**District Summary of 2011 Title III AMAO Determinations** 

System Code	System Name#	AMAO 1: Progress	AMAO 2: Proficiency	AMAO 3: AYP EL Subgroup Performance
111	Consortium	Met	Met	Does Not Apply to Consortium
601	Appling County	Met	Met	Met
602	Atkinson County	Met	Met	Met
603	Bacon County	Met	Did Not Meet	Too Few in Subgroup
604	Baker County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
605	Baldwin County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
606	Banks County	Met	Met	Met
607	Barrow County	Met	Met	Met
608	Bartow County	Met	Met	Met
609	Ben Hill County	Met	Met	Met
610	Berrien County	Met	Met	Met
611	Bibb County	Met	Met	Met
612 613	Bleckley County	Met Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup Too Few in Subgroup
614	Brantley County  Brooks County	Met	Met Met	<u> </u>
615	Bryan County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup Met
616	Bulloch County	Met	Met	Met
617	Burke County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
618	Butts County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
619	Calhoun County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
620	Camden County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
621	Candler County	Met	Met	Met
622	Carroll County	Met	Met	Met
623	Catoosa County	Met	Met	Met
624	Charlton County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
625	Chatham County	Met	Met	Met
626	Chattahoochee County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
627	Chattooga County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
628	Cherokee County	Met	Met	Met
629	Clarke County	Met	Met	Met
630	Clay County	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
631	Clayton County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
632	Clinch County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
633	Cobb County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
634	Coffee County	Met	Met	Met
635	Colquitt County	Met	Met	Met
636	Columbia County	Met	Met	Met
637	Cook County	Met	Met	Met
638	Coweta County	Met	Met	Met
639 640	Crawford County Crisp County	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup Too Few in Subgroup
	, ,	Met	Met	9 1
641 642	Dade County  Dawson County	Met	Met Met	Too Few in Subgroup Too Few in Subgroup
643	Decatur County  Decatur County	Met Met	Met	Met
644	DeKalb County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
645	Dodge County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
646	Dooly County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
647	Dougherty County	Met	Met	Met
648	Douglas County	Met	Met	Met
649	Early County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
650	Echols County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
651	Effingham County	Met	Met	Met
652	Elbert County	Met	Met	Met
653	Emanuel County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
654	Evans County	Met	Did Not Meet	Met
655	Fannin County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
656	Fayette County	Met	Met	Met
657	Floyd County	Met	Met	Met
658	Forsyth County	Met	Met	Met
659	Franklin County	Did Not Meet	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
660	Fulton County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
661	Gilmer County	Met	Did Not Meet	Did Not Meet
662	Glascock County	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup
663	Glynn County	Met	Met	Met
664	Gordon County	Met	Met	Met
665	Grady County	Met	Met	Met
666	Greene County	Met	Met	Met

System Code	System Name#	AMAO 1: Progress	AMAO 2: Proficiency	AMAO 3: AYP EL Subgroup Performance
667	Gwinnett County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
668	Habersham County	Met	Met	Met
669	Hall County	Met	Met	Met
670	Hancock County		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
671	Haralson County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
672	Harris County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
673	Hart County	Met	Met	Met Subgroup
674 675	Heard County Henry County	Too Few in Subgroup  Met	Too Few in Subgroup  Met	Too Few in Subgroup  Met
676	Houston County	Met	Met	Met
677	Irwin County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
678	Jackson County	Met	Met	Met
679	Jasper County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
680	Jeff Davis County	Met	Met	Met
681	Jefferson County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
682	Jenkins County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
683	Johnson County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
684	Jones County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
685	Lamar County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
686	Lanier County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
687	Laurens County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
688	Lee County	Met	Met	Met
689	Liberty County	Met	Met	Met
690	Lincoln County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
691	Long County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
692	Lowndes County	Met	Met	Met
693	Lumpkin County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
694	Macon County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
695	Madison County	Met	Met	Met
696 697	Marion County McDuffie County	Met Met	Met Met	Too Few in Subgroup Too Few in Subgroup
698	McIntosh County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
699	Meriwether County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
700	Miller County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
701	Mitchell County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
702	Monroe County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
703	Montgomery County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
704	Morgan County	Did Not Meet	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
705	Murray County	Met	Met	Met
706	Muscogee County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
707	Newton County	Met	Met	Met
708	Oconee County	Met	Met	Met
709	Oglethorpe County	Met	Met	Met
710	Paulding County	Met	Met	Met
711	Peach County	Met	Met	Met
712	Pickens County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
713	Pierce County	Met Too Fow in Subgroup	Met	Met Too Fow in Subgroup
714 715	Pike County	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup  Met	Too Few in Subgroup Met
716	Polk County Pulaski County	Met Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
717	Putnam County	Met	Met	Met
717	Quitman County	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup
719	Rabun County	Met	Met	Met
720	Randolph County	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
721	Richmond County	Met	Met	Met
722	Rockdale County	Met	Met	Met
723	Schley County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
724	Screven County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
725	Seminole County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
726	Spalding County	Met	Met	Met
727	Stephens County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
728	Stewart County	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup
729	Sumter County	Met	Met	Met
730	Talbot County		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
731	Taliaferro County	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup
732	Tattnall County	Met	Met	Met
733	Taylor County	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup
734	Telfair County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup

System Code	System Name#	AMAO 1: Progress	AMAO 2: Proficiency	AMAO 3: AYP EL Subgroup Performance
735	Terrell County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
736	Thomas County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
737	Tift County	Met	Met	Met
738	Toombs County	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
739	Towns County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
740	Treutlen County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
741	Troup County	Met	Met	Met
742	Turner County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
743	Twiggs County		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
744	Union County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
745	Thomaston-Upson County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
746	Walker County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
747	Walton County	Met	Met	Met
748	Ware County	Met	Met	Met
749	Warren County		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
750	Washington County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
751	Wayne County	Met	Met	Met
752	Webster County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
753	Wheeler County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
754	White County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
755	Whitfield County	Met	Met	Met
756	Wilcox County		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
757	Wilkes County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
758	Wilkinson County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
759	Worth County	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
761	Atlanta Public Schools	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
763	Bremen City	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
764	Buford City	Met	Met	Met
765	Calhoun City	Met	Met	Met
766	Carrollton City	Met	Met	Met
767	Cartersville City	Met	Met	Met
769	Chickamauga City	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
771	Commerce City	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
772	Dalton City	Met	Met	Met
773 774	Decatur City	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
774	Dublin City	Met Met	Met Met	Too Few in Subgroup
	Gainesville City			Did Not Meet
779	Jefferson City	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
781 784	Marietta City Pelham City	Met Met	Met Met	Met Too Few in Subgroup
	Rome City			
785 786	Social Circle City	Met Met	Met Met	Met Too Few in Subgroup
789	Thomasville City	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
789 791	T: 0"	Met		-
791 792	Valdosta City	Met	Met Met	Met
792 793	Valdosta City  Vidalia City	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
7820108	Mountain Education Center	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
7820110	Odyssey	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
7820112	Scholars Academy	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
7830103	CCAT	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
7830110	Ivy Prep	Met	Met	Too Few in Subgroup
7830112	Peachtree Hope Charter		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
7830210	Pataula Charter Academy		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
7830210	Fulton Leadership Academy		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
7830410	Atlanta Heights Charter		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
7830610	Coweta Charter Academy		Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
7991893	State Schools - Atlanta Area School for the Deaf	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup
7991894	State Schools - Atlanta Area School for the Blind	Too Few in Subgroup		Too Few in Subgroup
7991895	State Schools - Georgia Academy for the Blind State Schools - Georgia School for the Deaf	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup	Too Few in Subgroup
999	State of Georgia	Met	Met	Did Not Meet
	State of Georgia	INICI	IVIC	DIG NOT WEEL

#All districts in the state are included in this table.

Determinations for districts belonging to the Title III Consortium will be congruent with the determination of the Consortium for AMAO 1 and AMAO 2. For AMAO 3, each district is reported independently.

Districts with too few EL students to make a determination on any AMAO have no determination reported.

2011 District Performance on AMAO 1: Progress Toward English Language Proficiency

System Code	System Name#	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Records	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Record(s) Who Made Progress	AMAO-1: 2011 Percent of Students Making Progress (Target=50%)	Is District Progress Percentage Greater than or Equal to 50%?	Final 2011 AMAO 1 Determinations
111	Consortium	1,269	851	67.1%	Yes	Met
601	Appling County	70	45	64.3%	Yes	Met
602	Atkinson County	83	57	68.7%	Yes	Met
603	Bacon County	46	28	60.9%	Yes	Met
606	Banks County	54	31	57.4%	Yes	Met
607	Barrow County	591	371	62.8%	Yes	Met
608	Bartow County	404	271	67.1%	Yes	Met
609	Ben Hill County	106	79	74.5%	Yes	Met
611	Bibb County	222	163	73.4%	Yes	Met
616	Bulloch County	148	100	67.6%	Yes	Met
622	Carroll County	159	104	65.4%	Yes	Met
625	Chatham County	378	289	76.5%	Yes	Met
628	Cherokee County	902	632	70.1%	Yes	Met
629	Clarke County	757	481	63.5%	Yes	Met
631	Clayton County	2418	1654	68.4%	Yes	Met
633	Cobb County	5875	3818	65.0%	Yes	Met
634	Coffee County	220	139	63.2%	Yes	Met
635	Colquitt County	669	422	63.1%	Yes	Met
636	Columbia County	139	108	77.7%	Yes	Met
637	Cook County	66	49	74.2%	Yes	Met
638	Coweta County	275	193	70.2%	Yes	Met
642	Dawson County	37	26	70.3%	Yes	Met
643	Decatur County	93	55	59.1%	Yes	Met
644	DeKalb County	6003	3734	62.2%	Yes	Met
647	Dougherty County	106	77	72.6%	Yes	Met
648	Douglas County	646	412	63.8%	Yes	Met
651	Effingham County	47	27	57.4%	Yes	Met
652	Elbert County	71	50	70.4%	Yes	Met
653	Emanuel County	60	46	76.7%	Yes	Met
654	Evans County	144	78	54.2%	Yes	Met
656	Fayette County	313	229	73.2%	Yes	Met
657	Floyd County	193	131	67.9%	Yes	Met
658	Forsyth County	1044	733	70.2%	Yes	Met
659	Franklin County	41	20	48.8%	No	Did Not Meet
660	Fulton County	3009	2153	71.6%	Yes	Met
661	Gilmer County	277	167	60.3%	Yes	Met
663	Glynn County	373	244	65.4%	Yes	Met
664	Gordon County	212	136	64.2%	Yes	Met
665	Grady County	141	100	70.9%	Yes	Met
666	Greene County	59	37	62.7%	Yes	Met
667	Gwinnett County	12544	8783	70.0%	Yes	Met
668	Habersham County	425	322	75.8%	Yes	Met
669	Hall County	3002	1947	64.9%	Yes	Met
673	Hart County	50	34	68.0%	Yes	Met
675	Henry County	490	360	73.5%	Yes	Met
676	Houston County	514	340	66.1%	Yes	Met
678	Jackson County	195	120	61.5%	Yes	Met
680	Jeff Davis County	163	103	63.2%	Yes	Met
688	Lee County	32	22	68.8%	Yes	Met
689	Liberty County	35	25	71.4%	Yes	Met
691	Long County	72	41	56.9%	Yes	Met
692	Lowndes County	122	81	66.4%	Yes	Met
032	LOWINGS COUNTY	144	J 01	00.470	169	IVIEL

System Code	System Name#	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Records	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Record(s) Who Made Progress	AMAO-1: 2011 Percent of Students Making Progress (Target=50%)	Is District Progress Percentage Greater than or Equal to 50%?	Final 2011 AMAO 1 Determinations
693	Lumpkin County	47	34	72.3%	Yes	Met
695	Madison County	55	41	74.5%	Yes	Met
704	Morgan County	47	21	44.7%	No	Did Not Meet
705	Murray County	281	175	62.3%	Yes	Met
706	Muscogee County	321	247	76.9%	Yes	Met
707	Newton County	343	231	67.3%	Yes	Met
708	Oconee County	72	48	66.7%	Yes	Met
709	Oglethorpe County	41	23	56.1%	Yes	Met
710	Paulding County	231	162	70.1%	Yes	Met
711	Peach County	130	93	71.5%	Yes	Met
713	Pierce County	63	35	55.6%	Yes	Met
715	Polk County	286	204	71.3%	Yes	Met
717	Putnam County	32	24	75.0%	Yes	Met
719	Rabun County	75	55	73.3%	Yes	Met
721	Richmond County	45	25	55.6%	Yes	Met
722	Rockdale County	381	268	70.3%	Yes	Met
726	Spalding County	82	74	90.2%	Yes	Met
729	Sumter County	100	70	70.0%	Yes	Met
732	Tattnall County	145	92	63.4%	Yes	Met
737	Tift County	374	258	69.0%	Yes	Met
738	Toombs County	124	67	54.0%	Yes	Met
741	Troup County	80	68	85.0%	Yes	Met
747	Walton County	81	53	65.4%	Yes	Met
748	Ware County	57	38	66.7%	Yes	Met
751	Wayne County	74	39	52.7%	Yes	Met
755	Whitfield County	1369	909	66.4%	Yes	Met
761	Atlanta Public Schools	947	642	67.8%	Yes	Met
764	Buford City	166	121	72.9%	Yes	Met
765	Calhoun City	199	155	77.9%	Yes	Met
766	Carrollton City	117	79	67.5%	Yes	Met
767	Cartersville City	223	156	70.0%	Yes	Met
772	Dalton City	802	562	70.1%	Yes	Met
776	Gainesville City	1399	843	60.3%	Yes	Met
779	Jefferson City	37	28	75.7%	Yes	Met
781	Marietta City	622	482	77.5%	Yes	Met
785	Rome City	328	235	71.6%	Yes	Met
792	Valdosta City	59	45	76.3%	Yes	Met
999	State	55,199	37,222	67.4%	Yes	Met

<sup>#</sup> To be included in this table, a district must have at least 1 ELL student with an ACCESS test record.

For privacy and reliability reasons, performance is only reported for groups with more than 10 students.

2011 CONSORTIUM District Performance on AMAO 1: Progress Toward English Language Proficiency

System Code	System Name#	Consortium Membership	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Records	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Record(s) Who Made Progress	Making Progress (Target=50%)	Is District Progress Percentage Greater than or Equal to 50%?	Final 2011 AMAO 1 Determinations
111	Consortium	Consortium	1,269	851	67.1%	Yes	
604	Baker County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
605	Baldwin County	Consortium	33	22	66.7%	Yes	Met
610	Berrien County	Consortium	44	41	93.2%	Yes	Met
612	Bleckley County	Consortium	12	4	33.3%	No	Did Not Meet
613	Brantley County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
763	Bremen City	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
614	Brooks County	Consortium	31	25	80.6%	Yes	Met
615	Bryan County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
617	Burke County	Consortium	11	6	54.5%	Yes	Met
618	Butts County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
619	Calhoun County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
620	Camden County	Consortium	26	19	73.1%	Yes	Met
621	Candler County	Consortium	46	24	52.2%	Yes	Met
623	Catoosa County	Consortium	41	26	63.4%	Yes	Met
624	Charlton County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
626	Chattaga County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup		 4E E9/	 No	Too Few in Subgroup
627	Chattooga County	Consortium	22	10	45.5%	No	Did Not Meet
769 632	Chickamauga City Clinch County	Consortium Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup Too Few in Subgroup
771	Commerce City	Consortium		21	58.3%	 V	Met
640	Crisp County	Consortium	36 29	8	27.6%	Yes No	Did Not Meet
641	Dade County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup	0 	27.0%		Too Few in Subgroup
773	Decatur City	Consortium	32	23	71.9%	Yes	Met
645	Dodge County	Consortium	32	23	71.9%	Yes	Met
646	Dodge County  Dooly County	Consortium	31	23	74.2%	Yes	Met
774	Dublin City	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup		74.2 /0		Too Few in Subgroup
649	Early County	Consortium	15	9	60.0%	Yes	Met
650	Echols County	Consortium	35	25	71.4%	Yes	Met
655	Fannin County	Consortium	16	12	75.0%	Yes	Met
671	Haralson County	Consortium	12	4	33.3%	No	Did Not Meet
672	Harris County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
677	Irwin County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
679	Jasper County	Consortium	25	15	60.0%	Yes	Met
681	Jefferson County	Consortium	21	13	61.9%	Yes	Met
682	Jenkins County	Consortium	19	15	78.9%	Yes	Met
683	Johnson County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
684	Jones County	Consortium	11	5	45.5%	No	Did Not Meet
685	Lamar County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
686	Lanier County	Consortium	19	14	73.7%	Yes	Met
687	Laurens County	Consortium	11	9	81.8%	Yes	Met
690	Lincoln County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
694	Macon County	Consortium	23	15	65.2%	Yes	Met
696	Marion County	Consortium	28	21	75.0%	Yes	Met
697	McDuffie County	Consortium	27	16	59.3%	Yes	Met
698	McIntosh County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
699	Meriwether County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
700	Miller County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
701	Mitchell County	Consortium	28	21	75.0%	Yes	Met
702	Monroe County	Consortium	15	11	73.3%	Yes	Met
703	Montgomery County	Consortium	18	11	61.1%	Yes	Met
784	Pelham City	Consortium	15	9	60.0%	Yes	Met
712	Pickens County	Consortium	28	18	64.3%	Yes	Met
716	Pulaski County	Consortium	12	6	50.0%	Yes	Met
723	Schley County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
724	Screven County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
725	Seminole County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
786	Social Circle City	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
727	Stephens County	Consortium	24	20	83.3%	Yes	Met
734	Telfair County	Consortium	20	18	90.0%	Yes	Met
735	Terrell County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
736	Thomas County	Consortium	36	29	80.6%	Yes	Met
745	Thomaston-Upson County	Consortium	24	16	66.7%	Yes	Met
789	Thomasville City	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
739	Towns County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup

System Code	System Name#	Consortium Membership	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Records	Number of 2011 EL ACCESS Test Takers - Matched to Prior Record(s) Who Made Progress	AMAO-1: 2011 Percent of Students Making Progress (Target=50%)	Is District Progress Percentage Greater than or Equal to 50%?	Final 2011 AMAO 1 Determinations*
740	Treutlen County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
791	Trion City	Consortium	31	19	61.3%	Yes	Met
742	Turner County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
744	Union County	Consortium	26	17	65.4%	Yes	Met
793	Vidalia City	Consortium	19	12	63.2%	Yes	Met
746	Walker County	Consortium	22	19	86.4%	Yes	Met
750	Washington County	Consortium	17	8	47.1%	No	Did Not Meet
752	Webster County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
753	Wheeler County	Consortium	14	12	85.7%	Yes	Met
754	White County	Consortium	22	14	63.6%	Yes	Met
757	Wilkes County	Consortium	16	11	68.8%	Yes	Met
758	Wilkinson County	Consortium	21	13	61.9%	Yes	Met
759	Worth County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
7820108	Mountain Education Center	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
7820110	Odyssey School	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup
7830110	Ivy Prep	Consortium	18	5	27.8%	No	Did Not Meet
7820112	Scholars Academy	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup				Too Few in Subgroup

<sup>#</sup> To be included in this table, a consortium district must have at least 1 ELL student with an ACCESS test record.

<sup>\*</sup> All districts in the Consortium met the AMAO 1 target because the consortium met the target. The other data displayed in this table can be used for informational purposes.

For privacy and reliability reasons, performance is only reported for groups more than 10 students

2011 District Performance on AMAO 2: Attainment of Proficiency

System Code	System Name	Number of EL ACCESS Test Takers	Number of EL ACCESS Test Takers Making Proficiency (Scoring at least 5.0 on Tier C)	AMAO-2: 2011 District Proficiency Percentage (AMAO Target = 6.25%)	2011 Proficiency Percentage Greater than 6.25%?	Second Look Denominator: Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as either EL=Y or EL=M in 2011	Second Look Numerator: Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as EL=M in 2011	Second Look Percentage (Target=Statewide Percentage, 17.4%)	AMAO-2: Second Look Criteria Greater than 17.4%?	Final 2011 AMAO 2 Determinations
111	Consortium	2,051	321	15.7%	Yes	1,881	332	17.7%	Yes	Met
601	Appling County	113	9	8.0%	Yes	108	32	29.6%	Yes	Yes
602	Atkinson County	121	10	8.3%	Yes	134	29	21.6%	Yes	Yes
603	Bacon County	65	3	4.6%	No	61	4	6.6%	No	No
606	Banks County	83	17	20.5%	Yes	76	9	11.8%	No	Yes
607	Barrow County	815	88	10.8%	Yes	827	104	12.6%	No	Yes
608	Bartow County	554	89	16.1%	Yes	569	82	14.4%	No	Yes
609 611	Ben Hill County	141 336	30 48	21.3% 14.3%	Yes	131 333	18 55	13.7% 16.5%	No No	Yes
616	Bibb County	208	19	9.1%	Yes Yes	190	17	8.9%	No	Yes
622	Bulloch County Carroll County	243	43	17.7%	Yes	227	33	14.5%	No	Yes Yes
625	Chatham County	596	77	12.9%	Yes	575	110	19.1%	Yes	Yes
628	Cherokee County	1,366	165	12.1%	Yes	1,270	191	15.0%	No	Yes
629	Clarke County	1,129	105	9.3%	Yes	1,291	275	21.3%	Yes	Yes
631	Clayton County	3,619	480	13.3%	Yes	3,932	695	17.7%	Yes	Yes
633	Cobb County	8,400	1,240	14.8%	Yes	8,611	999	11.6%	No	Yes
634	Coffee County	338	36	10.7%	Yes	264	34	12.9%	No	Yes
635	Colquitt County	956	110	11.5%	Yes	965	163	16.9%	No	Yes
636	Columbia County	249	52	20.9%	Yes	241	53	22.0%	Yes	Yes
637	Cook County	92	11	12.0%	Yes	95	23	24.2%	Yes	Yes
638	Coweta County	445	68	15.3%	Yes	483	82	17.0%	No	Yes
642	Dawson County	55	9	16.4%	Yes	63	15	23.8%	Yes	Yes
643	Decatur County	141	18	12.8%	Yes	155	33	21.3%	Yes	Yes
644	DeKalb County	9,294	820	8.8%	Yes	8,906	986	11.1%	No	Yes
647	Dougherty County	171	15	8.8%	Yes	127	0	0.0%	No	Yes
648	Douglas County	1,021	113	11.1%	Yes	963	150	15.6%	No	Yes
651	Effingham County	75	11	14.7%	Yes	83	24	28.9%	Yes	Yes
652	Elbert County	99	19	19.2%	Yes	98	23	23.5%	Yes	Yes
653	Emanuel County	77	6	7.8%	Yes	68	8	11.8%	No	Yes
654	Evans County	192	9	4.7%	No	157	16	10.2%	No	No
656	Fayette County	513	114	22.2%	Yes	476	102	21.4%	Yes	Yes
657	Floyd County	266	38	14.3%	Yes	203	34	16.7%	No	Yes
658	Forsyth County	1,558	271	17.4%	Yes	1,505	247	16.4%	No	Yes
659	Franklin County	60	11	18.3%	Yes	75	12	16.0%	No	Yes
660	Fulton County	4,729	766	16.2%	Yes	4,789	1,026	21.4%	Yes	Yes
661	Gilmer County	389	24	6.2%	No	345	29	8.4%	No	No
663	Glynn County	517	54	10.4%	Yes	565	67	11.9%	No	Yes
664	Gordon County	295	27	9.2%	Yes	288	63	21.9%	Yes	Yes
665	Grady County	229	27	11.8%	Yes	222	51	23.0%	Yes	Yes
666 667	Greene County	83 18.948	18 3.322	21.7% 17.5%	Yes Yes	83 20,585	14 4.438	16.9% 21.6%	No Yes	Yes Yes
	Gwinnett County		3,322 54	8.6%			4,438 82			
668 669	Habersham County Hall County	625 3,919	456	11.6%	Yes Yes	555 4,389	761	14.8% 17.3%	No No	Yes Yes
673	Hart County	69	9	13.0%	Yes	60	8	13.3%	No	Yes
675	Henry County	703	114	16.2%	Yes	805	220	27.3%	Yes	Yes
676	Houston County	786	121	15.4%	Yes	793	103	13.0%	No	Yes
678	Jackson County	269	43	16.0%	Yes	270	50	18.5%	Yes	Yes
680	Jeff Davis County	234	26	11.1%	Yes	215	46	21.4%	Yes	Yes
688	Lee County	66	19	28.8%	Yes	72	22	30.6%	Yes	Yes
689	Liberty County	88	11	12.5%	Yes	53	6	11.3%	No	Yes
691	Long County	118	11	9.3%	Yes	94	6	6.4%	No	Yes
692	Lowndes County	193	32	16.6%	Yes	204	61	29.9%	Yes	Yes
693	Lumpkin County	71	6	8.5%	Yes	66	12	18.2%	Yes	Yes
695	Madison County	91	11	12.1%	Yes	90	25	27.8%	Yes	Yes
704	Morgan County	65	9	13.8%	Yes	58	0	0.0%	No	Yes
705	Murray County	430	25	5.8%	No	459	104	22.7%	Yes	Yes
706	Muscogee County	488	45	9.2%	Yes	376	65	17.3%	No	Yes
707	Newton County	481	74	15.4%	Yes	529	110	20.8%	Yes	Yes
708	Oconee County	117	19	16.2%	Yes	135	37	27.4%	Yes	Yes
709	Oglethorpe County	57	4	7.0%	Yes	67	17	25.4%	Yes	Yes
710	Paulding County	337	70	20.8%	Yes	376	78	20.7%	Yes	Yes
711 713	Peach County	185	24	13.0%	Yes	167	26	15.6%	No	Yes
	Pierce County	95	11	11.6%	Yes	102	24	23.5%	Yes	Yes

System Code	System Name	Number of EL ACCESS Test Takers	Number of EL ACCESS Test Takers Making Proficiency (Scoring at least 5.0 on Tier C)	AMAO-2: 2011 District Proficiency Percentage (AMAO Target = 6.25%)	2011 Proficiency Percentage Greater than 6.25%?	Second Look Denominator: Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as either EL=Y or EL=M in 2011	Second Look Numerator: Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as EL=M in 2011	Second Look Percentage (Target=Statewide Percentage, 17.4%)	AMAO-2: Second Look Criteria Greater than 17.4%?	Final 2011 AMAO 2 Determinations
715	Polk County	416	53	12.7%	Yes	441	94	21.3%	Yes	Yes
717	Putnam County	60	10	16.7%	Yes	55	15	27.3%	Yes	Yes
719	Rabun County	93	6	6.5%	Yes	108	21	19.4%	Yes	Yes
721	Richmond County	85	13	15.3%	Yes	115	0	0.0%	No	Yes
722	Rockdale County	585	80	13.7%	Yes	609	107	17.6%	Yes	Yes
726	Spalding County	134	36	26.9%	Yes	119	30	25.2%	Yes	Yes
729	Sumter County	145	21	14.5%	Yes	145	21	14.5%	No	Yes
732	Tattnall County	199	28	14.1%	Yes	180	14	7.8%	No	Yes
737	Tift County	529	90	17.0%	Yes	532	81	15.2%	No	Yes
738	Toombs County	163	15	9.2%	Yes	171	33	19.3%	Yes	Yes
741	Troup County	161	36	22.4%	Yes	110	19	17.3%	No	Yes
747	Walton County	126	9	7.1%	Yes	129	30	23.3%	Yes	Yes
748	Ware County	85	9	10.6%	Yes	86	14	16.3%	No	Yes
751	Wayne County	97	8	8.2%	Yes	100	8	8.0%	No	Yes
755	Whitfield County	1,857	256	13.8%	Yes	1,902	314	16.5%	No	Yes
761	Atlanta Public Schools	1,402	174	12.4%	Yes	1,320	168	12.7%	No	Yes
764	Buford City	276	35	12.7%	Yes	263	74	28.1%	Yes	Yes
765	Calhoun City	274	55	20.1%	Yes	290	76	26.2%	Yes	Yes
766	Carrollton City	190	33	17.4%	Yes	153	14	9.2%	No	Yes
767	Cartersville City	321	60	18.7%	Yes	340	56	16.5%	No	Yes
772	Dalton City	1,192	136	11.4%	Yes	1,307	322	24.6%	Yes	Yes
776	Gainesville City	1,878	157	8.4%	Yes	1,854	237	12.8%	No	Yes
779	Jefferson City	50	9	18.0%	Yes	60	11	18.3%	Yes	Yes
781	Marietta City	940	148	15.7%	Yes	962	186	19.3%	Yes	Yes
785	Rome City	439	67	15.3%	Yes	534	84	15.7%	No	Yes
792	Valdosta City	113	23	20.4%	Yes	113	20	17.7%	Yes	Yes
999	State	81,581	11,475	14.1%	Yes	83,957	14,591	17.4%	N/A	Yes

<sup>#</sup> To be included in this table, a district must have at least 1 EL student with an ACCESS test record.

For privacy and reliability reasons, performance is only reported for groups with more than 10 students

Page	2011 CONSOR	TIUM District Performance on	AMAO 2: Attainment	t of Proficiency								
Column	-	·	Membership	ACCESS Test Takers	Test Takers Making Proficiency (Scoring at least 5.0 on Tier C)	District Proficiency Percentage (AMAO Target = 6.25%)	Percentage Greater than 6.25%?	Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as either EL=Y or EL=M in 2011	Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as EL=M in 2011	(Target=Statewide Percentage, 17.4%)	Look Criteria Greater than 17.4%?	Determinations*
Column												
640   Service Conference   Controller   March   Marc		Danor County										
Company   Comp												
Company   Comp												
Total   Beame City												
October   Communication   October   Section   October   Section   October   Section   October   October												
1	614	Brooks County	Consortium	40	5	12.5%	Yes	52	9	17.3%	No	Met
Fig.   Part Courty   Control   Con												
Common Control   Consider   To Freit A Suppose												
Control   Control   34   8   20.5%   Yes   54   19   20.5%   Yes   Mat   Mat									*			
Cardio County   Consocration   Ed.												
Column												
General Control Cont												
Georgia   Controlled Control   19												
Post	626	Chattahoochee County	Consortium	19	3	15.8%	Yes	3	0	0.0%	No	
Committed Comm					0	0.0%	No	26		7.7%	No	
Tri												
663   Class County												11101
Page Contry												
Product Order   Consistent   St.												
646   Debge County												
046					4				16			Met
649   Egify Control   Consortium   42   2   4   50   55   Ves   27   6   22.2%   Ves   Met				41	7	17.1%	Yes	36	0	0.0%		Met
650   Edito's County   Consortium   19   4   2   4.89%   No   53   3   5.7%   No   No   No   655   Famin County   Consortium   19   4   2.1%   5   22.8%   Ves   24   5   5.28%   Ves   No   Met   Met   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N		Dublin City	Consortium									
655   Famin County												
671   Haratin County   Convention   70 Few in Subgroup                       10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup               10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup           10 Few in Subgroup           10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup           10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup               10 Few in Subgroup               10 Few in Subgroup               10 Few in Subgroup               10 Few in Subgroup                 10 Few in Subgroup               10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup             10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup       10 Few in Subgroup       10 Few in Subgroup       10 Few in Subgroup       10 Few in Subgroup       10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup         10 Few in Subgroup           10 Few in Subgroup               10 Few in Subg					_							
Fig. 2   Hairs Courty   Constraint   Too Few is Subgroup												
Fig.   For   Info County   Consentium   To Few in Subgroup												
Proceedings   Processed   Pr												
681   Jufertenn County   Consortium   35   3   8.6%   Yes   28   7   25.0%   Yes   Met												
683   Johnsch County   Consortium   Too Few in Subgroup                           Too Few in Subgroup   685   Lamar County   Consortium   13   1   7.7%   Yes   12   1   8.3%   No   Met   M			Consortium	35	3						Yes	
684	682	Jenkins County	Consortium	29	10	34.5%	Yes	24	0	0.0%	No	Met
686			Consortium									
Consortium   28   3   10.7%   Yes   32   4   12.5%   No   Met												11101
687   Laurier County   Consortium   29   3   10.3%   Yes   26   6   23.1%   Yes   Met												
Sept												
694   Marion Country												
686   Marion County												
697   McDuffle County   Consortium   46   9   19.6%   Yes   41   11   26.8%   Yes   Met   Met   698   McIntosic County   Consortium   14   1   7.1%   Yes   11   5   45.5%   Yes   Met   Met   700   McIntosic County   Consortium   14   1   7.1%   Yes   11   5   45.5%   Yes   Met   Met   700   McIntosic County   Consortium   36   11   30.6%   Yes   42   1   2.4%   No   Met   701   Mitchell County   Consortium   25   4   16.0%   Yes   42   1   2.4%   No   Met   703   Montgonery County   Consortium   25   4   16.0%   Yes   23   4   17.4%   No   Met   703   Montgonery County   Consortium   26   7   26.5%   Yes   25   5   20.0%   Yes   Met   712   Pickens County   Consortium   47   10   21.3%   Yes   19   3   15.8%   No   Met   712   Pickens County   Consortium   40   8   20.0%   Yes   40   8   20.0%   Yes   Met   712   Pickens County   Consortium   40   8   20.0%   Yes   40   8   20.0%   Yes   Met   713   Scriety County   Consortium   750 Fev in Subgroup					6							Met
Fig.   Merwether County   Consortium   14	697	McDuffie County	Consortium	46	9	19.6%	Yes	41	11	26.8%		Met
To   Miller County												
To   Mitchell County   Consortium   36											Yes	
To   Montoe County   Consortium   25   4   16.0%   Yes   23   4   17.4%   No   Met												
703   Montgomery County   Consortium   26   7   26.9%   Yes   25   5   20.0%   Yes   Met												
Pelham City												Met
Title												
Tile												
To Few in Subgroup	716		Consortium	27								No
725   Seminole County   Consortium   16   3   18.8%   Yes   4   1   25.0%   Yes   Met		Schley County										
To Few in Subgroup												
The first county   Consortium   To Few in Subgroup   To Few in Subgrou												IIIO
To Few in Subgroup												
To Few in Subgroup					_							
Thomas County												
745         Thomaston-Upson County         Consortium         37         2         5.4%         No         28         3         10.7%         No         No           789         Thomasville City         Consortium         Too Few in Subgroup				48								
Trigonome												
740         Treutlen County         Consortium         Too Few in Subgroup	789	Thomasville City	Consortium									
791         Trion City         Consortium         41         4         9.8%         Yes         48         15         31.3%         Yes         Met           742         Turner County         Consortium         11         2         18.2%         Yes         12         0         0.0%         No         Met           744         Union County         Consortium         38         4         10.5%         Yes         34         3         8.8%         No         Met           793         Vidalia City         Consortium         29         4         13.8%         Yes         22         1         4.5%         No         Met           746         Walker County         Consortium         38         9         23.7%         Yes         32         7         21.9%         Yes         Met												Too Few in Subgroup
742         Turner County         Consortium         11         2         18.2%         Yes         12         0         0.0%         No         Met           744         Union County         Consortium         38         4         10.5%         Yes         34         3         8.8%         No         Met           793         Vidalia City         Consortium         29         4         13.8%         Yes         22         1         4.5%         No         Met           746         Walker County         Consortium         38         9         23.7%         Yes         32         7         21.9%         Yes         Met												
744         Union County         Consortium         38         4         10.5%         Yes         34         3         8.8%         No         Met           793         Vidalia City         Consortium         29         4         13.8%         Yes         22         1         4.5%         No         Met           746         Walker County         Consortium         38         9         23.7%         Yes         32         7         21.9%         Yes         Met												
793         Vidalia City         Consortium         29         4         13.8%         Yes         22         1         4.5%         No         Met           746         Walker County         Consortium         38         9         23.7%         Yes         32         7         21.9%         Yes         Met												
746 Walker County Consortium 38 9 23.7% Yes 32 7 21.9% Yes Met												
									7			
		Washington County							0			

System Code	System Name#	Consortium Membership	Number of EL ACCESS Test Takers	Number of EL ACCESS Test Takers Making Proficiency (Scoring at least 5.0 on Tier C)	AMAO-2: 2011 District Proficiency Percentage (AMAO Target = 6.25%)	2011 Proficiency Percentage Greater than 6.25%?	Second Look Denominator: Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as either EL=Y or EL=M in 2011	Second Look Numerator: Number of Students Reported as EL=Y in 2010 and as EL=M in 2011	Second Look Percentage (Target=Statewide Percentage, 17.4%)	AMAO-2: Second Look Criteria Greater than 17.4%?	Final 2011 AMAO 2 Determinations*
752	Webster County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup		***						Too Few in Subgroup
753	Wheeler County	Consortium	21	3	14.3%	Yes	18	3	16.7%	No	Met
754	White County	Consortium	34	6	17.6%	Yes	37	8	21.6%	Yes	Met
757	Wilkes County	Consortium	28	0	0.0%	No	22	2	9.1%	No	No
758	Wilkinson County	Consortium	26	4	15.4%	Yes	22	0	0.0%	No	Met
759	Worth County	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup								Too Few in Subgroup
7820108	Mountain Education Center	Consortium	16	1	6.3%	Yes	24	0	0.0%	No	Met
7820110	Odyssey School	Consortium	11	1	9.1%	Yes					Too Few in Subgroup
7830110	Ivy Prep	Consortium	25	3	12.0%	Yes	26	4	15.4%	Yes	Met
7820112	Scholars Academy	Consortium	Too Few in Subgroup		***						Too Few in Subgroup

<sup>#</sup> To be included in this table, a district must have at least 1 EL student with an ACCESS test record.

<sup>\*</sup> All districts in the Consortium met the AMAO 2 target because the consortium met the target. The other data displayed in this table can be used for informational purposes.

For privacy and reliability reasons, performance is only reported for groups with more than 10 students