

In September 2011, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) offered each state education agency (SEA) the opportunity to request flexibility from the one-size-fits-all requirements of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)*, on behalf of itself, its local education agencies (LEAs), and schools. SEAs wishing to qualify for *ESEA* flexibility were required to provide the Department with rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve instructional quality.

In order to receive *ESEA* flexibility, each SEA developed and implemented a system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support that considered student achievement, graduation rates, and school performance and progress over time for the “all students” group, individual *ESEA* student subgroups, and any combined subgroup. A key element of the accountability systems was the identification of a state’s lowest-achieving schools and schools with the lowest graduation rates as priority schools and schools with the most significant achievement or graduation rate gaps as focus schools. Each SEA identified a number of schools equal to at least 5 percent of its Title I participating schools as priority schools and equal to at least 10 percent of its Title I participating schools as focus schools. Each SEA is ensuring that schools and students receive interventions and supports based on this comprehensive system of identification.

SEAs approved to begin implementation of *ESEA* flexibility in the 2012–13 school year (Windows 1 and 2 states) used 2010–11 data, 2011–12 data, or multiple years of data including 2011–12 data to identify schools under their systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support. Similarly, SEAs approved to begin implementation of *ESEA* flexibility in the 2013–14 school year (Windows 3 and 4 states) used 2011–12 data, 2012–13 data, or multiple years of data including 2012–13 data to identify schools under their accountability systems. The Department analyzed aggregate student data reported by SEAs to determine the extent to which each SEA’s identification of schools captured low subgroup achievement, low subgroup graduation rates, large subgroup achievement and graduation rate gaps, and subgroups meeting annual measurable objectives (AMOs), the 95-percent participation rate, and graduation rate targets. The data analysis that follows is a profile developed specifically for each state based on SEA-provided data for Title I participating schools. Each Window 1 and Window 2 state will have a Year 1 analysis (based on 2011–12 data) and a Year 2 analysis (based on 2012–13 data). Each Window 3 and Window 4 state will have only a Year 1 analysis (based on 2012–13 data). Please note that the analyses were impacted by varying levels of school data quality as indicated in the footnote for each exhibit and as noted in Appendix A-1 (Technical notes) and Appendix A-2 (Excluded and modified state profile analyses). Additionally, under *ESEA* flexibility, a state may have identified Title I eligible, but not Title I participating schools as priority schools. Such schools would not be included in the following analysis, which includes only Title I participating schools.

These profiles are provided to states as tools to facilitate continuous improvement of each SEA’s system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support and to support conversations between individual SEAs and the Department. The Department intends to continue to generate data analyses of *ESEA* flexibility going forward. The current profiles are not designed to provide information on the effectiveness of individual state systems or the impact of *ESEA* flexibility on student achievement or other educational outcomes.

Section I: Overview of Accountability Under *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility*

Exhibit 1. What percentage of Title I participating elementary, middle, high, and non-standard schools were priority, focus, or other?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating elementary schools, 2 percent (4 schools) were priority schools, 10 percent (28 schools) were focus schools, and 88 percent (243 schools) were among all other Title I participating schools for 2013–14.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 18: Grades offered; 2013–14 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 409 Title I participating schools)

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

Exhibit 2. What percentage of Title I participating schools in each state-defined status were priority, focus, or other?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools categorized as “5 Stars,” 2 percent (1 school) were priority schools, 6 percent (3 schools) were focus schools, and 92 percent (45 schools) were among all other Title I participating schools for 2013–14.

Source: 2013–14 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 34: Improvement status - school, DG 779: State-defined school status ($n = 403$ Title I participating schools [49 5-Stars schools, 176 4-Stars schools, 118 3-Stars schools, 46 2-Stars schools, and 14 1-Star schools])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

Exhibit 3. What were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?

Characteristics	Priority and Focus Schools	All Other Title I Participating Schools
School Level (Percentage of Schools)		
Elementary	57.1%	68.8%
Middle	16.1%	15.0%
High	21.4%	6.8%
Non-standard ^a	5.4%	9.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
School Type (Percentage of Schools)		
Regular	76.8%	98.6%
Alternative	23.2%	1.4%
Special education	0.0%	0.0%
Vocational	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Charter School Status (Percentage of Schools)	8.9%	5.9%
Urbanicity (Percentage of Schools)		
Large or middle-sized city	16.1%	15.0%
Urban fringe and large town	51.8%	39.9%
Small town and rural area	32.1%	45.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Percentage of Students by Race/Ethnicity		
American Indian	4.8%	1.1%
Asian	1.4%	1.3%
Black	<1%	<1%
Hispanic	28.4%	19.6%
White	62.2%	75.5%
Total^b	97.7%	98.4%
Percentage of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	66.0%	57.0%
Percentage of Students With Disabilities	10.2%	8.4%
Percentage of Limited English Proficient Students^c		
Average Total School Enrollment	311	379

Exhibit reads: In Idaho, 57 percent of Title I participating priority and focus schools for 2013–14 were elementary schools, compared to 69 percent of all other Title I participating schools.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 18: Grades offered, DG 21: School type, DG 27: Charter status, DG 39: Membership, DG 74: Children with disabilities (IDEA) school age, DG 123: LEP students in LEP program, DG 565: Free or reduced-price lunch; 2013–14 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ($n = 409$ Title I participating schools [56 Title I participating priority or focus schools and 353 all other Title I participating schools])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

Section II: Performance of Title I Schools on Proficiency Rates and Graduation Rates

Exhibit 4. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in reading?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools, 80 percent of priority schools (8 schools), 11 percent of focus schools (4 schools), and 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (3 schools) scored in the bottom 5th percentile statewide in terms of the performance of the “all students” group in reading in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED Facts, Data Group (DG) 584: Academic achievement in reading; 2013–14 ED Facts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 382 Title I participating schools [10 priority, 36 focus, and 336 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

Exhibit 5. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in mathematics?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools, 60 percent of priority schools (6 schools), 6 percent of focus schools (2 schools), and 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (3 schools) scored in the bottom 5th percentile statewide in terms of the performance of the “all students” group in mathematics in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 583: Academic achievement in mathematics; 2013–14 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 382 Title I participating schools [10 priority, 36 focus, and 336 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

Exhibit 6. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroup gaps that exceeded statewide subgroup gaps by one or more standard deviations?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools, 0 percent of all other Title I participating schools (0 schools) had a performance gap between Black and nonBlack students exceeding the state-level gap by one or more standard deviations in reading in 2012–13. No priority or focus school met or exceeded the minimum *n* size for the subgroups included in the Black-nonBlack subgroup gap analysis.

Source: 2012–13 ED*FACTS*, Data Group (DG) 583: Academic achievement in mathematics, DG 584: Academic achievement in reading; 2013–14 ED*FACTS*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 327 Title I participating schools [6 priority, 33 focus, and 288 all other Title I participating])

Note: States had flexibility regarding which subgroups and subgroup gaps they would target in identifying focus schools. Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

Section III: Performance of Title I Schools on ESEA Accountability Targets

Exhibit 9. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in reading?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools, 20 percent of priority schools (2 schools), 19 percent of focus schools (7 schools), and 47 percent of all other Title I participating schools (157 schools) met the state-defined reading AMO target for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 552: AMO reading/ELA status; 2013–14 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 383 Title I participating schools [10 priority, 36 focus, and 337 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

Exhibit 10. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in reading?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools, 100 percent of priority schools (15 schools), 100 percent of focus schools (40 schools), and 100 percent of all other Title I participating schools (345 schools) met the reading 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 553: Reading/ELA participation status; 2013–14 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 400 Title I participating schools [15 priority, 40 focus, and 345 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

Exhibit 11. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in mathematics?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools, 20 percent of priority schools (2 schools), 31 percent of focus schools (11 schools), and 58 percent of all other Title I participating schools (194 schools) met the state-defined mathematics AMO target for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*FACTS*, Data Group (DG) 554: AMO mathematics status; 2013–14 ED*FACTS*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 383 Title I participating schools [10 priority, 36 focus, and 337 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

Exhibit 12. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in mathematics?




Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating schools, 87 percent of priority schools (13 schools), 100 percent of focus schools (40 schools), and 99 percent of all other Title I participating schools (343 schools) met the mathematics 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*FACTS*, Data Group (DG) 555: Mathematics participation status; 2013–14 ED*FACTS*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 400 Title I participating schools [15 priority, 40 focus, and 345 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

Exhibit 13. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate targets?



Exhibit reads: In Idaho, among Title I participating high schools, 0 percent of priority schools (0 schools), 40 percent of focus schools (2 schools), and 75 percent of all other Title I participating schools (30 schools) met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate target for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED^{FACTS}, Data Group (DG) 557: High school graduation rate indicator; 2013–14 ED^{FACTS}, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 66 Title I participating high schools [8 priority, 5 focus, and 53 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

Appendix

Exhibit A-1. Technical notes

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
<p>Exhibit 1. What percentage of Title I participating elementary, middle, high, and non-standard schools were priority, focus, or other?</p>	<p>School levels were defined using <i>Common Core of Data (CCD)</i> codes, which were calculated from the school’s corresponding low/high grade span: elementary (low grade: PK–3, high grade: PK–8); middle (low grade: 4–7, high grade: 4–9); high (low grade: 7–12, high grade: 12 only); and non-standard (grade configurations not falling within the elementary, middle, or high categories). This exhibit is restricted to elementary, middle, and high schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 16 schools, including 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
<p>Exhibit 2. What percentage of Title I participating schools in each state-defined status were priority, focus, or other?</p>	<p>State-defined accountability status levels in Idaho range from “5 Stars” to “1 Star,” with “1 Star” representing the lowest performance level. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 22 schools, including 6 Title I participating schools with no state-defined accountability status for 2013–14; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
<p>Exhibit 3. What were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?</p>	<p>^a Non-standard schools are schools with a grade configuration not falling within the elementary (low grade: PK–3, high grade: PK–8); middle (low grade: 4–7, high grade: 4–9); or high school (low grade: 7–12, high grade: 12 only) categories. ^b Percentage of students by race/ethnicity may not sum to 100 percent due to exclusion of students reported as “two or more races.” <i>Asian</i> includes Pacific Islander, <i>American Indian</i> includes Alaska Native, <i>Black</i> includes African American, and <i>Hispanic</i> includes Latino. ^c The percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students participating in LEP programs is excluded because the difference between the state aggregate count based on <i>EDFacts</i> and the total LEP count in the Consolidated State Performance Report exceeds 15 percent. Student characteristics are weighted in proportion to the number of students enrolled in a school. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. Due to missing data in <i>EDFacts</i>, analysis samples vary across school characteristics, ranging from 42 to 56 for Title I participating priority or focus schools and from 257 to 353 for all other Title I participating schools. This exhibit also excludes 16 schools, including 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
<p>Exhibit 4. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in reading?</p>	<p>Percentiles are defined by the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading/English language arts. The percentage of schools in the bottom 5th percentile may exceed 5 percent in cases where the cut point for the 5th percentile and higher ranked percentiles (e.g., 10th, 15th) is 0 percent proficient. No priority or focus school met or exceeded the minimum <i>n</i> size for the Asian or Black subgroups. Under <i>ESEA</i> flexibility, Idaho uses a combined subgroup consisting of the following student subgroups: economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient, students with disabilities, American Indian, Black, and Hispanic. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 43 schools, including 23 Title I participating schools (6 priority, 4 focus, 13 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; 4 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 4 all other Title I participating) missing reading proficiency data for every student subgroup; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
<p>Exhibit 5. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in mathematics?</p>	<p>Percentiles are defined by the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics. The percentage of schools in the bottom 5th percentile may exceed 5 percent in cases where the cut point for the 5th percentile and higher ranked percentiles (e.g., 10th, 15th) is 0 percent proficient. No priority or focus school met or exceeded the minimum <i>n</i> size for the Asian or Black subgroups.</p> <p>Under ESEA flexibility, Idaho uses a combined subgroup consisting of the following student subgroups: economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient, students with disabilities, American Indian, Black, and Hispanic.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 43 schools, including 23 Title I participating schools (6 priority, 4 focus, 13 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; 4 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 4 all other Title I participating) missing mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
<p>Exhibit 6. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroup gaps that exceeded statewide subgroup gaps by one or more standard deviations?</p>	<p>^a SWD = Students with disabilities ^b LEP = Limited English proficient ^c Econ Disadv = Economically disadvantaged</p> <p>No priority or focus school met or exceeded the minimum <i>n</i> size for the subgroups included in the Black-nonBlack subgroup gap analysis.</p> <p>Proficiency rates for the nonBlack, nonHispanic, noneconomically disadvantaged, nonSWD, and nonLEP subgroups were calculated by subtracting the number of proficient students and the number of students with valid scores for the Black, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, SWD, and LEP subgroups, respectively, from the number of proficient students and the number of students with valid scores for the “all students” group, and then dividing the resulting number of proficient students in the nonBlack, nonHispanic, noneconomically disadvantaged, nonSWD, or nonLEP subgroup by the number of students with valid scores in the subgroup.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 98 schools, including 77 Title I participating schools (10 priority, 7 focus, 60 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; 5 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 5 all other Title I participating) missing reading and mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup gap included in the exhibit; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
<p>Exhibit 9. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in reading?</p>	<p>No Title I participating school was reportedly accountable for the students with disabilities, limited English proficient, or Asian subgroups. In addition, no priority or focus school was reportedly accountable for the Black subgroup.</p> <p>Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 42 schools, including 25 Title I participating schools (6 priority, 4 focus, 15 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading AMO target; 1 Title I participating school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading AMO targets; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>

03/31/15

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
Exhibit 10. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in reading?	<p>No priority school was reportedly accountable for the Asian or Black subgroups. Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 25 schools, including 8 Title I participating schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 7 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading participation target; 1 Title I participating school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading participation targets; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
Exhibit 11. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in mathematics?	<p>No Title I participating school was reportedly accountable for the students with disabilities, limited English proficient, or Asian subgroups. In addition, no priority or focus school was reportedly accountable for the Black subgroup.</p> <p>Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 42 schools, including 25 Title I participating schools (6 priority, 4 focus, 15 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics AMO target; 1 Title I participating school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics AMO targets; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
Exhibit 12. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in mathematics?	<p>No priority school was reportedly accountable for the Asian or Black subgroups. Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 25 schools, including 8 Title I participating schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 7 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics participation target; 1 Title I participating school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics participation targets; 4 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; 1 school missing data for 2012–13 Title I participation status; and 11 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>
Exhibit 13. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate targets?	<p>Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools serving grade 12 that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit may include non-standard schools (i.e., schools with grade configurations not falling within the elementary, middle, or high categories) serving grade 12. This exhibit excludes 16 high schools, including 5 Title I participating high schools (1 priority, 1 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) missing data for all graduation rate targets; 1 Title I participating high school missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 10 high schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</p>

Exhibit A-2. Excluded and modified state profile analyses

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
Exhibit 3. What were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?	Modified to exclude the percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students participating in LEP programs because the difference between the state aggregate count based on ED <i>Facts</i> and the total LEP count in the Consolidated State Performance Report exceeded 15 percent.
Exhibit 7. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?	Excluded because Idaho was exempt from reporting on adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates.
Exhibit 8. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rate subgroup gaps that exceeded statewide subgroup gaps by one or more standard deviations?	Excluded because Idaho was exempt from reporting on adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates.