

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 identified as priority, focus, or other?**




**Exhibit reads:** In Oklahoma, among Title I participating elementary schools, 6 percent (45 schools) were identified as priority, 11 percent (87 schools) were identified as focus, and 83 percent (648 schools) were among all other Title I participating schools for 2012–13.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 18: Grades offered; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 1,129 Title I participating schools)

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

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



**Exhibit reads:** In Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools categorized as “A,” 0 percent (0 schools) were identified as priority, 0 percent (0 schools) were identified as focus, and 100 percent (39 schools) were among all other Title I participating schools for 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 34: Improvement status - school, DG 779: State-defined school status ( $n = 1,111$  Title I participating schools [39 A schools, 471 B schools, 472 C schools, 121 D schools, and 8 F schools])

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

03/31/15

**Exhibit 3. At the time of identification, what were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?**

Characteristics	Schools Identified as Priority or Focus for 2012–13	All Other Title I Participating Schools
<b>School Level (Percentage of Schools)</b>		
Elementary	62.6%	70.6%
Middle	25.6%	17.2%
High	11.8%	11.2%
Non-standard <sup>a</sup>	0.0%	<1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>99.0%</b>
<b>School Type (Percentage of Schools)</b>		
Regular	99.5%	100.0%
Alternative	<1%	0.0%
Special education	0.0%	0.0%
Vocational	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Charter School Status (Percentage of Schools)</b>	<1%	1.9%
<b>Urbanicity (Percentage of Schools)</b>		
Large or middle-sized city	36.5%	13.3%
Urban fringe and large town	23.2%	30.3%
Small town and rural area	40.3%	56.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Percentage of Students by Race/Ethnicity</b>		
American Indian	15.5%	18.8%
Asian	1.4%	1.3%
Black	19.5%	8.5%
Hispanic	22.4%	14.1%
White	36.7%	52.0%
<b>Total<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>95.6%</b>	<b>94.7%</b>
<b>Percentage of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch</b>	80.0%	68.0%
<b>Percentage of Students With Disabilities</b>	15.4%	13.7%
<b>Percentage of Limited English Proficient Students<sup>c</sup></b>		
<b>Average Total School Enrollment</b>	433	352

**Exhibit reads:** In Oklahoma, 63 percent of Title I participating schools identified as priority or focus for 2012–13 were elementary schools, compared to 71 percent of all other Title I participating schools.


Source: 2011–12 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; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 1,129$  Title I participating schools [211 Title I participating schools identified as priority or focus and 918 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. At the time of identification, 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 56 percent of priority schools (41 schools), 1 percent of focus schools (1 school), and 2 percent of all other Title I participating schools (17 schools) scored in the bottom 5th percentile statewide in terms of the performance of the “all students” group in reading in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 584: Academic achievement in reading; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 1,102$  Title I participating schools [73 priority, 138 focus, and 891 all other Title I participating])

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

**Exhibit 5. At the time of identification, 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 66 percent of priority schools (48 schools), 1 percent of focus schools (1 school), and less than 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (7 schools) scored in the bottom 5th percentile statewide in terms of the performance of the “all students” group in mathematics in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 583: Academic achievement in mathematics; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 1,103 Title I participating schools [73 priority, 138 focus, and 892 all other Title I participating])

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

03/31/15

**Exhibit 6. At the time of identification, 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 0 percent of priority schools (0 schools), 4 percent of focus schools (4 schools), and 3 percent of all other Title I participating schools (13 schools) had a performance gap between American Indian and nonAmerican Indian students exceeding the state-level gap by one or more standard deviations in reading in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 583: Academic achievement in mathematics, DG 584: Academic achievement in reading; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 955$  Title I participating schools [56 priority, 138 focus, and 761 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.

03/31/15

**Exhibit 7. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?**



**Exhibit reads:** In Oklahoma, among Title I participating high schools, 14 percent of priority schools (2 schools), 0 percent of focus schools (0 schools), and 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (1 school) had a state-defined graduation rate below 60 percent for the “all students” group in 2011–12.


Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 563: Graduation rate; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 130$  Title I participating high schools [14 priority, 11 focus, and 105 all other Title I participating])

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

03/31/15

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

**Exhibit 9. At the time of identification, 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 1 percent of priority schools (1 school), 4 percent of focus schools (5 schools), and 7 percent of all other Title I participating schools (55 schools) met the state-defined reading AMO target for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 552: AMO reading/ELA status; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 1,029$  Title I participating schools [69 priority, 137 focus, and 823 all other Title I participating])

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

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




**Exhibit reads:** In Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 96 percent of priority schools (70 schools), 100 percent of focus schools (138 schools), and 99 percent of all other Title I participating schools (895 schools) met the reading 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED Facts, Data Group (DG) 553: Reading/ELA participation status; 2012–13 ED Facts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 1,112 Title I participating schools [73 priority, 138 focus, and 901 all other Title I participating])

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

**Exhibit 11. At the time of identification, 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 1 percent of priority schools (1 school), 3 percent of focus schools (4 schools), and 7 percent of all other Title I participating schools (59 schools) met the state-defined mathematics AMO target for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*FACTS*, Data Group (DG) 554: AMO mathematics status; 2012–13 ED*FACTS*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 1,025 Title I participating schools [69 priority, 137 focus, and 819 all other Title I participating])

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

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



**Exhibit reads:** In Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 96 percent of priority schools (70 schools), 99 percent of focus schools (136 schools), and 100 percent of all other Title I participating schools (898 schools) met the mathematics 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 555: Mathematics participation status; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 1,113 Title I participating schools [73 priority, 138 focus, and 902 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
Exhibit 1. What percentage of Title I participating elementary, middle, high, and non-standard schools were identified as priority, focus, or other?	<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).</p> <p>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 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. <b>This exhibit excludes 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
Exhibit 2. What percentage of Title I participating schools in each state-defined status were identified as priority, focus, or other?	<p>State-defined accountability status levels in Oklahoma range from “A” to “F,” with “F” representing the lowest performance level.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. <b>This exhibit excludes 25 schools, including 18 Title I participating schools missing data for state-defined accountability status for 2012–13 and 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
Exhibit 3. At the time of identification, what were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?	<p><sup>a</sup> 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.</p> <p><sup>b</sup> 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.</p> <p><sup>c</sup> 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.</p> <p>Student characteristics are weighted in proportion to the number of students enrolled in a school.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. Due to missing data in <i>EDFacts</i>, analysis samples vary across school characteristics, ranging from 154 to 211 for Title I participating schools identified as priority or focus and from 573 to 918 for all other Title I participating schools. <b>This exhibit also excludes 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
Exhibit 4. At the time of identification, 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>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.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 34 schools, including 25 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 25 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; <b>2 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 2 all other Title I participating) missing reading proficiency data for every student subgroup; and 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
Exhibit 5. At the time of identification, 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>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.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 33 schools, including 25 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 25 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; <b>1 Title I participating school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) missing mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup; and 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>

03/31/15

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
<p>Exhibit 6. At the time of identification, 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><sup>a</sup> Am In = American Indian  <sup>b</sup> Hisp = Hispanic  <sup>c</sup> SWD = Students with disabilities  <sup>d</sup> LEP = Limited English proficient  <sup>e</sup> Econ Disadv = Economically disadvantaged</p> <p>Proficiency rates for the nonAmerican Indian, 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 American Indian, 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 nonAmerican Indian, 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 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 181 schools, including 173 Title I participating schools (17 priority, 0 focus, 156 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; <b>1 Title I participating school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) missing reading and mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup gap included in the exhibit; and 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 7. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?</p>	<p>The U.S. Department of Education approved Oklahoma’s request to delay reporting its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and use a state-defined formula as its transitional rate for 2011–12. Under ESEA flexibility, states identified all Title I schools with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years.</p> <p>This exhibit excludes the Hispanic subgroup because of quality concerns regarding the 2011–12 graduation rate data (among all schools serving grade 12 that were operational in 2011–12, 15 percent or more of schools reported a 0 percent graduation rate for this subgroup) and the students with disabilities subgroup because the state did not report graduation rate data for this subgroup. <i>One or More ESEA Subgroups</i> was revised to include the limited English proficient, economically disadvantaged, American Indian, Asian, Black, and White subgroups.</p> <p>Under ESEA flexibility, Oklahoma uses a combined subgroup (“bottom 25th percentile”). Graduation rate data, however, were not reported for the combined subgroup.</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 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. 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. <b>This exhibit excludes 1 Title I participating high school missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 9. At the time of identification, 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 priority school was accountable for the Asian 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 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 107 schools, including 84 Title I participating schools (4 priority, 1 focus, 79 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading AMO target; <b>16 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 16 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading AMO targets; and 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 10. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in reading?</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 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 24 schools, including 1 Title I participating school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading participation target; <b>16 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 16 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading participation targets; and 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>

03/31/15

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
Exhibit 11. At the time of identification, 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 priority school was accountable for the Asian 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 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 111 schools, including 88 Title I participating schools (4 priority, 1 focus, 83 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics AMO target; <b>16 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 16 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics AMO targets; and 7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
Exhibit 12. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in mathematics?	<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 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 23 schools, including 16 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 16 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics participation targets and <b>7 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>

**Exhibit A-2. Excluded and modified state profile analyses**

<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Technical Notes</b>
Exhibit 3. At the time of identification, 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. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?	Modified to: (a) exclude the Hispanic subgroup because of quality concerns regarding the 2011–12 graduation rate data (among all schools serving grade 12 that were operational in 2011–12, 15 percent or more of schools reported a 0 percent graduation rate for this subgroup); (b) display state-defined graduation rates because Oklahoma was exempt from reporting on adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates; and (c) remove the minimum analysis threshold (i.e., 10 students in graduation cohort) because the ED <i>Facts</i> data file did not include cohort counts.
Exhibit 8. At the time of identification, 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 the provided ED <i>Facts</i> data file did not include cohort counts.
Exhibit 13. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate targets?	Excluded because Oklahoma was exempt from reporting data for the adjusted four-year cohort graduation rate targets.