## Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

## Clarification of DC's AMO calculations

## Introduction

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) are unique yearly targets in reading and mathematics for each subgroup, school and district, as described in DC's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Request. The purpose of this document is to clarify the calculations the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) uses to set AMOs, particularly in circumstances where a given school or subgroup did not exist in the default AMO baseline year (SY2010-11) or did not reach the threshold for AMO setting in the baseline year, which is 25 or more students. These processes must be approved by the U.S. Department of Education.
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AMO Decision Tree:
The calculations highlighted in yellow, blue and red below are referenced and explained in detail on pages 3-5.


## Details on AMO Calculations

Note on n -size: In the calculation of AMOs for population subgroups, AMOs are set only if there are 25 or more test takers in the particular subgroup of the school or LEA; Monitored students don't count towards the 25, but only count in calculations when the school has already met the 25 student threshold.

## Yellow Calculation, Baseline SY2010-2011: How AMOs are calculated when CAS 2011 n

 $\geq 25$This is the calculation shown in yellow on the decision tree. AMOs are set in annual equal increments toward a goal of halving the percentage of test takers in the "all students" group and in each subgroup not proficient by 2017 assessment performance.

## Example: CAS $2011 \mathrm{n} \geq 25$

A school had $43.4 \%$ proficiency in math in 2011. So, $56.6 \%$ of test takers are not proficient. Halving $56.6 \%$ not proficient in six years would mean reducing the proportion of not proficient students by 28.3 percent by 2017 , an incremental change of -4.7 percentage points per year. Conversely, it would mean increasing proficiency from $43.4 \%$ to $71.6 \%$ by 2017, +4.7 percentage points per year.

| SCHOOL INFORMATION | BASELINE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroup | Math Tested 2011 | Math Prof 2011 | Math Baseline |
| All Students | 500 | $43.4 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ |

How We Develop AMO Targets:

1. Calculate proficiency gap: $100-43.4=56.6$ non-proficiency
2. Divide in half to get targeted 6 year decrease in non-proficiency: 56.6 / $2=28.3$
3. Divide by 6 to get annual targeted decrease in non-proficiency: $28.3 / 6=4.7$

Targets for percent of students proficient in Math at this school:

| Math Baseline | Target 2012 | Target 2013 | Target 2014 | Target 2015 | Target 2016 | Target 2017 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $43.4 \%$ | $48.1 \%$ | $52.8 \%$ | $57.5 \%$ | $62.2 \%$ | $66.9 \%$ | $71.6 \%$ |

What would this mean if the school subsequently had 45.9\% of students proficient in math in 2012? The school would not meet its AMO in that category.

## 2012 DC CAS

| Math Tested 2012 | Math Prof 2012 | Math Target 2012 | Met Math AMO 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 525 | $45.9 \%$ | $48.1 \%$ | NO |

## Blue Calculation, Baseline SY2011-2012: How AMOs are calculated when $\mathbf{n}<25$ for CAS 2011 and $n \geq 25$ for CAS 2012

This is the calculation shown in blue on the decision tree. If either of the following conditions listed are met, we calculate 6year AMOs from the current year and truncate the last target year, so that the schools have the same accountability conditions as schools with a baseline in 2011:
A. A school subgroup was less than 25 students for SY2010-2011;
B. The school is new and did not have SY2010-2011 results.

## Example: CAS $2012 \mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{2 5}$, CAS $2011 \mathbf{n}<25$

An LEA with 20 test takers in the "Race: African American" subgroup for Math Tested 2011 will not have a Math Performance 2011 Metric nor a Math Baseline reported, because the LEA did not meet the 25 or more students in the subgroup threshold. The Math Baseline is determined by 2012 DC CAS Math Performance for the subgroup, when the number of African American test takers rises above 25 to 50 in SY2011-2012. Math Baseline Proficiency of $40 \%$ has $60 \%$ of "Race: African American" test takers not proficient. Halving the $60 \%$ not proficient in six years would mean reducing the proportion of not proficient students by 35 percent by 2017, an incremental change of -5.0 percentage points per year. Conversely, it would mean increasing proficiency from $40.0 \%$ to $65.0 \%$ by $2017,+5.0$ percentage points per year.

| SCHOOL INFORMATION |  | BASE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroup | Math Tested 2011 | Math Prof 2011 | Math Baseline |
| Race: African American | 20 | NA | NA |
| SCHOOL INFORMATION |  | 2012 D |  |
| Subgroup | Math Tested 2012 | Math Prof 2012 | Math Baseline |
| Race: African American | 50 | 40\% | 40\% |
| How We Develop AMO Targets: <br> 1. Calculate proficiency gap: $100-40=60$ non-proficiency <br> 2. Divide in half to get targeted 6 year decrease in non-proficiency: $60 / 2=30.0$ <br> 3. Divide by 6 to get annual targeted decrease in non-proficiency: $30 / 6=5.0$ |  |  |  |

Targets for percent of students proficient in Math at this school:

| Math Baseline | Target 2012 | Target 2013 | Target 2014 | Target 2015 | Target 2016 | Target 2017 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $40.0 \%$ | NA | $45.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $55.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $65.0 \%$ |

What would this mean if the school subsequently had $\mathbf{4 7 . 0 \%}$ of students proficient in math in 2012? The school would meet its AMO in that category.

| 2013 DC CAS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Math Tested 2012 | Math Prof 2013 | Math Target 2013 | Met Math AMO 2012 |
| 55 | $47 \%$ | $45 \%$ | Yes |

## Red Calculation, Baseline SY2012-2013: How AMOs are calculated when $\mathbf{n}<25$ for CAS 2011, $\mathbf{n}<25$ for CAS 2012, and $\mathbf{n} \geq 25$ for CAS 2013

This is the calculation shown in red on the decision tree. For schools in their first year of CAS in SY2012-2013 or with a subgroup eligible for AMOs for the first time in SY2012-2013, we would calculate $1^{\text {st }}$ Year AMO Baseline and $1^{\text {st }}$ Year AMO Target using the following methodology:

- $\quad 1^{\text {st }}$ Year AMO Baseline $=2013$ percent proficient for that subgroup - the state subject average growth for that subgroup from 2012 to 2013
- $\quad 1^{\text {st }}$ Year AMO Target $=$ AMO Baseline $+(((1-\mathrm{AMO}$ Baseline $) / 2) / 6)$
- AMOs for subsequent years would be set using the school's results from 2013 as a baseline.


## Example: Baseline SY2012-2013

A school has a subgroup of African-American students greater than 25 students for the first time in 2013. 40\% of these students score proficient or higher on the 2013 CAS. The Math Baseline is determined by taking the Math Proficiency for the 2013 CAS (40\%) and subtracting the statewide average growth in Math from the 2012 CAS to the 2013 CAS for that subgroup (3.6\%). A Math Baseline Proficiency of $36.4 \%$ means that $63.6 \%$ of "Race: African American" test takers are not proficient. Halving the $63.6 \%$ not proficient in six years would mean reducing the proportion of not proficient students by 31.8 percent, an incremental change of -5.0 percentage points per year. Conversely, it would mean increasing proficiency from $40.0 \%$ to $65.0 \%$ over 6 years, +5.0 percentage points per year.

What would this mean if the school had $\mathbf{4 0 . 0 \%}$ of students proficient in math in 2013? The school would not meet its AMO in that category.

## How We Develop AMO Targets:

1. Calculate proficiency gap: $100-40=60$ non-proficient
2. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year AMO Baseline $=40-3.6=36.4$
3. $1^{\text {st }}$ Year AMO Target $=36.4+(((1-36.4) / 2) / 6)=36.4+((63.6 / 2) / 6)=36.4+(31.8 / 6)=36.4+5.30=41.7$
4. Subsequent years' targets calculated using 2013 school performance as a baseline with a 6 year timeline.
a. Calculate proficiency gap: $100-40=60$ non-proficient
b. Divide in half to get targeted 6 year decrease in non-proficiency: $60 / 2=30.0$
c. Divide by 6 to get annual targeted decrease in non-proficiency: $30 / 6=5.0$

Targets for percent of students proficient in Math at this school:

| Math Baseline <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | Target 2013 | Math Baseline <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | Target 2014 | Target 2015 | Target 2016 | Target 2017 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 36.4 | $41.7 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $60 \%$ |

