in order of number of speakers.

Source: Authors' analysis of state federal reporting documents.

**APPENDIX E
STATE PROFILES**

This appendix provides detailed information on English language learner (ELL) students as well as state and subgrantee progress toward meeting the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) in each state. All tables refer to public school students in grades K–12.

Alabama

Alabama has seen rapid growth in its K–12 ELL student population in recent years, registering a 263 percent increase over 1995/96–2005/06 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b). By 2007/08, 3 percent of all students in Alabama public schools were identified as ELL students (table E1).

The five most commonly spoken languages by Alabama’s ELL students in 2007/08 were (in order) Spanish, Korean, Arabic, Vietnamese, and Russian (Alabama State Department of Education 2008b). Alabama reported using three language instructional models to serve these students in

Title III–funded districts: sheltered instruction, sheltered immersion, content-based English as a second language, and pull-out English as a second language (Alabama State Department of Education 2008b; see appendix F).

Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees. Alabama reported 51 Title III subgrantees in 2007/08, including 2 consortia (table E2).

English language proficiency assessment used. Alabama had used Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs) to assess English proficiency since 2005 (Alabama State Department of Education n.d.b), administering the assessment to 16,816 students in 2007/08 (table E3).

Table E4 provides information on the student scores provided by ACCESS for ELLs.

AMAO 1. Alabama’s definition for AMAO 1 grouped students for calculations based on their

**TABLE E1
English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in Alabama, 2007/08**

Number of English language learner students enrolled in K–12	Percentage of total enrollment identified as English language learner students	Number of students receiving Title III services
19,508	3	16,816

Source: American Institutes for Research 2010b; Alabama State Department of Education 2008b.

**TABLE E3
Grade spans, tiers, and language domains assessed by ACCESS for ELLs in Alabama, 2007/08**

Grade spans	Tiers	Language domains assessed
Pre-K–K, 1–2, 3–5, 6–8, 9–12	A: Beginning B: Intermediate C: Advanced proficiency	Listening, speaking, reading, writing

ACCESS for ELLs is Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners.

Note: Tiers apply to each grade span of the test.

Source: WIDA Consortium n.d., 2009b.

**TABLE E2
Title III subgrantees in Alabama, 2007/08 (number, unless otherwise noted)**

Title III subgrantees	District subgrantees	Consortium subgrantees	Districts represented within the consortia	Districts with access to Title III funding	Total districts	Districts with access to Title III funding (percent)
51	49	2	4	53	131	40

Source: Alabama State Department of Education n.d.d, 2008b.

TABLE E4
Types of scores generated by ACCESS for ELLs in Alabama, 2007/08

Language domain scores	Composite scores	Proficiency level scores
Listening, speaking, reading, writing	Oral language (listening/speaking), literacy (reading/writing), comprehension (listening/reading), overall	1: Entering 2: Beginning 3: Developing 4: Expanding 5: Bridging 6: Reaching

ACCESS for ELLs is Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners.

Source: WIDA Consortium n.d., 2009b.

previous year’s ACCESS for ELLs score. These *proficiency cohorts* were organized in score spans, defined as successive ranges on the overall composite score (ALSDE n.d.b; table E5).

Students were considered to have made progress if they met Alabama’s adequate progress in language acquisition targets (Alabama State Department of Education n.d.b). These targets required that students meet the established minimum gain in their overall ACCESS for ELLs composite score from one year to the next, based on their proficiency cohort and grade level. For example, in 2006/07 a grade 3 student who received a 2.2 overall composite score on the ACCESS for ELLs (proficiency cohort 2) would have needed to score at least 3.0 (2.2 plus the required minimum gain

of 0.8) to meet the targets for 2007/08 (table E6). In 2007/08, subgrantees and the state had to meet the same single percentage target of students served by Title III to meet AMAO 1 (G. deJong, Administrator, Federal Programs, Alabama

TABLE E5
Proficiency cohorts for AMAO 1 calculations in Alabama, 2007/08

Proficiency cohort	ACCESS for ELLs overall composite score span
1	1.2–2.0
2	2.1–2.8
3	2.9–3.5
4	3.6–4.1
5	4.2–4.7
6	4.8–5.3
7	5.4–6.0

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective. ACCESS for ELLs is Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners.

Source: Alabama State Department of Education n.d.b.

TABLE E6
Definitions of student progress toward AMAO 1 in Alabama, 2007/08

Grade span	Proficiency cohort in 2006/07	Minimum gain in ACCESS for ELLs overall composite score required to make adequate progress in language acquisition
K-2	1-2	1.0
	3	0.8
	4	0.6
	5	0.4
3-5	1-2	0.8
	3	0.6
	4	0.4
	5	0.2
6-8	1-2	0.6
	3	0.4
	4	0.3
	5	0.2
9-12	1-2	0.5
	3	0.4
	4	0.3
	5	0.2

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective; ACCESS for ELLs is Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners.

Source: Alabama State Department of Education n.d.b.

TABLE E7

AMAO 1 target and determinations in Alabama, 2007/08

Students making progress (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 1?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 1	
Target	Actual		Number	Percent
48.5	55.4	Yes	44	86

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Alabama State Department of Education 2008a.

TABLE E8

AMAO 2 targets and determinations in Alabama, 2007/08

Target for students with five or more years in a language instruction program	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 2		Did state meet AMAO 2?
	Number	Percent	
<i>Subgrantee</i> Each subgrantee had its own target, set by taking as a baseline the percentage of students that achieved proficiency the previous year. Each subgrantee was expected to increase the percentage of students reaching proficiency annually toward 100 percent by 2014. (No guidelines on the required increase were published.)	43	84	na
<i>State</i> All English language learner students attain proficiency in five years or less.	na	na	Yes

na is not applicable; AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Cook et al. 2008; Alabama State Department of Education 2008a.

Department of Education, personal communication, August 10, 2009).

Alabama met AMAO 1 in 2007/08, with 55.4 percent of students making progress (table E7).

AMAO 2. Alabama's definition of AMAO 2 in 2007/08 grouped students into cohorts by the number of years they had been served in a language instruction program and included only the cohort with five or more years of instruction (Alabama State Department of Education n.d.b).⁶ Students were considered proficient when they received an ACCESS for ELLs overall composite score of 4.8 or higher on the tier B or tier C exam (Alabama State Department of Education). Individual subgrantees and the state each had to meet

its own target of students reaching proficiency. Alabama and 84 percent of its subgrantees met AMAO 2 in 2007/08 (table E8).

AMAO 3. To trigger the need for an AMAO 3 determination, schools in Alabama had to have at least 40 ELL students (Alabama State Department of Education 2008a).

Alabama used two main instruments to measure student progress (table E10).

Both Alabama and its districts with access to Title III funds that had enough ELL students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination met AMAO 3 in 2007/08 (table E13).

TABLE E9
Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Alabama, 2007/08 (percent)

Target	Reported
95	99

Source: Alabama State Department of Education n.d.c.

TABLE E10
Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Alabama, 2007/08

Grade span	Assessment
3-8 ^a	Alabama reading and mathematics test
High school	Grade 11: Alabama high school graduation exam

a. An alternate assessment was used for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Source: Alabama State Department of Education 2008b.

TABLE E11
Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Alabama, 2007/08 (percent proficient or advanced)

Grade	Reading/language arts		Math	
	Target	Reported	Target	Reported
3	77	71.3	68	65.0
4	77	69.9	72	64.3
5	77	63.7	65	58.5
6	81	66.7	56	49.8
7	68	43.5	49	35.7
8	59	41.0	55	49.3
11	86	84.1	77	75.4

Source: Alabama State Department of Education n.d.a, 2008b.

TABLE E12
Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Alabama, 2007/08 (percent)

Grade level	Indicator	Target	Reported
Elementary and middle school	Attendance	95	97
High schools	Graduation rate	90 or Improvement toward target	83

Source: Alabama State Department of Education n.d.a.

TABLE E13
AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Alabama, 2007/08

Did state meet AMAO 3?	Districts with access to Title III funding with enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination		Number of districts with access to Title III funding without enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination (no AMAO 3 determination reported)	Number of districts with access to Title III funding
	Number meeting AMAO 3	Percent meeting AMAO 3		
Yes	32	100	21	53

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Alabama State Department of Education n.d.d, 2008a.

Florida

Florida has long been a state with one of the highest numbers of ELL students (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b). Over 1995/96–2005/06, the number of ELL students in K–12 public schools rose 60 percent (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b). In 2007/08, 10 percent of all students enrolled in Florida public schools were enrolled in ELL programs (table E14).

The seven languages most commonly spoken by Florida’s ELL students in 2007/08 were (in order) Spanish (by far the most common), Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Vietnamese, Arabic, Chinese, and French (Florida Department of Education 2008a). The state reported using six language instruction models to serve these students in Title III–funded districts: sheltered English, sheltered core/basic subject areas, mainstream/inclusion (English), mainstream/inclusion (core/basic subject areas), one-way developmental bilingual education, and dual language (Florida Department of Education 2008a; see appendix F).

Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees. In 2007/08, Florida reported having 48 Title III subgrantees (table E15).

English language proficiency assessment used. To assess English proficiency for ELL students in 2007/08, Florida used the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA), developed by a consortium of five states (Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee), Accountability Works, and the Educational Testing Service (Florida Department of Education n.d.c). Florida had used this assessment since 2006. In 2007/08, 117,771 students were administered the assessment. Table E16 provides basic information on the format of the assessment and language domains assessed.

Table E17 provides information on the student scores provided by the CELLA.

AMAO 1. Florida’s 2007/08 AMAO 1 definition grouped all ELL students together for calculations (Florida Department of Education n.d.c). Students were considered to have made progress if they increased their proficiency level or reached proficiency in all three CELLA domains (listening/speaking, writing, and reading; Florida

TABLE E14
English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in Florida, 2007/08

Number of English language learner students enrolled in K–12	Percentage of total enrollment identified as English language learner students	Number of students receiving Title III services
268,207	10	161,445

Source: Florida Department of Education 2008a; American Institutes for Research 2010b.

TABLE E16
Grade spans and language domains assessed by the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment in Florida, 2007/08

Grade spans	Language domains assessed
K–2, 3–5, 6–8, 9–12	Listening, speaking, reading, writing

Source: Florida Department of Education n.d.b.

TABLE E15
Title III subgrantees in Florida, 2007/08 (number, unless otherwise noted)

Title III subgrantees	District subgrantees	Consortium subgrantees	Districts with access to Title III funding	Total districts	Districts with access to Title III funding (percent)
48	48	0	48	67	72

Source: Florida Department of Education 2008a,c,d,e.

TABLE E17

Types of scores generated by the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment in Florida, 2007/08

Language domain scores	Composite scores	Proficiency level scores
Listening, speaking, reading, writing	Oral language (listening/speaking), ^a total	1: Beginner 2: Low intermediate 3: High intermediate 4: Proficient

a. Students receive separate raw scores for listening and speaking. The scores are then combined for a listening/speaking scale score and proficiency level. The listening/speaking, reading, and writing skill areas receiving both scale scores and proficiency levels are the “domains” used for Florida’s AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 targets.

Source: Florida Department of Education n.d.b.

Department of Education n.d.c). Progress for subgrantees and the state required meeting a target for the percentage of all students making progress in each of the three language domains (table E18).

AMAO 2. Florida’s 2007/08 AMAO 2 definition grouped students into cohorts by the number of years they had been served in a language instruction program and included only the cohorts of students with more than three years’ instruction.⁷ Florida grouped these students into grade-level

cohorts (K–2, 3–5, 6–8, and 9–12). Students were considered proficient when they received a proficient scale score and proficiency level on the CELLA in listening/speaking, writing, and reading (Florida Department of Education n.d.c). The state and subgrantees had to meet targets for each grade-level cohort (table E19).

AMAO 3. To trigger the need for an AMAO 3 determination, Florida schools had to have at least 30 ELL students or enough students to account

TABLE E18

AMAO 1 targets and determinations in Florida, 2007/08

Domain	Students making progress (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 1?	Title III subgrantees meeting AMAO 1	
	Target	Actual		Number	Percent
Listening/speaking	70	79	Yes	43	90
Writing	54	63			
Reading	56	67			

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Florida Department of Education 2008a,c.

TABLE E19

AMAO 2 targets and determinations in Florida, 2007/08

Grade span	Students with more than three years in a language instruction program reaching proficiency (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 2?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 2	
	Target	Actual		Number	Percent
K–2	23	32	Yes	33	69
3–5	8	19			
6–8	7	21			
9–12	7	18			

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Florida Department of Education n.d.c, 2008a,d.

for at least 15 percent of the school population; schools with at least 100 ELL students had to show progress on AMAO 3 regardless of the size of the school. Thus, a school of 500 students with 40 ELL students would not meet the minimum size, because the number of ELL students is less than 15 percent of the total. A school of 3,000 students with 100 ELL students would meet the minimum, even though the proportion of students is less than 15 percent (Florida Department of Education 2008b). Florida reported 98 percent of students participating in both the reading and math tests (table E20).

Florida used a single instrument, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, to assess student progress (table E21).

The state’s student achievement targets were set for the percentages of students reaching proficient or advanced levels in reading/language arts and math (table E22).

Florida did not meet the AMAO 3 accountability determination (table E24).

TABLE E20
Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Florida, 2007/08 (percent)

Target	Reported
95	Reading: 98 Math: 98

Source: Florida Department of Education n.d.a.

TABLE E21
Assessment used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Florida, 2007/08

Grade span	Assessment
3–8 ^a	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test
9–10	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

a. An alternate assessment was used for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Source: Florida Department of Education 2008b.

TABLE E22
Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Florida, 2007/08 (percent proficient or advanced)

Grade span	Reading/language arts		Math	
	Target	Reported	Target	Reported
3–8 and 9–10	58	37	62	47

Source: Florida Department of Education n.d.a, 2008b.

TABLE E23
Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Florida, 2007/08

Grade level	Indicator	Target	Reported (percent)
Grades 4, 8, and 10	Florida Writes assessment	More than 90 percent of students attain proficient score of 3.0 or If less than 90 percent, results improve by at least 1 percentage point from previous year	81
High school	Graduation rate	More than 85 percent or If less than 85 percent, results improve by at least 1 percentage point from previous year	48

Source: Florida Department of Education n.d.a.

TABLE E24
AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Florida, 2007/08

Did state meet AMAO 3?	Districts with access to Title III funding with enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly subgroup determination		Number of districts with access to Title III funding without enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination (no AMAO 3 determination reported)	Number of districts with access to Title III funding
	Number meeting AMAO 3	Percent meeting AMAO 3		
No	0	0	0	48

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.
 Source: Florida Department of Education 2008e.

Georgia

Georgia has seen rapid growth in its ELL student population in recent years. Over 1995/96–2005/06, the number of ELL students in K–12 public schools rose 252 percent (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b). In 2007/08, 5 percent of all public school students were identified as ELL students (table E25).

The most common languages spoken by Georgia’s ELL students in 2007/08 were (in order) Spanish (by far the most common), Vietnamese, Korean, other African languages, and Chinese (Georgia Department of Education 2008a). Georgia reported using five language instruction models to serve students in Title III–funded districts: sheltered instruction, content-based English as a second language, pull-out English as a second language, push-in English as a second language, and the *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol* (Georgia Department of Education 2008a; see appendix F).

Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees. Georgia reported having 81 Title III subgrantees in 2007/08 (table E26).

English language proficiency assessment used.

Georgia used ACCESS for ELLs to assess English language proficiency (Georgia Department of Education 2008c, 2009). (See tables E3 and E4 for information on the format of the assessment, the language domains assessed, and the types of scores generated.) It had used this assessment since 2006. In 2007/08, 60,129 students served by Title III were assessed (Georgia Department of Education 2008a).

AMAO 1. Georgia’s AMAO 1 definition grouped students into cohorts based on their previous year’s ACCESS for ELLs assessment score.⁸ Students were placed into seven cohorts, which Georgia called *performance bands*, based on composite scores (table E27).

Students were considered to have made progress if they met Georgia’s annual progress in English language acquisition target, requiring that students move from one performance band to the next (by increasing their ACCESS for ELLs overall composite score by a certain amount) each year (Georgia Department of Education 2008c). For example, a student who scored 2.4 in 2006/07, in performance

TABLE E25
English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in Georgia, 2007/08

Number of English language learner students enrolled in K–12	Percentage of total enrollment identified as English language learner students	Number of students receiving Title III services
79,894	5	65,815

Source: Georgia Department of Education n.d.b, 2008a,d; American Institutes for Research 2010b.

TABLE E26

Title III subgrantees in Georgia, 2007/08 (number, unless otherwise noted)

Title III subgrantees	District subgrantees	Consortium subgrantees	Districts represented within the consortia	Districts with access to Title III funding	Total districts	Districts with access to Title III funding (percent)
81	80	1	83	163	185	88

Source: Georgia Department of Education n.d.b, 2008d.

TABLE E27

Proficiency cohorts for AMAO 1 calculations in Georgia, 2007/08

Proficiency cohort (performance band)	ACCESS for ELLs overall composite score range
1	1.0–2.2
2	2.3–3.3
3	3.4–3.9
4	4.0–4.3
5	4.4–4.6
6	4.7–4.9
7	5.0+

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective; ACCESS for ELLs is Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners.

Source: Georgia Department of Education 2009.

band 2, would need to move to performance band 3 (or higher) by scoring at least 3.4 on the assessment to demonstrate progress in 2007/08.

Progress for the state and subgrantees was measured by a single percentage target of students served by Title III making progress. Beginning in 2007/08, when three consecutive years of ACCESS for ELLs data were available, Georgia created a “second look” criterion for district determinations.

Districts not meeting the AMAO 1 target outright were considered to have met AMAO 1 if they demonstrated movement toward the target. Georgia and 96 percent of its subgrantees met AMAO 1 in 2007/08 (table E28).⁹

AMAO 2. Georgia’s AMAO 2 definition grouped all ELL students together for calculations (Georgia Department of Education 2008c, 2009). Students were considered proficient if they received an overall ACCESS for ELLs composite score of 5.0 or higher on the tier C exam (Georgia Department of Education 2008c, 2009). A target percentage of students served by Title III had to reach proficiency at both the state and subgrantee levels. For subgrantees not meeting the target outright, AMAO 2 was considered met if the percentage of ELL students who exited ELL services during the year was above the state average (Georgia Department of Education 2008c, 2009).¹⁰ Georgia and 90 percent of its subgrantees met AMAO 2 (table E29).

AMAO 3. To trigger the need for an AMAO 3 determination, schools in Georgia had to have at least 40 ELL students or enough to account for 10 percent of students enrolled in grades 3–8 and 11; schools

TABLE E28

AMAO 1 target and determinations in Georgia, 2007/08

Students making progress (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 1?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 1	
Target	Actual		Number	Percent
47.0	64.1	Yes	78	96

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Georgia Department of Education 2008c,d.

TABLE E29
AMAO 2 target and determinations in Georgia, 2007/08

Students reaching proficiency (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 2?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 2	
Target	Actual		Number	Percent
5.0	12.6	Yes	73	90

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Georgia Department of Education 2008c,d.

TABLE E30
Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Georgia, 2007/08 (percent)

Target	Assessment	Reported
95	Criterion-referenced competency test/math	99.9
	Criterion-referenced competency test/reading-English language arts	99.0
	Georgia high school graduation test/math	98.2
	Georgia high school graduation test/English language arts	97.8

Source: Georgia Department of Education n.d.c.

TABLE E31
Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Georgia, 2007/08

Grade span	Assessment
3-8 ^a	Criterion-referenced competency test
High school	Grade 11: Georgia high school graduation test

a. An alternate assessment was used for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Source: Georgia Department of Education 2008b.

TABLE E32
Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Georgia, 2007/08 (percent proficient or advanced)

Grade or grade span	Reading/language arts		Math	
	Target	Reported	Target	Reported
3-8	73.3	76.1	59.5	62.4
11	87.7	59.8	74.9	54.5

Source: Georgia Department of Education n.d.c.

TABLE E33
Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Georgia, 2007/08

Grade level	Indicator	Target	Reported (percent)
Elementary and middle school	Attendance	No more than 15 percent of students absent more than 15 days	3.8
High school	Graduation rate	70 percent in current year or 70 percent using a three-year average or 10 percent progress over previous year (from minimum threshold of 50 percent)	50.2

Source: Georgia Department of Education, n.d.c, 2008b.

TABLE E34
AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Georgia, 2007/08

Did state meet AMAO 3?	Districts with access to Title III funding with enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination		Number of districts with access to Title III funding without enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination (no AMAO 3 determination reported)	Total number of districts in state with access to Title III funding
	Number meeting AMAO 3	Percent meeting AMAO 3		
No	46	92	113	163

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: Georgia Department of Education 2008d; Carol Johnson, ESOL/Title III Program Specialist, Georgia Department of Education, personal communication, April 22, 2010.

with 75 ELL students were required to show progress on AMAO 3 regardless of the size of the school (Georgia Department of Education 2008b). More than 97 percent of Georgia students participated in the content area assessments (table E30).

Georgia used two main instruments to measure student progress (table E31).

Georgia met AMAO 3 in 2007/08. Among districts for which a determination was required, 46 percent met AMAO 3 (table E34).

Mississippi

Mississippi had the fewest ELL students in the Southeast Region, despite a 73 percent increase across K–12 public schools over 1995/96–2005/06 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b). In 2007/08, 1 percent of all public school students was identified as ELL students (table E35).

The five most common languages spoken by Mississippi’s ELL students in 2007/08 were (in order) Spanish (by far the most common), Vietnamese, Arabic, Cantonese, and Chinese (Mississippi Department of Education 2008b). Mississippi reported using seven types of language instruction models to serve students in Title III–funded districts: transitional bilingual, developmental bilingual, heritage language, sheltered English instruction, structured English immersion, content-based English as a second language, and pull-out English

as a second language (Mississippi Department of Education 2008b; see appendix F).

Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees. In 2007/08, Mississippi reported having 23 Title III subgrantees (table E36).

English language proficiency assessment used. To assess proficiency, Mississippi used a version of the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT), modified expressly for the state’s use by Pearson (Mississippi Department of Education 2006; K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010).¹¹ Mississippi had used this assessment since 2004. In 2007/08, 2,683 students served by Title III were administered the ELPT (Mississippi Department of Education 2008b). Table E37 provides basic information on the format of the assessment and language domains assessed.

TABLE E35
English language students and students receiving Title III services in Mississippi, 2007/08

Number of English language learner students enrolled in K–12	Percentage of total enrollment identified as English language learner students	Number of students receiving Title III services
5,428	1	4,664

Source: Mississippi Department of Education 2008b; American Institutes for Research 2010b.

TABLE E36
Title III subgrantees in Mississippi, 2007/08 (number, unless otherwise noted)

Title III subgrantees	District subgrantees	Consortium subgrantees	Districts with access to Title III funding	Total districts	Districts with access to Title III funding (percent)
23	23	0	23	152	15

Source: Mississippi Department of Education 2008b.

Table E38 provides information on the student scores provided by the ELPT assessment.

AMAO 1. Mississippi’s AMAO 1 definition grouped students into two cohorts, based on the number of years they had been in a language instruction program: students with two years and students with three or more years (Mississippi Department of Education 2006). There was no cohort for one year, because students need two years of scores to calculate progress. Students were determined to have made progress if they increased their overall score or their score on at least one of the ELPT language domains by at least one level from the previous year; students at the highest level (transitional) were expected to maintain that

level (Mississippi Department of Education 2006). Subgrantees and the state had to meet separate targets for each cohort.

Table E39 shows Mississippi’s 2007/08 AMAO 1 targets and reported determinations. Although there were two cohort targets, separate cohort percentage results were not reported, because of how the state calculated determinations. For each subgrantee (and the state), an index was created based on the two cohorts. If a cohort met the target exactly, its index was zero; if the cohort exceeded the target, its index was positive. If both cohorts met or exceeded their targets, the combined index was zero or positive, and the subgrantee was reported as having met AMAO 1. A negative value indicated that the targets were not met by both cohorts (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010).

An additional criterion was also used: Mississippi considered any subgrantee with fewer than 40 ELL students to have met the AMAO by default. This was the case for 16 of the 23 subgrantees (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education,

TABLE E37
Grade spans and language domains assessed by the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test in Mississippi, 2007/08

Grade spans	Language domains assessed
K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12	Listening, speaking, reading, writing, comprehension

Source: Pearson n.d.

TABLE E38
Types of scores generated by the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test in Mississippi, 2007/08

Language domain scores	Composite scores	Proficiency levels
Listening, speaking, reading, writing, comprehension	Oral language (listening/speaking, or “social” score for students at prereading levels), total	1: Preproduction 2: Early production 3: Emergent 4: Intermediate 5: High intermediate 6: Transitional

Source: Pearson n.d.

TABLE E39

AMAO 1 targets and determinations in Mississippi, 2007/08

Target percentage of students making progress	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 1		Did state meet AMAO 1?
	Number	Percent	
2-year cohort: 68	23	100 ^a	No ^a
3-years-or-more cohort: 80			

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Mississippi considered any subgrantee with fewer than 40 English language learner students to have met the AMAO by default. Combining the 7 subgrantees that met AMAO 1 outright and the 16 that met by default, all 23 were reported as having met AMAO 1. When all 2,683 students statewide were aggregated, however, the state did not meet either target (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c).

Source: Mississippi Department of Education 2006, 2008b.

personal communication, May 6, 2010; Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c).

AMAO 2. Mississippi's AMAO 2 definition grouped students for calculations into three cohorts, based on how long they had been enrolled in a Title III language instruction program. The one-year cohort comprised students in their first full year of English language instruction, the two-year cohort comprised students in their second full year, and the three-or-more-year cohort comprised those in their third full year and beyond (Mississippi Department of Education 2006). Students were considered to be proficient when their ELPT total score was transitional (Mississippi Department of Education 2006). To meet AMAO 2, subgrantees and the state were required to ensure that a percentage of students served by Title III in each cohort reached proficiency.

Table E40 shows Mississippi's AMAO 2 targets and reported determinations for 2007/08. Although there were three cohort targets, separate cohort percentage results were not reported, because of how the state calculated determinations. For each subgrantee (and the state), an index was created across the three cohorts. If a cohort met the target exactly, its index was zero; if it exceeded the target, its index was positive. If all three cohorts met or exceeded their targets, the combined index was zero or positive, and the subgrantee was reported as meeting AMAO 2. A negative value indicated that the targets were not met by all three cohorts (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010).

An additional criterion was also used: Mississippi considered any subgrantee with fewer than 40

TABLE E40

AMAO 2 targets and determinations in Mississippi, 2007/08

Target percentage of students reaching proficiency	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 2		Did state meet AMAO 2?
	Number	Percent	
1-year cohort: 37	19	83 ^a	Yes
2-year cohort: 45			
3-years-or-more cohort: 52			

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Combining the 3 subgrantees that met AMAO 2 outright and the 16 that met it by default, 19 were reported as having met AMAO 2. When all students were aggregated, the state met the three cohort targets (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Y. Gilbert, Title III State Coordinator, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c).

Source: Mississippi Department of Education 2006, 2008b.

ELL students to have met the AMAO by default. This was the case for 16 of the 23 subgrantees (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Y. Gilbert, Title III State Coordinator, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c).

AMAO 3. To trigger the need for an AMAO 3 determination, schools in Mississippi had to have

at least 40 ELL students (Mississippi Department of Education 2008a). In 2007/08, 99 percent of ELL students in the state participated in the content area assessments. (table E41).

Mississippi used two main instruments to measure student progress (table E42).

TABLE E41

Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in Mississippi, 2007/08 (percent)

Target	Reported
95	99

Source: Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c.

TABLE E42

Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in Mississippi, 2007/08

Grade span	Assessment
3–8 ^a	Mississippi curriculum test
High school	End-of-course assessments in algebra and English II

a. An alternate assessment was used for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Source: K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, October 30, 2009; Mississippi Department of Education 2008a.

TABLE E43

Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in Mississippi, 2007/08 (percent proficient or advanced)

Grade	Reading/language arts		Math	
	Target	Reported	Target	Reported
3	37	45	42	63
4	34	36	40	55
5	34	36	37	50
6	32	31	38	45
7	28	27	37	43
8	30	26	32	50
Grade	English II		Algebra I	
	Target	Reported	Target	Reported
9			80	
10			39	
11	31	24 ^a	24	63 ^b
12			15	

na is not applicable.

a. Mississippi used “English II data from the secondary grade span.” No particular grade level for this course was stipulated (Mississippi Department of Education 2008a, p. 56).

b. Mississippi did not report Algebra I scores for individual grades in 2007/08 (K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, October 30, 2009).

Source: Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c, 2008a; K. Thompson, Director, Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education, personal communication, October 30, 2009.

TABLE E44

Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in Mississippi, 2007/08 (percent)

Grade level	Indicator	Target	Reported
Elementary and middle school	Attendance	93 or Increase from previous year	95
High school	Graduation rate	72 or Increase from previous year	87

Source: Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c.

TABLE E45

AMAO 3 accountability determinations in Mississippi, 2007/08

Did state meet AMAO 3?	Districts meeting AMAO 3		Number of districts with access to Title III funding
	Number	Percent	
Yes	23 ^a	100 ^a	23

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

a. Mississippi considered any subgrantee with fewer than 40 English language learner students to have met the AMAO by default. Combining the 7 subgrantees that met AMAO 1 outright and the 16 that met by default, all 23 subgrantees were reported as having met AMAO 3.

Source: Mississippi Department of Education 2008b, n.d.c.

Mississippi set targets for reading/language arts and math in grades 3–8 and English II and algebra for grades 9–12 (table E43).

Mississippi reported AMAO 3 determinations differently from the other five states. Seven of its 23 district subgrantees met the AMAO for their English language learner student subgroup per Title I adequate yearly progress. Mississippi also reported the 16 district subgrantees without enough ELL students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination as having met AMAO 3 (Mississippi Department of Education n.d.c; table E45). Hence, all 23 were reported as meeting AMAO 3.

North Carolina

North Carolina has experienced extremely rapid growth in its ELL K–12 student population in recent years, with the population growing 346 percent over 1995/96–2005/06 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b). In 2007/08, 8 percent of all public school students were identified as ELL students (table E46).

The five most common languages spoken by North Carolina's ELL students in 2007/08 were (in order) Spanish (by far the most common), Hmong, Vietnamese, Arabic (Egyptian), and Korean (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction 2008b). North Carolina reported using six language instructional models to serve students in Title III–funded districts: dual language, transitional bilingual, heritage language, sheltered instruction, content-based English as a second language, and pull-out English as a second language (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction 2008b; see appendix F).

Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees. North Carolina reported having 85 Title III subgrantees in 2007/08, including 2 consortia and 1 charter school (table E47). It was the only state that had a charter school as a Title III subgrantee.

English language proficiency assessment used. To assess English proficiency for ELL students in 2007/08, North Carolina used the IDEA English Language Proficiency Test (IPT; North Carolina State Board of Education 2008; North Carolina

TABLE E46
English language learner students and students receiving Title III services in North Carolina, 2007/08

Number of English language learner students enrolled in K-12	Percentage of total enrollment identified as English language learner students	Number of students that received Title III services
114,620	8	113,011

Source: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction 2008b; American Institutes for Research 2010b.

TABLE E47
Title III subgrantees in North Carolina, 2007/08 (number, unless otherwise noted)

Title III subgrantees	District subgrantees	Consortium subgrantees	Districts represented within the consortia	Charter school subgrantees	Districts with access to Title III funding	Total districts	Districts with access to Title III funding (percent)
85	82	2	14	1	96	115	83

Source: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction n.d.d, 2008b; H. Fasciano, Title III Director, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, April 23, 2010.

TABLE E48
Grade spans and language domains assessed by the IDEA English Language Proficiency Test in North Carolina, 2007/08

Grade or grade span	Language domains assessed
Kindergarten	Reading/writing, listening/speaking
1-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12	Listening, speaking, reading, writing

Source: Ballard and Tighe 2009; George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education n.d.; North Carolina Department of Public Instruction n.d.b, 2007.

Department of Public Instruction 2008c), developed by Ballard and Tighe. North Carolina had used this assessment since 2005.¹² In 2007/08, 101,713 students served by Title III were administered the IPT. Table E48 provides basic information on the format of the assessment and language domains assessed.

Table E49 provides information on the student scores provided by the IPT.

AMAO 1. North Carolina’s AMAO 1 definition grouped all ELL students together for calculations. Students were determined to have made progress if they increased their score from the previous year by at least one level in at least one language domain (North Carolina State Board of Education 2008). Progress for subgrantees and the state was achieved when a target percentage of all students

served by Title III made progress (North Carolina State Board of Education 2008). North Carolina and all its subgrantees met AMAO 1 in 2007/08 (table E50).

AMAO 2. North Carolina’s AMAO 2 definition grouped students into cohorts by the number of years they had been in U.S. schools and included a cohort only for students that had been in U.S. schools for five years or more (with credit given for those attaining proficiency in less than five years; North Carolina State Board of Education 2008). Students were considered proficient if they achieved a score of superior in all four language domains on the test (North Carolina State Board of Education 2008). To meet AMAO 2, the state and subgrantees had to meet the same target for the percentage of all relevant students who achieved proficiency (North Carolina State

TABLE E49

Types of scores generated by the IDEA English Language Proficiency Test in North Carolina, 2007/08

Grade or grade span	Language domain scores	Composite scores	Proficiency levels
Kindergarten	Reading/writing Listening/speaking	Comprehension (listening/ reading)	1: Novice low 2: Novice high 3: Intermediate low
1–12	Listening, speaking, reading, writing		4: Intermediate high 5: Advanced 6: Superior

Source: Ballard and Tighe 2009; George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education n.d.; North Carolina Department of Public Instruction n.d.b, 2007; H. Fasciano, Title III Director, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, May 11, 2010.

TABLE E50

AMAO 1 target and determinations in North Carolina, 2007/08

Students making progress (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 1?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 1	
Target	Actual		Number	Percent
60.0	84.1	Yes	85	100

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction n.d.d, 2008b.

Board of Education 2008). North Carolina and 45 percent of its subgrantees met AMAO 2 in 2007/08 (table E51).

AMAO 3. To trigger the need for an AMAO 3 determination, schools in North Carolina had to have at least 40 ELL students or enough students to account for 1 percent of total enrollment (whichever is greater; North Carolina Department of Public Instruction 2008a). In 2007/08, 99 percent of ELL students in grades 3–8 in the state participated in content area assessments; in grade 10, 96 percent participated in the reading assessment and 95 percent in the math assessment (table E52).

North Carolina used a variety of instruments to measure student progress (table E53).

TABLE E52

Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress test in North Carolina, 2007/08

Target	Reported	
	Subject/ grade level	Percent
95	Reading 3–8	99
	Math 3–8	99
	Reading 10	96
	Math 10	95

Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction n.d.e.

TABLE E51

AMAO 2 target and determinations in North Carolina, 2007/08

Students reaching proficiency (in U.S. schools for five or more years; percent)		Did state meet AMAO 2?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 2	
Target	Actual		Number	Percent
17	19	Yes	38	45

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction n.d.d, 2008b.

TABLE E53
Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in North Carolina, 2007/08

Grade span	Assessment
3–8 ^a	End-of-grade assessments
High school	Grade 10: math (Algebra I end-of-course assessment) English I: end-of-course assessments Grade 10: writing assessment

a. An alternate assessment was used for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction n.d.e.

The state’s student achievement targets were then set for the percentages of students reaching proficient or advanced in reading/language arts and math (table E54).

North Carolina did not meet AMAO 3 for 2007/08 (table E56).

TABLE E54
Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in North Carolina, 2007/08 (percent proficient or advanced)

Grade or grade span	Reading/language arts		Math	
	Target	Reported	Target	Reported
3–8	43.2	23.1	77.2	51.9
10	38.5	27.5	68.4	49.2

Note: North Carolina used a number of instruments to assess progress of high school students. The state reported determinations for all assessments under the generic discipline areas of reading/language arts and math.

Source: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction n.d.e.

TABLE E55
Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in North Carolina, 2007/08

Grade level	Indicator	Target	Reported (percent)
Elementary and middle school	Attendance	A more than 0.1 percentage point increase from previous year up to 90 percent or Any annual fluctuation over 90 percent	96.2
High school	Graduation rate	A more than 0.1 percentage point from previous year up to 80 percent or Any annual fluctuation over 80 percent	49.9

Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction n.d.e, 2008a.

TABLE E56
AMAO 3 accountability determinations in North Carolina, 2007/08

Did state meet AMAO 3?	Districts with access to Title III funding with enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination		Number of districts with access to Title III funding without enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination (no AMAO 3 determination reported)	Number of districts with access to Title III funding
	Number meeting AMAO 3	Percent meeting AMAO 3		
No	7	8.2	12	96

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction n.d.d,e, 2008b; H. Fasciano, Title III Director, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, April 23, 2010.

South Carolina

South Carolina experienced the fastest growth of all Southeast Region states in its public school K–12 ELL student population in recent years, registering an increase of 688 percent over 1995/96–2005/06 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition 2009b). In 2007/08, 4 percent of all public school students in South Carolina were identified as ELL students (table E57).

The five most common languages spoken by South Carolina’s ELL students in 2007/08 were (in order) Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Portuguese, and Arabic (South Carolina Department of Education 2008b). South Carolina reported using six language instruction models to serve these students in Title III–funded districts: dual language, sheltered English instruction, structured English immersion, specially designed academic instruction in English, content-based English as a second language, and pull-out English as a second language (South Carolina Department of Education 2008b; see appendix F).

Numbers and types of Title III subgrantees. In 2007/08, South Carolina reported having 44 Title III subgrantees (table E58).

English language proficiency assessment used. South Carolina used the English Language Development

Assessment (ELDA) to assess the English proficiency of ELL students in 2007/08 (South Carolina Department of Education n.d.e). ELDA was developed by a consortium of 15 states that were members of the Limited English Proficiency State Consortium for Assessment and Student Standards hosted by the Council of Chief State School Officers, in collaboration with the American Institutes for Research, the Center for the Study of Assessment Validity and Evaluation at the University of Maryland, and Measurement Incorporated (Council of Chief State School Officers 2005). South Carolina had used this assessment for grades 3–12 since 2005 and for K–2 since 2006. In 2007/08, 28,129 students served by Title III were administered the ELDA. Table E59 provides basic information on the grade spans and language domains assessed.

Table E60 provides information of the student scores provided by the ELDA.

AMAO 1. South Carolina’s AMAO 1 definition grouped all ELL students together for calculations (South Carolina Department of Education n.d.e). Students were considered to have made progress if they increased their overall composite score on the ELDA one level from the previous year (South Carolina Department of Education n.d.e). Subgrantees and the state were required to meet a single target percentage of all students served by Title III (South Carolina

TABLE E57

English language students and students receiving Title III services in South Carolina, 2007/08

Number of English language learner students enrolled in K–12	Percentage of total enrollment identified as English language learner students	Number of students receiving Title III services
29,907	4	27,244

Source: South Carolina Department of Education 2008b; American Institutes for Research 2010b.

TABLE E58

Title III subgrantees in South Carolina, 2007/08 (number, unless otherwise noted)

Title III subgrantees	District subgrantees	Consortium subgrantees	Districts represented within the consortia	Districts with access to Title III funding	Total districts	Districts with access to Title III funding (percent)
44	37	7	30	67	85	79

Source: South Carolina Department of Education 2008 c,d,e.

TABLE E59
Grade spans and language domains assessed by the English Language Development Assessment in South Carolina, 2007/08

Grade spans	Language domains assessed
K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12	Listening, speaking, reading, writing

Source: Council of Chief State School Officers 2005; South Carolina Department of Education n.d.c,d, 2009a,b.

Department of Education 2008c). The state and 100 percent of its subgrantees met the target (table E61).

AMAO 2. South Carolina’s AMAO 2 definition grouped all students together for calculations (South Carolina Department of Education n.d.e). Students were categorized as proficient if they attained an overall composite score proficiency level of 5 on the ELDA (South Carolina Department of Education n.d.e). Subgrantees and the state were required to meet a single target percentage of students reaching proficiency. The state and 100 percent of its subgrantees met the target (table E62).

AMAO 3. To trigger the need for an AMAO 3 determination, schools in South Carolina had to have

TABLE E60
Types of scores generated by the English Language Development Assessment in South Carolina, 2007/08

Language domain scores	Composite scores	Proficiency levels
Listening, speaking, reading, writing	Comprehension (listening/reading), overall	0-1: Prefunctional 2: Beginning 3: Intermediate 4: Advanced 5: Fluent English proficient

Source: Council of Chief State School Officers 2005; South Carolina Department of Education n.d.c,d, 2009a,b.

at least 40 ELL students (South Carolina Department of Education 2008a). More than 99 percent of students participated in the content area assessments (table E63).

South Carolina used two main instruments to measure student progress (table E64).

The state’s student achievement targets were set for the percentages of students reaching proficient or advanced (table E65).

South Carolina did not meet AMAO 3 in 2007/08 (table E67).

TABLE E61
AMAO 1 target and determinations in South Carolina, 2007/08

Students making progress (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 1?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 1	
Target	Actual		Number	Percent
20.0	37.2	Yes	44	100

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: South Carolina Department of Education 2008b,c.

TABLE E62
AMAO 2 target and determinations in South Carolina, 2007/08

Students reaching proficiency (percent)		Did state meet AMAO 2?	Subgrantees meeting AMAO 2	
Target	Actual		Number	Percent
0.5	7.8	Yes	44	100

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: South Carolina Department of Education 2008b,d,n.d.e.

TABLE E63

Target and reported participation rates on Title I adequate yearly progress tests in South Carolina, 2007/08 (percent)

Target	Reported
95	English language arts: 99.1 Math: 99.8

Source: South Carolina Department of Education n.d.f, 2008a.

TABLE E64

Assessments used to measure Title I adequate yearly progress in South Carolina, 2007/08

Grade span	Assessment
3–8 ^a	Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test
High school	High School Assessment Program

a. An alternate assessment was used for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Source: South Carolina Department of Education 2008a.

TABLE E65

Targets and reported results for Title I adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts and math in South Carolina, 2007/08

Grade span	Reading/language arts		Math	
	Target	Reported	Target	Reported
3–8 and 9–12	45.8	37.8	42.7	40.0

Source: South Carolina Department of Education n.d.f., 2008a.

TABLE E66

Second academic indicators of adequate yearly progress in South Carolina, 2007/08

Grade level	Indicator	Target	Reported (percent)
Elementary and middle school	Attendance	94 percent or 0.1 percentage point improvement on school or district’s previous year’s attendance rate	96.6
High schools	Graduation rate	Met or exceeded previous year or Average over three years (current year and two previous academic years, when three years of data are available) meets or exceeds previous year or Meets or exceeds 88.3 percent	61.7

Source: South Carolina Department of Education n.d.f, 2008a.

TABLE E67

AMAO 3 accountability determinations in South Carolina, 2007/08

Did state meet AMAO 3?	Districts with access to Title III funding with enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination		Number of districts with access to Title III funding without enough English language learner students to generate a Title I adequate yearly progress subgroup determination (no AMAO 3 determination reported)	Number of districts with access to Title III funding
	Number meeting AMAO 3	Percent meeting AMAO 3		
No	26	68.4	29	67

AMAO is annual measurable achievement objective.

Source: South Carolina Department of Education 2008b,e.

APPENDIX F
FEATURES OF INSTRUCTION MODELS, 2007/08

The consolidated performance reports submitted by the states in 2007/08 did not describe their language instruction programs. To provide some context on what these programs might entail, the following definitions are adapted primarily from the most recent Title III Biennial Report to Congress, 2004-06 (Office of English Language Acquisition 2008). Information on inclusion/mainstream is from the Florida Department of Education (n.d.e). Information on submersion is from Leung and Franson (1989); Skutnabb-Kangas (1991); and Swain and Johnson (1997), as cited in Fazio and Lyster (1998)

Models developing literacy in English only

Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English, content/core-based English as a second language, Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol, and sheltered English instruction (core/basic)

- Students learn content in an all-English setting.
- Students from various linguistic backgrounds can be in the same class.
- Instruction is adapted to students' proficiency levels and supplemented by gestures, visual aids, and other scaffolding techniques.

Structured English immersion

- Students learn content in an all-English setting, with only ELL students in the class.
- All instruction is in English, adjusted to the proficiency level of students so that subject matter is comprehensible, using sheltered instruction techniques.
- Teachers need receptive skill in "to understand" students' first language.

Pull-out English as a second language/English language development

- Students leave their mainstream classroom to spend part of the day receiving English as a second language instruction, which often focuses on grammar, vocabulary, and communication skills in English but not on academic content.
- There is typically no support for students' native languages.

Push-in English as a second language

- Students are served in a mainstream classroom, receiving instruction in English and possibly some native language support.
- The English as a second language teacher or an instructional aide provides clarification (and translation if needed) and uses English as a second language strategies.

Inclusion; mainstream (English/core/basic)

- Instruction takes place in the mainstream classroom rather than in self-contained English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or bilingual classrooms.
- Students are provided with comprehensible instruction using either the students' native languages or ESOL strategies.

Submersion

- Instruction is entirely in English, with no attempt made to scaffold instruction.
- Teachers usually do not speak students' primary languages.

Models developing literacy in two languages

Two-way immersion or two-way bilingual

- Classes include students with an English language background and students from one other language background.
- Instruction is in both languages, typically starting with a smaller proportion of instruction in English and gradually moving to half the instruction in each language.
- Students typically stay in the program throughout elementary school.

Dual language

- “Dual language immersion” usually refers to two-way immersion or two-way bilingual education.
- “Dual language” refers to students from one language group who develop full literacy skills in their native language and English.

Heritage language instruction

- Content is taught in English and the students’ native languages, by teachers fluent in both languages.
- Instruction typically targets students who are non-English speakers or who have weak literacy skills in their native language.
- Instruction can support endangered minority languages.

Transitional bilingual, developmental bilingual, late exit transitional, early exit transitional, and one-way developmental bilingual

- Instruction at lower grades is in students’ native languages, gradually transitioning to English; students typically transition into mainstream classrooms with their English-speaking peers.
- Differences among programs focus on the degree of literacy students develop in their native languages and how long they spend in the bilingual classroom before transitioning.

NOTES

1. States must hold their subgrantees accountable for meeting their AMAOs (No Child Left Behind 2002d). If a subgrantee fails to meet the three AMAOs for two consecutive years, the state education agency must require the subgrantee to develop an improvement plan specifying how the subgrantee will work to meet the AMAOs, provide technical assistance to the subgrantee, and develop collaborative professional development strategies and activities, grounded in scientific research. If a subgrantee fails to meet the AMAOs for four consecutive years, the state education agency must require the subgrantee to modify the curriculum, program, and method of instruction, make a determination regarding whether the subgrantee may continue to receive Title III funding, and require the subgrantee to replace education personnel involved with failing to meet the objectives.
2. Acquiring a new language for academic purposes takes a long time. Some experts have posited a typical timeframe of four to five full academic years (for example, Working Group on ELL Policy 2010), but debate continues on the issue (see, for example, Collier 1995; Hakuta, Butler, and Witt 2000).
3. This study does not address why states defined their AMAOs the way they did. It may be that these states decided to include only these cohorts of students in AMAO 2, based on the assumption that students need at least three to five years in a language instruction program to reach full proficiency. (That is, students with fewer years would not yet have had enough time to make enough progress to be expected to reach full proficiency by the end of a school year.)
4. State adequate yearly progress plans have multiple levels of detail, beyond the scope of this report. This report helps readers understand the expectations on states and districts with access to Title III funds for AMAO 3 accountability; it does not explain state Title I accountability plans in detail. Readers interested in states' full adequate yearly progress plans can find the source documents in the state-specific resources used in the document review section of the references.
5. These requirements are flexible for the participation (and scores) of some ELL students. According to the 2006 amended regulations to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I Part A (Federal Register 2006) and the nonregulatory guidance on these regulations (U.S. Department of Education 2007), "recently arrived LEP" students were defined as ELL students who have attended schools in the United States for less than 12 months. States could choose to exempt these students from one (and only one) administration of the state's reading/language arts assessment. These students are required to take the state's English language proficiency assessment, which could count as participation toward the 95 percent participation requirement for reading/language arts. Recently arrived ELL students had to take their state's math assessment. (No exemption was provided.) States could, however, exclude the scores of these students on the math and the reading/language arts assessment (if taken) from one (and only one) cycle of adequate yearly progress determinations. Additionally, "former LEPs" (former ELL students) were defined as students who were identified as ELL students at some point in the previous two years but who no longer met the state's definition of an ELL student. States could include these students in the ELL student subgroup when calculating adequate yearly progress determinations for up to two years after the students were no longer ELL students. However, states could not include these students in the ELL student subgroup for calculating the participation rate.
6. The state may have decided to include only this cohort of students in AMAO 2 based on

the assumption that students need at least five years in a language instruction program to reach full proficiency (that is, students who received less than five years' instruction would not yet have had enough time to reach full proficiency by the end of the school year). This study does not address the question of why states defined their AMAOs the way they did. The assumption discussed here is included simply to give context for thinking about this type of grouping of students for AMAO 2. The literature cited in the why this study section of this report provides more information.

7. The state may have decided to include only this cohort of students in AMAO 2 based on the assumption that students need at least five years in a language instruction program to reach full proficiency (that is, students who received less than five years' instruction would not yet have had enough time to reach full proficiency by the end of the school year). This study does not address the question of why states defined their AMAOs the way they did. The assumption discussed here is included simply to give context for thinking about this type of grouping of students for AMAO 2. The literature cited in the why this study section of this report provides more information.
8. Students were included in cohorts only if present for the "full academic year" (present at both the fall and spring full-time equivalent attendance counts), the same mechanism used to determine state education funding for local school systems (Georgia Department of Education 2008c, 2009). After 2007/08, Georgia eliminated the full academic year requirement from AMAO 1 determinations (Georgia Department of Education 2009).
9. In 2009, Georgia modified its AMAO 1 policy to remove this second look provision (Georgia Department of Education 2009).
10. According to Georgia State Board of Education rule 160-4-5-.02, students can exit ELL student services by scoring proficient on ACCESS for ELLs and on the state reading assessment or scoring proficient on one of these assessments and being evaluated by a language assessment committee that deems them ready to exit services (Georgia State Board of Education 2006).
11. In 2008, Mississippi adopted ACCESS for ELLs for use beginning in 2008/09 (WIDA 2009c). In 2007/08, Mississippi acquired its assessment materials from Harcourt Assessment, Inc. (Y. Gilbert, personal communication, May 6, 2010; Mississippi Department of Education 2007).
12. In 2008, North Carolina joined the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium and adapted ACCESS for ELLs for use beginning school year 2008/09 (WIDA Consortium 2008).

REFERENCES

This section is divided into general references and state-specific references.

General references

- American Institutes for Research. (2010a). *Title III policy: state of the states, ESEA evaluation brief: the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*. Washington, DC. Retrieved May 17, 2010, from <http://www.ecs.org/html/offsite.asp?document=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Eair%2Eorg%2Ffiles%2FTitle%5FIII%5FState%5Fof%5Fthe%5FStates%5F043010%5Fr1%2Epdf>.
- American Institutes for Research. (2010b). *Title III accountability: behind the numbers, ESEA evaluation brief: the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*. Washington, DC. Retrieved May 17, 2010, from <http://www.ecs.org/html/offsite.asp?document=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Eair%2Eorg%2Ffiles%2FTitle%5FIII%5FBehind%5Fthe%5FNumbers%5F043010%2Epdf>.
- American Institutes for Research. (2010c). *Title III accountability and district improvement efforts: a closer look, ESEA evaluation brief: the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*. Washington, DC. Retrieved May 17, 2010, from <http://www.ecs.org/html/offsite.asp?document=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Eair%2Eorg%2Ffiles%2FTitle%5FIII%5FDistrict%5FImprovement%5F043010%2Epdf>.
- Anderson, K. (2009). *War or common cause? A critical ethnography of language education policy, race, and cultural citizenship*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Badgett, B., and Buckendahl, C. (2006, October). *Establishing annual measurable achievement objectives for limited English proficiency students: five options*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Sun Valley, ID. Retrieved February 9, 2010, from <http://www.unl.edu/buros/biaco/html/researchpres.html#2006>.
- Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J., and Herwanto, S. (2005). *The new demography of America's schools: immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Collier, V. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. *Directions in Language & Education*, 1(4). Retrieved February 7, 2011, from www.thomasandcollier.com/Downloads/1995_Acquiring-a-Second-Language-for-School_DLE4.pdf.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010a). *Common core state standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: The Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. Retrieved June 21, 2010, from <http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards/english-language-arts-standards>.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010b). *Common core state standards for mathematics*. Washington, DC: The Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. Retrieved June 21, 2010, from <http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards/mathematics>.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010c). *Application of common core state standards for English language learners*. Retrieved June 21, 2010, from <http://www.corestandards.org/assets/application-for-english-learners.pdf>.
- Cook, H.G., Boals, T., Wilmes, C., and Santos, M. (2008). *Issues in the development of annual measurable achievement objectives for WIDA consortium states* (WCER Working Paper 2008-2). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin–Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Retrieved May 15, 2008, from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/publications/workingPapers/papers.php>.
- Fazio, L., and Lyster, R. (1998). Immersion and submersion classrooms: a comparison of instructional practices in language arts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19(4), 303–317.
- Federal Register. (2006). *Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged. Final regulations Title I Part*

- A, *limited English proficient students*. Vol. 71, No. 177 / Wednesday, September 13 / Rules and Regulations. Retrieved May 11, 2010, from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2006-3/091306a.html>.
- Federal Register. (2008). *Notice of final interpretations of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Vol. 73, No. 202 / Friday, October 17 / Notices. Retrieved March 11, 2009, from <http://www.nclb.gov/title3/>.
- Fry, R. (2008). *The role of schools in the English language learner achievement gap*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., and Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* (Policy Report 2000-1). Santa Barbara, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Retrieved April 27, 2010, from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/13w7m06g>.
- Hanowar, V. (2009, January 8). Training gets a boost. Quality counts 2009: portrait of a population: how English language learners are putting schools to the test. *Education Week*, pp. 28–29.
- Kindler, A. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students & available educational programs and services 1999–2000 summary report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs. Retrieved August 7, 2008, from http://www.nclb.gov/stats/2_nation.htm.
- Leung, C., and Franson, C. (1989) The multilingual classroom: the case for minority language pupils. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 10, 461–472.
- Linquanti, R. (1999). *Fostering academic success for English language learners: what do we know?* San Francisco, CA: WestEd. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from <http://www.wested.org/policy/pubs/fostering/models.htm>.
- Linquanti, R. (2007, February). *Setting the stage: implementing NCLB Title III AMAOs to foster accountability for ELL success*. Paper presented at a meeting hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center on Meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Learners, Arlington, VA.
- Linquanti, R., and George, C. (2007). Establishing and utilizing an NCLB Title III accountability system: California's approach and findings to date. In J. Abedi (Ed.), *English language proficiency assessment in the United States: current status and future practice*. Los Angeles and Davis, CA: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing.
- Maxwell, L.A. (2009, January 8). Shifting landscape: immigration transforms communities. Quality counts 2009: portrait of a population: how English language learners are putting schools to the test. *Education Week*, pp. 10–16.
- Meyer, D., Madden, D., and McGrath, D.J. (2004). *Issue brief: English language learner students in U.S. public schools 1994 and 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2009). *The nation's report card*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved September 14, 2009, from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009a). *The nation's report card: mathematics 2009* (NCES 2010-451). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009b). *The nation's report card: reading 2009* (NCES 2010-458). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2000). *If your child learns in two languages: a parent's guide for improving educational opportunities for children acquiring English as a second language*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from http://www.nclb.gov/files/rcd/BE019820/If_Your_Child_Learns.pdf.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2009a). *Title III accountability*. Retrieved January 27, 2010, from <http://www.nclb.gov/accountability/>.

- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2009b). *Title III state information system, rate of LEP growth 1995–96 through 2005–06*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/t3sis/>.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Education Programs. (n.d.). *Types of language instruction educational programs (LIEPs)*. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core Standards Initiative description*. Retrieved June 21, 2010, from <http://www.corestandards.org/>.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002a). Pub. L. No. 107–110, § 3111, 115 Stat. 1425, 1691–1694.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002b). Pub. L. No. 107–110, §§ 3122, 3123, 115 Stat. 1425, 1702–1705.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002c). Pub. L. No. 107–110, § 3121, 115 Stat. 1425, 1701–1702.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002d). Pub. L. No. 107–110, § 3122, 115 Stat. 1425, 1702–1704.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002e). Pub. L. No. 107–110, § 1111, 115 Stat. 1425, 1444–1446.
- Office of English Language Acquisition. (n.d.). *Office of English Language Acquisition responsibilities*. Retrieved July 1, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/index.html?src=oc>.
- Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students. (2008). *Biennial report to Congress on the implementation of the Title III State Formula Grant Program, school years 2004–2006*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 11, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/title3biennial0406.pdf>.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1991). *Bilingualism or not: the education of minorities*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Swain, M., and Johnson, K. (1997). Immersion education: a Category within bilingual education. In R. Johnson and M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion Education: international Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomás Rivera Policy Institute. (2004). *The new Latino south and the challenge to public education: strategies for educators and policymakers in the emerging immigrant communities*. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California.
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.a). *Title III Part A programs—strengthening institutions*. Retrieved January 6, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/iduestitle3a/funding.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.b). *English language acquisition state grants: part I: non-regulatory guidance on implementation of Title III State Formula Grant Program*. Retrieved August 26, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sfgp/nrgcomp.html#resp>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Part II: final non-regulatory guidance on the Title III State Formula Grant Program—standards, assessment and accountability. Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students. Retrieved January 6, 2010, from www2.ed.gov/programs/nfdp/NRG1.2.25.03.doc.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008, October). *Title III notice of final interpretations*. Presentation for the LEP Partnership/Title I & Title III Directors' Meeting. Retrieved January 8, 2010, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/title3/>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2007). *Assessment and accountability for recently arrived and former limited English proficient (LEP) students: non-regulatory guidance*. Retrieved May 11, 2010, from www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/lepguidance.doc.

- U.S. Department of Education. (2010). Press release, statement on National Governors Association and State Education Chiefs Common Core Standards, June 2. Retrieved June 7, 2010, from <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/statement-national-governors-association-and-state-education-chiefs-common-core->
- WIDA Consortium. (2009). World Class Instructional Design and Assessment consortium website. Retrieved March 20, 2009, from <http://www.wida.us/>.
- Wolf, M.K., Kao, J., Griffin, N., Herman, J.L., Bachman, P.L., Chang, S.M., and Farnsworth, T. (2008). *Issues in assessing English language learners: English language proficiency measures and accommodation uses—practice review* (CRESST Technical Report 732). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Working Group on ELL Policy. (2010). *Recommendations for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, updated March 26. Retrieved May 1, 2010, from <http://ellpolicy.org/esea/>.
- Zehr, M. (2010, May 20). Common-standards draft excludes ELL proficiency. *Education Week*. Retrieved June 1, 2010, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/05/20/33common-ell.h29.html?tkn=ZSUFM2KciGOrIRtc%2BOnAfRtCtIhqGALKvpjJ&print>.
- Zúñiga, V., and Hernandez-Leon, R. (2005). *New destinations: Mexican immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
-
- State-specific resources used in document review
- Alabama*
- Federal reporting documents*
- Alabama State Department of Education. (2008a). *Alabama consolidated state application accountability workbook* (for state grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Pub. L. No. 107–110) [February 1, 2008]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.
- Alabama State Department of Education. (2008b). *Consolidated state performance report: parts I and II for State Formula Grants Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (school year 2007–08, Alabama). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#sy07-08>.
- ELP assessment documents*
- WIDA Consortium. (2009b). *Assessing comprehension and communication in English state to state for English language learners: interpretive guide for score reports*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS/index.aspx.
- WIDA Consortium. (n.d.). *ACCESS for ELLs: overview*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://wida.wceruw.org/assessment/ACCESS/index.aspx>.
- AMAO policy documents*
- Alabama State Department of Education. (n.d.b). *Changes to Alabama annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs)*. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from personnel at Alabama State Department of Education via email.
- Alabama State Department of Education. (n.d.a). *Accountability reporting system* [state AYP data reporting]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.alsde.edu/Accountability/Accountability.asp>.
- Alabama State Department of Education. (2008c). *2008 interpretive guide: Alabama accountability system*. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from <http://www.alsde.edu/Accountability/2008Report/2008AYPInterpretiveGuide.pdf>.
- Cook, H. G., Boals, T., Wilmes, C., and Santos, M. (2008). *Issues in the development of annual measurable achievement objectives for WIDA consortium states*

(WCER Working Paper 2008-2). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin–Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Retrieved June 3, 2010 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/publications/workingPapers/papers.php>.

AMAO subgrantee and determinations data

Alabama State Department of Education. (n.d.c). *Accountability reporting system* [state AYP data reporting]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.alsde.edu/Accountability/Accountability.asp>.

Alabama State Department of Education. (n.d.d). *AMAO school history 2004–2005* [state reported data]. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from personnel at Alabama State Department of Education via email.

Florida

Federal reporting documents

Florida Department of Education. (2008a). *Consolidated state performance report: parts I and II for State Formula Grants Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (school year 2007–08, Florida). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved, February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#sy07-08>.

Florida Department of Education. (2008b). *State of Florida consolidated state application accountability workbook* (for state grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Pub. L. 107–110) [Revised June 8, 2008]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.

ELP assessment documents

Florida Department of Education. (n.d.b). *Florida CELLA interpretive guide* [interpretive guide for 2007/08]. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Student Achievement though Language Acquisition. Retrieved March 9, 2009, from <http://www.fldoe.org/aala/cELLa.asp>.

AMAO policy documents

Florida Department of Education. (n.d.c). *Implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) under Title III, Part A: attachment A*. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Student Achievement though Language Acquisition. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.fldoe.org/aala/pdf/ImplementationAttachmentA.pdf>.

Florida Department of Education. (n.d.a). *Search school accountability reports 1999 to 2009* [state AYP data reporting]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org>.

Florida Department of Education. (2006). *2006 guide to calculating adequate yearly progress (AYP): technical assistance paper 2006/06*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/2006AYPTAP.pdf>.

Florida Department of Education. (2007). *Florida AYP overview 2006/07*. Retrieved June 18, 2008, from <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/>.

AMAO subgrantee and determinations data

Florida Department of Education. (2008c). *District annual measurable achievement objectives for English language learners: district AMAO 1* [state reported data]. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Student Achievement though Language Acquisition. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.fldoe.org/aala/amao.asp>.

Florida Department of Education. (2008d). *District annual measurable achievement objectives for English language learners: District AMAO 2* [state reported data]. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Student Achievement though Language Acquisition. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.fldoe.org/aala/amao.asp>.

Florida Department of Education. (2008e). *District annual measurable achievement objectives for English language learners: district AMAO 3* [state reported data]. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Student Achievement though Language Acquisition. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.fldoe.org/aala/amao.asp>.

Florida Department of Education. (n.d.d). *2007/08 District annual measurable achievement objectives for English language learners*. [state reported data]. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Student Achievement through Language Acquisition. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.fldoe.org/aala/pdf/AMAOCella2007/08.pdf>.

Florida Department of Education. (n.d.e). *Search school accountability reports 1999 to 2009* [state AYP data reporting]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org>.

Other documents

Florida Department of Education. (n.d.e). *Technical assistance note no. 019-ESOL-95: inclusion as an instructional model for LEP students*. Retrieved January 28, 2010, from <http://www.fldoe.org/aala/tapinclu.asp>.

Georgia

Federal reporting documents

Georgia Department of Education. (2008a). *Consolidated state performance report: parts I and II for State Formula Grants Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (school year 2007–08, Georgia). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#sy07-08>.

Georgia Department of Education. (2008b). *State of Georgia consolidated state application accountability workbook* (for state grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Pub. L. 107–110) [Revised June 13, 2008]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.

ELP assessment documents

WIDA Consortium. (n.d.). *ACCESS for ELLs: overview*. Retrieved August 13, 2009, from <http://wida.wceruw.org/assessment/ACCESS/index.aspx>.

WIDA Consortium. (2009b). *Assessing comprehension and communication in English state to state for English language learners: interpretive guide for score reports*. Retrieved August 13, 2009, from www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS/index.aspx.

AMAO policy documents

Georgia Department of Education. (2009). *Letter from Kathy Cox, Office of the State Superintendent of Schools, to Zollie Stevenson, Director of Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs* [dated March 11, 2009]. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from personnel at Georgia Department of Education via email.

Georgia Department of Education. (2008c). *Annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for Title III programs in Georgia*. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from personnel at Georgia Department of Education via email.

Georgia State Board of Education. (2006). Rule 160-4-5-.02. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/pea_board.aspx?PageReq=PEABoardRules.

Georgia Department of Education. (n.d.a). *2007/08 adequate yearly progress (AYP)* [state AYP data reporting]. Retrieved June 18, 2009, from <http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ayp2008/performance.asp?SchoolID=000-0000-b-1-2-3-4-5-6-0-8-9-10>.

Georgia Department of Education. (2007). *Georgia AYP overview 2006/07*. Retrieved June 18, 2009, from <http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=103&StateId=ALL&T=1>.

Georgia Governor's Office of Student Achievement. (2008). *Report card, enrollment by demographics*. Retrieved October 16, 2009, from <http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=102&StateId=ALL&T=1>.

AMAO subgrantee and determinations data

Georgia Department of Education. (2008d). *Standards, instruction and assessment, innovative academic programs. 2008 Title III AMAO determinations* [state reported data]. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/ci_iap_esol.aspx.

Georgia Department of Education. (n.d.b). *Title III consortium information Georgia* [state reported data]. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from personnel at Georgia Department of Education via email.

Georgia Department of Education. (n.d.c). *2007/08 adequate yearly progress (AYP)* [state AYP data reporting]. Retrieved June 18, 2009, from <http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ayp2008/performance.asp?SchoolID=000-0000-b-1-2-3-4-5-6-0-8-9-10>.

Mississippi

Federal reporting documents

Mississippi Department of Education. (2008a). *Mississippi statewide accountability system: consolidated state application accountability workbook* (for state grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Pub. L. 107-110) [September 4, 2008]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.

Mississippi Department of Education. (2008b). *Consolidated state performance report: parts I and II for State Formula Grants Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (school year 2007-08, Mississippi). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#sy07-08>.

ELP assessment documents

Mississippi Department of Education. (2007). *Assessment of English language learner (ELL) students*, Powerpoint training produced by the Office of Student Assessment. Retrieved May 6, 2010, from personnel at Mississippi Department of Education via email.

Pearson Education. (n.d.). *Stanford English Language Proficiency Test* [informational web page]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8429-206>.

WIDA Consortium. (2009c, September 2). *WIDA welcomes our 19th state, Mississippi!* Retrieved February 13, 2010, from <http://www.wida.us/News/archive.aspx>.

AMAO policy documents

Mississippi Department of Education. (2006). *Title III accountability: a plan in compliance with Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Jackson, MS: Office of Research & Statistics. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from http://orshome.mde.k12.ms.us/ors/accountability/2007/Title_III_Accountability.doc.

Mississippi Department of Education. (n.d.a). *Accountability reporting system* [state AYP reporting data]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from http://orsap.mde.k12.ms.us:8080/MAARS/maarsMS_TestResultsProcessor.jsp?userSessionId=341&TestYear=2007&TestPanel=1.

AMAO subgrantee and determinations data

Mississippi Department of Education. (n.d.b). *Mississippi annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) reports 2002-2008*. [state reported data]. Jackson, MS: Office of Research & Statistics. Retrieved March 18, 2009, from personnel at Mississippi Department of Education via email.

Mississippi Department of Education. (n.d.c). *Accountability reporting system* [state AYP reporting data]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from http://orsap.mde.k12.ms.us:8080/MAARS/maarsMS_TestResultsProcessor.jsp?userSessionId=341&TestYear=2007&TestPanel=1 and http://orsap.mde.k12.ms.us/MAARS/maarsMS_TestResultsProcessor.jsp?userSessionId=287&DistrictId=1703&TestPanel=7.

North Carolina

Federal reporting documents

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2008a). *State board of education, state of North Carolina: consolidated state application accountability workbook* (for state grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Pub. L. 107-110) [October 2, 2008]. Washington, DC:

- U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2008b). *Consolidated state performance report: parts I and II for State Formula Grants Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (school year 2007–08, North Carolina). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#sy07-08>.
- North Carolina State Board of Education. (n.d.). *North Carolina State Board of Education policy manual: globally competitive students series* (Policy ID GCS-C-020). Retrieved June 17, 2010, from <http://sbepolicy.dpi.state.nc.us/>.
- ELP assessment documents*
- Ballard & Tighe. (2008). *Ballard & Tighe's new IPT testing system selected by North Carolina as test of choice to meet NCLB requirements* [for immediate release, August 8, 2008]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.nclb.ballard-tighe.com/download/north carolina.pdf>.
- Ballard & Tighe. (2009). *IPT description*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.nclb.ballard-tighe.com/system/description.html>.
- George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education. (n.d.). *IDEA language proficiency tests (IPT)—English*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from http://r3cc.ceee.gwu.edu/standards_assessments/EAC/eac0108.htm.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2007). *Understanding the IDEA English language proficiency test (IPT), Vol. 1, No.1*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/testing/briefs/iptassessmentbrieffinalaug2007.pdf>.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.b). *Achievement levels for IDEA English language proficiency test (IPT)*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/policyoperations/iptlevels.pdf>.
- WIDA Consortium. (2008, June 10). *WIDA welcomes our 18th state, North Carolina!* Retrieved February 13, 2010, from <http://www.wida.us/News/archive.aspx>.
- AMAO policy documents*
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2008c). *A summary report of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (based on 2007–08 data)* [November 6, 2008]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/stateboard/meetings/2008/visions/11gcs07attach2add.pdf>.
- North Carolina State Board of Education. (2008). *North Carolina State Board of Education policy manual: annual measurable achievement objectives for NCLB Title III* [May 1, 2008]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/stateboard/meetings/2008/11/gcs/11gcs07.pdf>.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.a). *Adequate yearly progress reports for 2007/08* [state AYP reporting data]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://ayp.ncpublicschools.org/2008/>.
- AMAO subgrantee and determinations data*
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.c). *AMAO 3 (performance of the LEP subgroups on AYP), 2007/08*. [state reported data]. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from personnel at North Carolina Department of Public Instruction via email.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.d). *North Carolina AMAO 1, 2, & 3 determinations*. [state reported data]. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from personnel at North Carolina Department of Public Instruction via email.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.e). *Adequate yearly progress reports for 2007/08* [state AYP reporting data]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://ayp.ncpublicschools.org/2008/>.

*South Carolina**Federal reporting documents*

South Carolina Department of Education. (2008a). *South Carolina consolidated state application accountability workbook* (for state grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Pub. L. 107-110) [June 5, 2008]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.

South Carolina Department of Education. (2008b). *Consolidated state performance report: parts I and II for State Formula Grants Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (school year 2007-08, South Carolina). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#sy07-08>.

ELP assessment documents

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2005). *English language development assessment (ELDA)*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/ELDA_brochure.pdf.

South Carolina Department of Education. (2009a). *English language development assessment (ELDA) test administration manual: reading, writing, listening, speaking. Grades 3-12*. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Assessment/old/assessment/programs/elda/elda.html>.

South Carolina Department of Education. (2009b). *English language development assessment (ELDA) test administration manual: reading, writing, listening, speaking. Grades K-2*. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Assessment/old/assessment/programs/elda/elda.html>.

South Carolina Department of Education. (n.d.b). *English language development assessment (ELDA)*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Assessment/old/assessment/programs/elda/elda.html>.

South Carolina Department of Education. (n.d.c). *Performance level descriptors for ELDA grades K-2*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Assessment/old/assessment/programs/elda/documents/ELDA_K_2PLDs.pdf.

South Carolina Department of Education. (n.d.d). *Performance level descriptors for ELDA grades 3-12*. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Assessment/old/assessment/programs/elda/documents/ELDA_3_12PLDSs.pdf.

AMAO policy documents

South Carolina Department of Education. (n.d.e). *Title III requirements* [state-developed Powerpoint presentation]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Federal-and-State-Accountability/old/fp/documents/TitleIIIRequirements.ppt>.

South Carolina Department of Education. (n.d.a). *School and district AYP results: AYP results by school year*. [state AYP reporting data]. Retrieved June 18, 2009, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Data-Management-and-Analysis/NCLBAYPReportsByYear.html>.

South Carolina Department of Education. (2007). *South Carolina 2007 state AYP report card*. Retrieved June 18, 2008, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Data-Management-and-Analysis/NCLBAYPReportsByYear.html>.

AMAO subgrantee and determinations data

South Carolina Department of Education. (n.d.f). *South Carolina school and district AYP results*. Retrieved June 18, 2009, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Data-Management-and-Analysis/NCLBAYPReportsByYear.html>.

South Carolina Department of Education. (2008c). *AMAO 1 Title III 2007-08 summary report* [state reported data]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Federal-and-State-Accountability/old/fp/ESOLTitleIII.html>.

- South Carolina Department of Education. (2008d). *AMAO 2 Title III 2007–08 summary report* [state reported data]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Federal-and-State-Accountability/old/fp/ESOLTitleIII.html>.
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2008e). *AMAO 3 (AYP) status* [state reported data]. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Federal-and-State-Accountability/old/fp/ESOLTitleIII.html>.
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2008f). *2007–08 Title III final grant awards*. [state reported data]. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from personnel at South Carolina Department of Education via email.