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 Texas, among Title I participating elementary schools, 4 percent (130 schools) were priority schools, 10 percent (338 schools) were focus schools, and 86 percent (2,864 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 = 5,574 Title I participating schools)

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.
Exhibit 3. What were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Priority and Focus Schools</th>
<th>All Other Title I Participating Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Level (Percentage of Schools)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Type (Percentage of Schools)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charter School Status (Percentage of Schools)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbanicity (Percentage of Schools)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large or middle-sized city</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe and large town</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town and rural area</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Students by Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Students With Disabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Limited English Proficient Students&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Total School Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>585</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, 55 percent of Title I participating priority and focus schools for 2013–14 were elementary schools, compared to 61 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 = 5,574 Title I participating schools [847 Title I participating priority or focus schools and 4,727 all other Title I participating schools])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.
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 Texas, among Title I participating schools, 58 percent of priority schools (143 schools), 15 percent of focus schools (80 schools), and less than 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (20 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 EDFacts, Data Group (DG) 584: Academic achievement in reading; 2013–14 EDFacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 5,396 Title I participating schools [246 priority, 547 focus, and 4,603 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total Schools Accountable for Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students With Disabilities</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating schools, 66 percent of priority schools (163 schools), 11 percent of focus schools (60 schools), and less than 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (16 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 EDFacts, Data Group (DG) 583: Academic achievement in mathematics; 2013–14 EDFacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 5,455 Title I participating schools [248 priority, 558 focus, and 4,649 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 Texas, among Title I participating schools, 4 percent of priority schools (4 schools), 3 percent of focus schools (6 schools), and 2 percent of all other Title I participating schools (35 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.


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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total High Schools Reporting for Subgroup</th>
<th>Percentage of Title I Participating High Schools With Graduation Rate Below 60 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or More ESEA Subgroups</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students With Disabilities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating high schools, 61 percent of priority schools (45 schools), 9 percent of focus schools (7 schools), and 2 percent of all other schools (15 schools) had a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate below 60 percent for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 EDFacts, Data Group (DG) 695: Adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates; 2013–14 EDFacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 835 Title I participating high schools [74 priority, 81 focus, and 680 all other Title I participating])

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Priority Schools</th>
<th>Focus Schools</th>
<th>All Other Title I Participating Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black-nonBlack</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-nonHispanic</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD*-nonSWD</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEPb-nonLEP</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Disadv*-nonEcon Disadv</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total High Schools Reporting for Subgroups | 30 | 35 | 180 | 38 | 53 | 338 | 41 | 53 | 271 | 40 | 45 | 166 | 49 | 65 | 482 |

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating high schools, 3 percent of priority schools (1 school), 3 percent of focus schools (1 school), and 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (1 school) had a graduation rate gap between Black and nonBlack students exceeding the state-level gap by one or more standard deviations in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 EDFacts, Data Group (DG) 695: Adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates; 2013–14 EDFacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 652 Title I participating high schools [60 priority, 71 focus, and 521 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total Schools Accountable for Subgroup</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Students With Disabilities</th>
<th>Limited English Proficient</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Schools</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Schools</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Title I Participating Schools</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating schools, 4 percent of priority schools (9 schools), 2 percent of focus schools (13 schools), and 70 percent of all other Title I participating schools (3,257 schools) met the state-defined reading AMO target for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 EDfacts, Data Group (DG) 552: AMO reading/ELA status; 2013–14 EDfacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 5,511 Title I participating schools [257 priority, 581 focus, and 4,673 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Students With Disabilities</th>
<th>Limited English Proficient</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_priority schools</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus schools</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>4125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other schools</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools accountable for subgroup</td>
<td>5,494</td>
<td>4,661</td>
<td>5,008</td>
<td>5,463</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>4,135</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating schools, 95 percent of priority schools (242 schools), 99 percent of focus schools (559 schools), and 100 percent of all other Title I participating schools (4,661 schools) met the reading 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 EDFacts, Data Group (DG) 553: Reading/ELA participation status; 2013–14 EDFacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 5,494 Title I participating schools [254 priority, 567 focus, and 4,673 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total Schools Accountable for Subgroup</th>
<th>Percentage of Title I Participating Schools (Accountable for Subgroup) That Met Mathematics AMO Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students With Disabilities</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>4,565</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating schools, 5 percent of priority schools (12 schools), 2 percent of focus schools (12 schools), and 61 percent of all other Title I participating schools (2,860 schools) met the state-defined mathematics AMO target for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 ED\textit{Facts}, Data Group (DG) 554: AMO mathematics status; 2013–14 ED\textit{Facts}, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 5,503 Title I participating schools [256 priority, 578 focus, and 4,669 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total Schools Accountable for Subgroup</th>
<th>Percentage of Title I Participating Schools That Met Mathematics Participation Rate Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students With Disabilities</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>4,661</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating schools, 91 percent of priority schools (232 schools), 99 percent of focus schools (561 schools), and 100 percent of all other Title I participating schools (4,661 schools) met the mathematics 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 EDFacts, Data Group (DG) 555: Mathematics participation status; 2013–14 EDFacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 5,496 Title I participating schools [255 priority, 567 focus, and 4,674 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total High Schools Accountable for Subgroup</th>
<th>Priority Schools</th>
<th>Focus Schools</th>
<th>All Other Title I Participating Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: In Texas, among Title I participating high schools, 68 percent of priority schools (44 schools), 81 percent of focus schools (57 schools), and 98 percent of all other Title I participating schools (514 schools) met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate target for the “all students” group in 2012–13.

Source: 2012–13 EDfacts, Data Group (DG) 557: High school graduation rate indicator; 2013–14 EDfacts, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 660 Title I participating high schools [65 priority, 70 focus, and 525 all other Title I participating])

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

### Exhibit A-1. Technical notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Number</th>
<th>Technical Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 1. What percentage of Title I participating elementary, middle, high, and non-standard schools were priority, focus, or other?</td>
<td>School levels were defined using Common Core of Data (CCD) 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 136 schools, including 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14 and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Exhibit 3. What were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools? | 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.” Asian includes Pacific Islander, American Indian includes Alaska Native, Black includes African American, and Hispanic includes Latino.

,c) This category represents the percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students participating in LEP programs among schools with LEP program—not all Title I participating—because the state did not report on schools with 0 LEP students participating in LEP programs.

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 EDFacts, analysis samples vary across school characteristics, ranging from 772 to 847 for Title I participating priority or focus schools and from 4,396 to 4,727 for all other Title I participating schools. This exhibit also excludes 136 schools, including 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14 and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status. |
| 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? | 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 n size for the American Indian subgroup.

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 314 schools, including 77 Title I participating schools (9 priority, 26 focus, 42 all other Title I participating) below the minimum n size for each student subgroup; 33 Title I participating schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 32 all other Title I participating) missing reading proficiency data for every student subgroup; 68 Title I participating schools (4 priority, 14 focus, 50 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; 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status. |
### 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?

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 \( n \) size for the American Indian subgroup. 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 255 schools, including 86 Title I participating schools (12 priority, 29 focus, 45 all other Title I participating) below the minimum \( n \) size for each student subgroup; 33 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 33 all other Title I participating) missing mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup; 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Number</th>
<th>Technical Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                | \( n \) is the number of students who graduated in four years with a regular high school diploma 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. Unless noted, no priority or focus high school met the analysis threshold (i.e., 10 students in graduation cohort) for the American Indian subgroup. This exhibit includes 170 Title I participating high schools (10 priority, 31 focus, 129 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. 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 230 high schools, including 61 Title I participating high schools (4 priority, 3 focus, 54 all other Title I participating) below the minimum analysis threshold (10 students in the graduation cohort) for each student subgroup; 101 Title I participating high schools (5 priority, 6 focus, 90 all other Title I participating) missing graduation rate data for every student subgroup; 7 Title I participating high schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 6 all other Title I participating) where 2009–10 grade 9 enrollment was over 100 percent greater or less than the number of students in the 2012–13 graduation cohort; 15 Title I participating high schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 46 high schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.

### 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?

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. 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 590 schools, including 419 Title I participating schools (72 priority, 62 focus, 285 all other Title I participating) below the minimum \( n \) size for each student subgroup; 32 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 32 all other Title I participating) missing reading and mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup gap included in the exhibit; 3 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) where the number of participating students from DG 588: 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; 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Number</th>
<th>Technical Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( a ) SWD = Students with disabilities  ( b ) LEP = Limited English proficient  ( c ) Econ Disadv = Economically disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 7. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?

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. No priority or focus high school met the analysis threshold (i.e., 10 students in graduation cohort) for the American Indian subgroup. This exhibit includes 170 Title I participating high schools (10 priority, 31 focus, 129 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. 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 230 high schools, including 61 Title I participating high schools (4 priority, 3 focus, 54 all other Title I participating) below the minimum analysis threshold (10 students in the graduation cohort) for each student subgroup; 101 Title I participating high schools (5 priority, 6 focus, 90 all other Title I participating) missing graduation rate data for every student subgroup; 7 Title I participating high schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 6 all other Title I participating) where 2009–10 grade 9 enrollment was over 100 percent greater or less than the number of students in the 2012–13 graduation cohort; 15 Title I participating high schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 46 high schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.
### 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?

- SWD = Students with disabilities
- LEP = Limited English proficient
- Econ Disadv = Economically disadvantaged

This exhibit includes 170 Title I participating high schools (10 priority, 31 focus, 129 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.

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 413 high schools, including 243 Title I participating high schools (18 priority, 13 focus, 212 all other Title I participating) below the minimum analysis threshold (10 students in the graduation cohort) for each student subgroup; 102 Title I participating high schools (5 priority, 6 focus, 91 all other Title I participating) missing graduation rate data for every student subgroup; 7 Title I participating high schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 6 all other Title I participating) where 2009–10 grade 9 enrollment was over 100 percent greater or less than the number of students in the 2012–13 graduation cohort; 15 Title I participating high schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 46 high schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.

### 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?

- Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.

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 199 schools, including 60 Title I participating schools (3 priority, 6 focus, 51 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading AMO target; 3 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading AMO targets; 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.

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

- Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.

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 216 schools, including 77 Title I participating schools (6 priority, 20 focus, 51 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading participation target; 3 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading participation targets; 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.

### 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?

- Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent.

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 68 Title I participating schools (4 priority, 9 focus, 55 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics AMO target; 3 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics AMO targets; 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Number</th>
<th>Technical Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 12. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in mathematics?</td>
<td>The American Indian and Asian subgroups were excluded because Texas did not provide participation target data for these subgroups. Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent. 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 214 schools, including 75 Title I participating schools (5 priority, 20 focus, 50 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics participation target; 3 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 3 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics participation targets; 73 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 63 schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>The American Indian and Asian subgroups were excluded because Texas did not provide adjusted four-year cohort graduation rate target data for these subgroups. Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent. 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 405 high schools, including 336 Title I participating high schools (19 priority, 20 focus, 297 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any graduation rate target; 8 Title I participating high schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 8 all other Title I participating) missing data for all graduation rate targets; 15 Title I participating high schools missing data for accountability status for 2013–14; and 46 high schools reporting “not applicable” for 2012–13 Title I participation status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exhibit A-2. Excluded and modified state profile analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Number</th>
<th>Technical Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 2. What percentage of Title I participating schools in each state-defined status were priority, focus, or other?</td>
<td>Excluded because Texas does not have a state-defined accountability designation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Modified to exclude the American Indian and Asian subgroups because Texas did not provide AMO target data for these subgroups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 10. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in reading?</td>
<td>Modified to exclude the American Indian and Asian subgroups because Texas did not provide participation target data for these subgroups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Modified to exclude the American Indian and Asian subgroups because Texas did not provide AMO target data for these subgroups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 12. What percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in mathematics?</td>
<td>Modified to exclude the American Indian and Asian subgroups because Texas did not provide participation target data for these subgroups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Modified to exclude the American Indian and Asian subgroups because Texas did not provide adjusted four-year cohort graduation rate target data for these subgroups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>