IMPROVEMENTS MADE BY OKLAHOMA TO ITS ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

Based on feedback from peer reviewers and U.S. Department of Education staff, Oklahoma made the following changes to its original request in order to meet the principles of ESEA flexibility.

PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS

- Oklahoma detailed its plans to develop a new State Longitudinal Data System that will better track how all students are performing over time and will provide timely student-level data to educators to use to support student learning, and will connect more strongly multiple data systems across P-20 education.
- Oklahoma explained its plans to prepare educators so that they will be ready to implement new
 college- and career-ready standards. Oklahoma's priorities for professional development include
 hiring coaches; providing curriculum-mapping software; collaborating among higher-education
 faculty and PreK-12 educators; and collaborating among Career and Technical educators, PreK12 educators, and business representatives. The Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher
 Education is involved with these efforts.
- Oklahoma described in more detail its plans to ensure that students with disabilities and English Learners have access to rigorous content aligned with college- and career-ready standards. For example, all students with disabilities, including those students who take alternate assessments, are a focus of the transition plan to college- and career-ready standards and the aligned assessments. Oklahoma will require each priority, focus, and targeted intervention school to develop a Language Instruction Educational Plan for each English Learner and provide professional development for all educators on improving outcomes for English Learners.

PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED SYSTEM OF DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY AND SUPPORT

- Oklahoma clarified that measuring student growth in reading and mathematics includes the performance results for all students and for students with disabilities.
- Oklahoma detailed the timeline for the development and approval of its A-F school grading system by spring 2012. The State also demonstrated how it will identify reward, priority, focus, and targeted intervention schools and included an interim plan for identifying and intervening in these schools if final approval of its school grading system is delayed.
- Oklahoma indicated that graduation rate will comprise a significant amount of the 33 percent of its A-F school grading system attributed to measures other than test scores and that its system

will recognize schools for recovering dropouts and for graduating students who take more than four years.

- Oklahoma streamlined the use of performance data by setting the expectation that to meet targets for reading and mathematics, the required scores and the minimum 95 percent participation rate for each assessment must be met.
- Oklahoma described the criteria it will use to determine the capacity of districts with priority schools to turn around those schools or turn over the operation of the schools to the State.
- Oklahoma clarified how it identifies focus schools based on the lowest-achieving three subgroups in the State and demonstrated that more schools are identified through this methodology than would be identified based on individual subgroups with a minimum "n" greater than 25.
- Oklahoma has differentiated specific interventions and supports for all schools in the bottom 25
 percent of the State in student achievement, in addition to those identified as priority or focus
 schools.

PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

- Oklahoma provided more detail on its plan for developing and adopting guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year.
- Oklahoma included a number of recommendations made by the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System Commission that will inform the substance of Oklahoma's teacher and leader evaluation guidelines.
- Oklahoma included a tentative timeline for training educators and piloting its teacher and leader evaluation system during the 2012–2013 school year and its process for reviewing information from the pilot in order to make recommendations regarding any needed changes to the State Board of Education by July 2013.