

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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating elementary schools, 15 percent (115 schools) were priority schools, 6 percent (44 schools) were focus schools, and 79 percent (621 schools) were among all other Title I participating schools for 2013–14.

Source: 2012–13 *EDFacts*, Data Group (DG) 18: Grades offered; 2013–14 *EDFacts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 1,168 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 priority, focus, or other?




Exhibit reads: In Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools categorized as “A,” 0 percent (0 schools) were priority schools, 3 percent (4 schools) were focus schools, and 97 percent (122 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 ($n = 1,158$ Title I participating schools [126 A schools, 310 B schools, 340 C schools, 238 D schools, and 144 F 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	65.4%	67.1%
Middle	22.2%	19.1%
High	11.5%	12.9%
Non-standard ^a	<1%	<1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
School Type (Percentage of Schools)		
Regular	99.6%	100.0%
Alternative	<1%	0.0%
Special education	0.0%	0.0%
Vocational	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Charter School Status (Percentage of Schools)	1.6%	1.5%
Urbanicity (Percentage of Schools)		
Large or middle-sized city	39.9%	11.9%
Urban fringe and large town	20.6%	35.4%
Small town and rural area	39.5%	52.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Percentage of Students by Race/Ethnicity		
American Indian	14.0%	18.2%
Asian	1.7%	1.6%
Black	19.5%	7.8%
Hispanic	25.5%	14.2%
White	33.8%	51.8%
Total^b	94.5%	93.7%
Percentage of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	83.7%	67.2%
Percentage of Students With Disabilities	14.9%	14.2%
Percentage of Limited English Proficient Students^c		
Average Total School Enrollment	411	354

Exhibit reads: In Oklahoma, 65 percent of Title I participating priority and focus schools for 2013–14 were elementary schools, compared to 67 percent of all other Title I participating schools.

Source: 2012–13 *EDFacts*, 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 *EDFacts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ($n = 1,168$ Title I participating schools [243 Title I participating priority or focus schools and 925 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 38 percent of priority schools (58 schools), 0 percent of focus schools (0 schools), and less than 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (2 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 ($n = 1,089$ Title I participating schools [154 priority, 73 focus, and 862 all other Title I participating])

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

03/31/15

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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 33 percent of priority schools (49 schools), 0 percent of focus schools (0 schools), and less than 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (4 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* = 1,082 Title I participating schools [149 priority, 75 focus, and 858 all other Title I participating])

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

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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 4 percent of priority schools (2 schools), 3 percent of focus schools (1 school), and 4 percent of all other Title I participating schools (17 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 2012–13.

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 = 974 Title I participating schools [132 priority, 77 focus, and 765 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.

Exhibit 7. 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, 29 percent of priority schools (4 schools), 7 percent of focus schools (1 school), and 3 percent of all other schools (3 schools) had a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate below 60 percent for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 695: Adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates; 2013–14 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 145 Title I participating high schools [14 priority, 14 focus, and 117 all other Title I participating])

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

03/31/15

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?




Exhibit reads: In Oklahoma, among Title I participating high schools, 0 percent of priority schools (0 schools), 0 percent of focus schools (0 schools), and 11 percent of all other Title I participating schools (7 schools) had a graduation rate gap between American Indian and nonAmerican Indian students exceeding the state-level gap by one or more standard deviations in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 695: Adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates; 2013–14 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 119 Title I participating high schools [11 priority, 14 focus, and 94 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

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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 17 percent of priority schools (26 schools), 61 percent of focus schools (49 schools), and 61 percent of all other Title I participating schools (539 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 ($n = 1,117$ Title I participating schools [154 priority, 80 focus, and 883 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 94 percent of priority schools (154 schools), 100 percent of focus schools (80 schools), and 99 percent of all other Title I participating schools (912 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* = 1,165 Title I participating schools [163 priority, 80 focus, and 922 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 20 percent of priority schools (30 schools), 65 percent of focus schools (52 schools), and 63 percent of all other Title I participating schools (554 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* = 1,114 Title I participating schools [152 priority, 80 focus, and 882 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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating schools, 95 percent of priority schools (155 schools), 98 percent of focus schools (78 schools), and 99 percent of all other Title I participating schools (915 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* = 1,166 Title I participating schools [163 priority, 80 focus, and 923 all other Title I participating])

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

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 Oklahoma, among Title I participating high schools, 36 percent of priority schools (4 schools), 64 percent of focus schools (9 schools), and 86 percent of all other Title I participating schools (78 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* = 116 Title I participating high schools [11 priority, 14 focus, and 91 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 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 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>
Exhibit 2. What percentage of Title I participating schools in each state-defined status were 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 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 23 schools, including 10 Title I participating schools with no state-defined accountability status for 2013–14 and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>
Exhibit 3. What were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?	<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.</p> <p>^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.</p> <p>^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.</p> <p>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 185 to 243 for Title I participating priority or focus schools and from 569 to 925 for all other Title I participating schools. This exhibit also excludes 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</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>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 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 92 schools, including 37 Title I participating schools (5 priority, 0 focus, 32 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; 3 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) missing reading proficiency data for every student subgroup; 39 Title I participating schools (4 priority, 7 focus, 28 all other Title I participating) where the number of participating students from DG 589: Assessment participation in reading did not match the number of students with valid scores from DG 584: Academic achievement in reading for 50 percent or more of grade and subgroup combinations; and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>

03/31/15

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. 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 99 schools, including 37 Title I participating schools (6 priority, 0 focus, 31 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; 2 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 2 all other Title I participating) missing mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup; 47 Title I participating schools (8 priority, 5 focus, 34 all other Title I participating) where the number of participating students from DG 588: Assessment participation in mathematics did not match the number of students with valid scores from DG 583: Academic achievement in mathematics for 50 percent or more of grade and subgroup combinations; and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</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 Am In = American Indian ^b Hisp = Hispanic ^c SWD = Students with disabilities ^d LEP = Limited English proficient ^e 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 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 207 schools, including 159 Title I participating schools (28 priority, 0 focus, 131 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; 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; 34 Title I participating schools (3 priority, 3 focus, 28 all other Title I participating) where the number of participating students from DG 588: Assessment participation in mathematics and DG 589: Assessment participation in reading did not match the number of students with valid scores from DG 583: Academic achievement in mathematics and DG 584: Academic achievement in reading, respectively, for 50 percent or more of grade and subgroup combinations; and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>
<p>Exhibit 7. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?</p>	<p>The regulatory four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who formed the cohort for that graduating class. The four-year adjusted cohort rate also includes students who graduate in less than four years. Under ESEA flexibility, states identified all Title I schools with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years.</p> <p>This exhibit includes 13 Title I participating high schools (2 priority, 2 focus, 9 all other Title I participating) where 2009–10 grade 9 enrollment was 10 percent to 99 percent greater or less than the number of students in the 2012–13 graduation cohort.</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 6 high schools, including 5 Title I participating high schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 4 all other Title I participating) below the minimum analysis threshold (10 students in the graduation cohort) for each student subgroup and 1 Title I participating high school missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>

03/31/15

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
<p>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?</p>	<p>^a SWD = Students with disabilities ^b LEP = Limited English proficient ^c Econ Disadv = Economically disadvantaged</p> <p>This exhibit includes 13 Title I participating high schools (2 priority, 2 focus, 9 all other Title I participating) where 2009–10 grade 9 enrollment was 10 percent to 99 percent greater or less than the number of students in the 2012–13 graduation cohort.</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 32 high schools, including 30 Title I participating high schools (4 priority, 0 focus, 26 all other Title I participating) below the minimum analysis threshold (10 students in the graduation cohort) for each student subgroup; 1 Title I participating high school (0 priority, 0 focus, 1 all other Title I participating) missing graduation rate data for every student subgroup; and 1 Title I participating high school missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</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>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 64 schools, including 51 Title I participating schools (9 priority, 0 focus, 42 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading AMO target and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>
<p>Exhibit 10. 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 2012–13 and reported improvement status for 2013–14. This exhibit excludes 16 schools, including 3 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading participation target and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>
<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>	<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 67 schools, including 54 Title I participating schools (11 priority, 0 focus, 43 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics AMO target and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>
<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>	<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 15 schools, including 2 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 2 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics participation target and 13 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</p>
<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>	<p>No Title I participating high school was reportedly 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 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 35 high schools, including 34 Title I participating high schools (4 priority, 0 focus, 30 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any graduation rate target and 1 Title I participating high school missing data for accountability status for 2013–14.</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 <i>EDFacts</i> and the total LEP count in the Consolidated State Performance Report exceeded 15 percent.