As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Achille</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Anderson Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Astec Charter M.S.

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Bodine Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education  
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Bokoshe ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Bokoshe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Bokoshe JHS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Bokoshe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Butner Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Butner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Caney Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Caney</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250-500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL RATING** | 57.6% | 70.4% |
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Capitol Hill HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>LRG Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Celia Clinton ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>LRG Urban</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
School Profile: Central HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Clayton HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Clayton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
School Profile: Clinton MS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>TPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Council Grove Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Western Heights</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Crutcho PS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely on a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Crutcho</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Mid/Sub</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Kindergarten-8th Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Douglass MS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>LRG Urban</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Dove Science Academy ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Charter</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Dustin ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Dustin District</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education  
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: East Central High School

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the review is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: F.D. Moon ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Farris Elem.

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Farris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Geronimo HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Geronimo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Graham High School

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Graham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Grant Public School

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely on a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Greasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings:</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Ratings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Greeley ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar Schools:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Hanna Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Hanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Hupfield Academy / Western Village

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely on a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, middle-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Data Analysis</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Expectations</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Proficiency</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Jackson Middle School

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>LRG Urban</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings:</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Ratings:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weighted Ratings:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Similar Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>OKC District</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
**Oklahoma State Department of Education**  
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

**School Profile: John Glenn ES**

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Western Heights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid/Sub</td>
<td>School Level Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: John Marshall MS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OKC</td>
<td>LRG Urban Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Kenwood Public School

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Kenwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Keyes Elementary School

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Keyes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Leach ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Leach</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>&lt;250</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Kindergarten-8th Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Lee Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
School Profile: Lindbergh Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Lone Wolf ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely on a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Lone Wolf District</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Lone Wolf School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;250</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings: CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</th>
<th>School Ratings</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</th>
<th>School Ratings</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL RATING**

60.9% 67.4%
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: MacArthur Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>School Rating</th>
<th>Weighted Rating</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRG Urban Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Results (10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
School Profile: Mannsville ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mannsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and Mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Marble City Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Marble City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Marcus Garvey Charter

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;250</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Marshall Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Martin Luther King ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Mason Elementary Schools

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Maud Elementary School

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Maud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>TPS District</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>School Ratings</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: McKinley Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmarks assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: McLain HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Mill Creek Elementary

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mill Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings:</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Ratings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Nathan Hale HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>LRG Urban</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Okay HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Okay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
School Profile: Oklahoma Centennial HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Ratings:</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Ratings:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weighted Ratings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>LRG Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Rogers MS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely on a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the review is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>LRG Urban</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Ryal PS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely on a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the questionnaire is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Ryal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
School Profile: Santa Fe South MS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Schulter</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>″ Historical Data Analysis (30%)″</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>″ Academic Support (20%)″</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>″ Organizational Support (20%)″</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>″ District Expectations (20%)″</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>″ Reading Proficiency (5%)″</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>″ Mathematics Proficiency (5%)″</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: SeeWorth Academy

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Charter Size Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Sequoyah ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Shidler ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Skelly PS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Skelly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>TPS LRG Urban</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
School Profile: Star Spencer HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OKC</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education  
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile  

**School Profile: Thackerville ES**

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Thackerville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

### Oklahoma State Department of Education

**“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile**

**School Profile: Thackerville HS**

**District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Thackerville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Level Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/ language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Thelma R. Parks ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations[20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Turner HS

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Turner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>250-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>Tuskahoma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>Kindergarten-8th Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>OKC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Size Category</td>
<td>LRG Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level Category</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ratings:</th>
<th>School Ratings:</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings:</th>
<th>Similar Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Webster ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>El Reno District Size Category</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary School Level Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Wheeler ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>OKC</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>Similar Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL RATING</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Oklahoma State Department of Education
“Priority School” District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Whitman ES

As part of Oklahoma’s ESEA Waiver application – to transition the state from the federal system of accountability to an Oklahoma-defined system – the State Department of Education identified the five percent of schools facing the greatest challenges in meeting the requirements of the federal accountability system. Oklahoma designated these schools as “Priority Schools.” The SDE asked each Priority School and its district to complete a capacity review in order to determine which schools would benefit most from a collaborative partnership with the SDE.

The capacity review included four areas – Historical Data Analysis, Academic Support, Organizational Support and District Expectations – that called upon schools to rely to a questionnaire and provide documentation in support of their answers (the list of topics included with each of the four areas of the is included on the next page).

The SDE developed a review process through which multiple independent reviewers evaluated the response and support documentation for each area of the capacity review. Each question was evaluated on a three-point scale (1=low capacity, 2=partial capacity, and 3=high capacity), and the results were averaged together within each area. SDE staff compiled the results of the evaluations and produced an overall score for each Priority School.

Forty percent of the overall score came from the Historical Data Analysis area, including 30 percent for the responses to the review questions related to the capacity to use data to drive improvement and the remaining 10 percent based on three years of assessment data in reading and mathematics. The other three areas contributed 20 percent each to the overall score.

The SDE then categorized each Priority School in two ways: the size of its district (<250, 250-500, mid-sized/suburban, large urban), and the level of each school based on grades taught (elementary, K-8, middle and high school). Eleven of the sixteen categories (four district sizes x four school levels) has a Priority School, and the SDE identified the lowest scoring school within each of these eleven categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size Category</th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>School Level Category</th>
<th>CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)</th>
<th>FINAL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Data Analysis (30%)</td>
<td>Reading Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Support (20%)</td>
<td>Mathematics Proficiency (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Support (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Expectations (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Ratings:</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Ratings:</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Ratings:</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar Schools:</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics included with each of the four areas of the capacity review:

- **Historical Data Analysis [30%]**
  - Multi-year analysis of test results for reading/language arts and mathematics*
  - Analysis of other critical factors:
    - Graduation and drop-out rates
    - Suspensions and behavioral records
    - Student mobility and teacher/principal attrition
    - Subgroup enrollment and performance
  - Evidence of using data to develop interventions
  - Plan for using data to develop interventions

- **Academic Support [20%]**
  - Curriculum alignment
  - Progress monitoring
  - Benchmark assessments
  - Timely and effective interventions
  - Local student Information System
  - Equitable distribution of quality instructional tools
  - School Board unified behind vision for school improvement

- **Organizational Support [20%]**
  - Effective human resource policies
  - Resource allocation aligned to goals
    - Highly qualified and effective teachers
    - Special Education
    - English Language Learners
    - Local, state, and federal funds
    - Information technology
  - Safe and orderly environment

- **District Expectations [20%]**
  - Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
  - Capacity Specific to Turnaround Principles
    - Strong Leadership
    - Effective Teachers
    - Extended Learning Time
    - Research-Based Instruction
    - Use of Data
    - School Environment
    - Family and Community Engagement

- **Reading and mathematics results**
  - School level results on state assessments for all Full Academic Year (FAY) students from 2009, 2010 and 2011.
  -