Oklahoma State Department of Education
"Priority School" District Capacity Review Profile

School Profile: Achille 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.

District **Achille**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.95	19.5%	21.9%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.46	16.4%	13.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.25	15.0%	13.5%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.29	15.3%	13.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	69%	3.4%	3.2%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	59%	2.9%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**72.5%**	**68.4%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.52	16.8%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.61	17.4%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	39%	2.0%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	35%	1.8%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**77.8%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Charter**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.81	28.1%	23.5%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.52	16.8%	13.6%
• Organizational Support (20%)	3.00	20.0%	15.9%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.83	18.9%	16.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	59%	2.9%	2.9%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	60%	3.0%	3.0%
FINAL RATING		**89.8%**	**75.3%**

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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.17	21.7%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.52	16.8%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.50	16.7%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	44%	2.2%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	38%	1.9%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**78.1%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Bokoshe**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.00	20.0%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.70	11.3%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.00	13.3%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.29	15.3%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	51%	2.6%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	54%	2.7%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**65.2%**	**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: 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.

District **Bokoshe**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.00	20.0%	20.0%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.70	11.3%	11.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.00	13.3%	13.3%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.29	15.3%	15.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	52%	2.6%	2.6%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	36%	1.8%	1.8%
FINAL RATING		**64.3%**	**64.3%**

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: Burroughs 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.27	15.2%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.27	15.2%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	62%	3.1%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	48%	2.4%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**75.7%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Butner**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.36	23.6%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.14	14.2%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.03	13.5%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.83	12.2%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	38%	1.9%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.0%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**67.6%**	**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: 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.

District **Caney**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **Elementary**

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

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.14	21.4%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.55	17.0%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.46	16.4%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	47%	2.3%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	45%	2.2%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**78.1%**	**79.4%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.66	17.7%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.46	16.4%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	50%	2.5%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	51%	2.6%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**79.0%**	**78.0%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.18	21.8%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.68	17.9%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.55	17.0%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.83	18.9%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	89%	4.4%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	83%	4.2%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**84.2%**	**79.4%**

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: 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.

District **Clayton**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.18	21.8%	21.9%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.79	11.9%	13.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.59	10.6%	13.5%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.83	12.2%	13.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	68%	3.4%	3.2%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**62.3%**	**68.4%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.09	13.9%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.64	17.6%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.83	18.9%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	75%	3.8%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	76%	3.8%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**79.5%**	**75.6%**

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.

District **Western Heights**
District Size Category **Mid/Sub**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.70	27.0%	24.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	17.2%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.91	19.4%	17.8%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.08	13.9%	14.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	45%	2.3%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	42%	2.1%	2.3%
FINAL RATING		**83.4%**	**78.4%**

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: 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 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.

District **Crutcho**
District Size Category **Mid/Sub**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.43	24.3%	24.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.46	16.4%	16.4%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.73	18.2%	18.2%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.67	17.8%	17.8%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	47%	2.4%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	43%	2.1%	2.1%
FINAL RATING		**81.1%**	**81.1%**

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: 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 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.95	19.5%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.71	18.0%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.42	16.1%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.1%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	40%	2.0%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**76.5%**	**75.6%**

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.

District **Charter**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.45	24.5%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.50	16.7%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	3.00	20.0%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	3.00	20.0%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	68%	3.4%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	68%	3.4%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**87.9%**	**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: 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.

District **Dustin**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.68	11.2%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.18	14.5%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.88	12.5%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	44%	2.2%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**64.2%**	**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: 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 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.18	21.8%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.57	17.1%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.83	18.9%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	56%	2.8%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	47%	2.4%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**81.3%**	**79.4%**

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: 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.19	21.9%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.27	15.2%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.42	16.1%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	47%	2.4%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	45%	2.3%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**76.6%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Farris**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

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

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.

District **Geronimo**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.36	23.6%	21.9%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.59	17.3%	13.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.71	18.1%	13.5%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.00	13.3%	13.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	82%	4.1%	3.2%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**78.8%**	**68.4%**

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: 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.

District **Graham**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.05	20.5%	20.5%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.55	10.3%	10.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.81	12.1%	12.1%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.04	13.6%	13.6%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	75%	3.7%	3.7%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	64%	3.2%	3.2%
FINAL RATING		**63.4%**	**63.4%**

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: 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 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.

District **Grant**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.67	16.7%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.82	12.1%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.67	11.1%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.58	10.6%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	45%	2.3%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	34%	1.7%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**54.4%**	**61.3%**

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: Greasy 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.

District **Greasy**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.70	17.0%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.32	15.5%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.09	13.9%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.94	13.0%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	42%	2.1%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	32%	1.6%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**63.1%**	**61.3%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.09	20.9%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.26	15.1%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	47%	2.4%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	49%	2.5%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**77.9%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Hanna**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.25	22.5%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.82	12.1%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.81	12.1%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.88	12.5%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	36%	1.8%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	49%	2.4%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**63.4%**	**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: 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 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.

District **Charter**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.78	27.8%	21.8%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.24	14.9%	13.7%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.27	15.2%	15.3%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.25	15.0%	14.7%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	62%	3.1%	2.6%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	64%	3.2%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**79.2%**	**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: 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.17	21.7%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.32	15.5%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.38	15.8%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	39%	2.0%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.1%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**75.7%**	**75.6%**

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: Jefferson 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.10	21.0%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.27	15.2%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.46	16.4%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	43%	2.1%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	44%	2.2%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**75.7%**	**75.6%**

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.

District **Western Heights**
District Size Category **Mid/Sub**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.70	27.0%	24.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	17.2%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.64	17.6%	17.8%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.08	13.9%	14.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	50%	2.5%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	51%	2.6%	2.3%
FINAL RATING		**82.3%**	**78.4%**

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: 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.03	20.3%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.48	16.5%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.42	16.1%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	49%	2.4%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	39%	2.0%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**76.2%**	**75.6%**

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.

District **Kenwood**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.35	23.5%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.73	11.5%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.55	10.3%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.42	9.4%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	43%	2.1%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	34%	1.7%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**58.6%**	**61.3%**

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.

District **Keyes**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.94	19.4%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.46	9.7%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.55	10.3%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.63	10.8%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	52%	2.6%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	55%	2.7%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**55.6%**	**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: 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.

District **Leach**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.80	28.0%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.27	15.2%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.68	17.9%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.21	14.7%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	54%	2.7%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	48%	2.4%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**80.8%**	**61.3%**

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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.01	20.1%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.61	17.4%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.50	16.7%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	68%	3.4%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	62%	3.1%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**79.5%**	**78.0%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.43	16.2%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.73	18.2%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	52%	2.6%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	51%	2.6%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**79.4%**	**78.0%**

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 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.

District **Lone Wolf**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.55	25.5%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.32	8.8%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.00	13.3%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.21	8.1%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	53%	2.6%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	52%	2.6%	2.4%
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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.48	16.5%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.70	18.0%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	54%	2.7%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	50%	2.5%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**79.5%**	**78.0%**

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: 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.

District **Mannsville**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.78	17.8%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.00	13.3%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.41	16.1%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.00	13.3%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.0%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	27%	1.3%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**63.9%**	**61.3%**

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.

District **Marble City**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.24	22.4%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.59	10.6%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.88	12.5%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.00	13.3%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	51%	2.6%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**63.7%**	**61.3%**

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.

District **Charter**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.65	26.5%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.11	14.0%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.80	18.7%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	3.00	20.0%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	40%	2.0%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	36%	1.8%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**83.0%**	**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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.85	19.0%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.67	17.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	48%	2.4%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	65%	3.2%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**82.2%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.10	21.0%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.29	15.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	44%	2.2%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**78.4%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Mason**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.90	19.0%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.00	13.3%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.06	13.7%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.75	11.7%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	57%	2.8%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	43%	2.2%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**62.7%**	**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: 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.

District **Maud**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.25	22.5%	21.8%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.91	12.7%	13.7%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.90	12.7%	15.3%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.29	15.3%	14.7%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	55%	2.8%	2.6%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.1%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**68.0%**	**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: McClure 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.57	17.1%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.70	18.0%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	45%	2.2%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	44%	2.2%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**79.4%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.48	16.5%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.61	17.4%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	52%	2.6%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	48%	2.4%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**78.8%**	**78.0%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.14	21.4%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.55	17.0%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.23	14.8%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.83	18.9%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	49%	2.5%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	61%	3.0%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**77.6%**	**79.4%**

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: 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.

District **Mill Creek**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.05	20.5%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.64	10.9%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.38	15.9%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.04	13.6%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	40%	2.0%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**65.1%**	**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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.18	21.8%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.73	18.2%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.61	17.4%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.83	18.9%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	65%	3.3%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	53%	2.7%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**82.2%**	**79.4%**

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: 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.

District **Okay**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.14	21.4%	21.9%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.29	8.6%	13.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.48	9.9%	13.5%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.67	11.1%	13.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	69%	3.5%	3.2%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**56.7%**	**68.4%**

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: 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.05	20.5%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.42	16.2%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.46	16.4%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	42%	2.1%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	38%	1.9%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**75.8%**	**79.4%**

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: Oklahoma Centennial 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.03	20.3%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.50	16.7%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.42	16.1%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	40%	2.0%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	40%	2.0%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**75.9%**	**75.6%**

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 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.03	20.3%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.21	14.7%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.25	15.0%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	44%	2.2%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	43%	2.1%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**73.2%**	**75.6%**

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: Roosevelt 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.77	17.7%	20.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.50	16.7%	15.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.6%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.42	16.1%	16.3%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	32%	1.6%	2.3%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	34%	1.7%	2.2%
FINAL RATING		**72.5%**	**75.6%**

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 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.

District **Ryal**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.05	20.5%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.32	15.5%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.65	11.0%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.79	11.9%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	48%	2.4%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	50%	2.5%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**63.8%**	**61.3%**

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: 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.

District **Charter**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **Middle School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.90	18.9%	23.5%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.56	10.4%	13.6%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.76	11.7%	15.9%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.08	13.9%	16.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	56%	2.8%	2.9%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	62%	3.1%	3.0%
FINAL RATING		**60.8%**	**75.3%**

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: Schulter 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.

District **Schulter**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.20	22.0%	22.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.68	11.2%	12.1%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.43	16.2%	14.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.65	11.0%	13.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	55%	2.8%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	49%	2.5%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**65.6%**	**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: 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.

District **Charter**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.50	25.0%	21.9%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.98	13.2%	13.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.46	16.4%	13.5%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.00	13.3%	13.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	28%	1.4%	3.2%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	30%	1.5%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**70.8%**	**68.4%**

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: 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.22	22.2%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.57	17.1%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.64	17.6%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.1%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**79.6%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.89	18.9%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.66	17.7%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.25	15.0%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	34%	1.7%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.0%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**74.1%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Skelly**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.59	15.9%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.00	13.3%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.94	12.9%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.00	13.3%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	51%	2.6%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	38%	1.9%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**59.9%**	**61.3%**

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: Springdale 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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.48	16.5%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.67	17.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	44%	2.2%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**78.6%**	**78.0%**

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: 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.33	23.3%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.49	16.6%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.29	15.3%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	52%	2.6%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	36%	1.8%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**78.4%**	**79.4%**

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: 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.

District **Thackerville**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.45	24.5%	21.8%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.50	16.7%	13.7%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.60	17.3%	15.3%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.08	13.9%	14.7%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	46%	2.3%	2.6%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	43%	2.2%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**76.8%**	**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: Thackerville 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.

District **Thackerville**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.41	24.1%	21.9%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.50	16.7%	13.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.18	14.5%	13.5%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.54	16.9%	13.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	57%	2.9%	3.2%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	56%	2.8%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**77.9%**	**68.4%**

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: 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.93	19.3%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.32	15.5%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.50	16.7%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	48%	2.4%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	47%	2.3%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**75.0%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **Turner**
District Size Category **250-500**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.82	18.2%	21.9%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.96	13.0%	13.9%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.55	10.3%	13.5%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.79	11.9%	13.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	73%	3.7%	3.2%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	62%	3.1%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**60.2%**	**68.4%**

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: Tuskahoma 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.

District **Tuskahoma**
District Size Category **<250**
School Level Category **Kindergarten-8th Grade**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.09	20.9%	19.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	1.76	11.7%	13.0%
• Organizational Support (20%)	1.55	10.3%	12.4%
• District Expectations (20%)	1.58	10.6%	12.2%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	67%	3.4%	2.5%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	51%	2.5%	2.0%
FINAL RATING		**59.4%**	**61.3%**

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: US Grant 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **High School**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.7%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.64	17.6%	17.3%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	17.7%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.38	15.8%	17.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	43%	2.1%	2.8%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	31%	1.6%	2.5%
FINAL RATING		**77.4%**	**79.4%**

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: 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.

District **El Reno**
District Size Category **Mid/Sub**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.90	19.0%	24.3%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.09	13.9%	17.2%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.49	16.6%	17.8%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.29	15.3%	14.4%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	50%	2.5%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	45%	2.2%	2.3%
FINAL RATING		**69.5%**	**78.4%**

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: 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.

District **OKC**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	1.95	19.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.59	17.3%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.82	18.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.30	15.4%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	35%	1.7%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	50%	2.5%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**75.2%**	**78.0%**

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.

District **TPS**
District Size Category **LRG Urban**
School Level Category **Elementary**

Average Ratings:	School Ratings:	Weighted Ratings:	Similar Schools
CAPACITY REVIEW (90%)			
• Historical Data Analysis (30%)	2.15	21.5%	21.1%
• Academic Support (20%)	2.46	16.4%	16.8%
• Organizational Support (20%)	2.67	17.8%	18.0%
• District Expectations (20%)	2.75	18.3%	17.5%
ASSESSMENT RESULTS (10%)			
• Reading Proficiency (5%)	41%	2.0%	2.4%
• Mathematics Proficiency (5%)	40%	2.0%	2.4%
FINAL RATING		**78.0%**	**78.0%**

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.
  -