2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

[X] Public [ ] Private

Cover Sheet

Type of School (Check all that apply)

[X] Elementary [ ] MIddle [ ] High [ ] K-12
[ ] Charte [X] Title I [ ] Magnet [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Ms. Teresa Schnoor
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Franklin Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1001 M Street
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Franklin	Nebraska	68939-1199
City	State	Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Franklin State School Code Number* 31-0506

Telephone (308) 425-6283 Fax (308) 425-6553

Web site/URL http://www.esu11.org/franklin/franklin. E-mail tschnoor@esu11.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date

Principal's Signature

Name of Superintendent Dr. Mike LucasEd.D.
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Franklin Public School Tel. (308) 425-6283

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mr. John Siel
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

Mail by commercial carrier (FedEx, UPS) or courier original signed cover sheet to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5E103, Washington DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school's application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2007-2008 school year.

3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.

4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2002 and has not received the No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.

5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district wide compliance review.

6. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

DISTRICT (Question 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:
   - 1 Elementary schools
   - 1 Middle schools
   - Junior High Schools
   - 1 High schools
   - Other
   - 3 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9752

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 8509

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located

   [ ] Urban or large central city
   [ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban are
   [ ] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural are
   [X] Rural

4. 9 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

   If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total		Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
Pre K			0		**7**			0
K	13	13	26		**8**			0
1	6	12	18		**9**			0
2	10	12	22		**10**			0
3	9	10	19		**11**			0
4	10	11	21		**12**			0
5	16	15	31		**Other**			0
6	14	12	26					
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL								163

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

_____ %	American Indian or Alaska Native
_____ %	Asian or Pacific Islander
_____ %	Black or African American
_____ %	Hispanic or Latino
100 %	White
100 %	**TOTAL**

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past yea 6 %

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year	4
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	6
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	10
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	163
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row	0.06
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	6

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 0 %

_____ Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented _____

Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals 45 %

Total number students who qualify: 73

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low income families, or the school does not participate in the federally supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 15 %

24 Total Number of Students Serve

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

1	Autism		Orthopedic Impairment
	Deafness		Other Health Impairment
1	Deaf-Blindnes	13	Specific Learning Disabilit
	Emotional Disturbanc	7	Speech or Language Impairment
	Hearing Impairment		Traumatic Brain Injury
2	Mental Retardation		Visual Impairment Including Blindness
	Multiple Disabilities		

11. Indicate number of full time and part time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	Full-time	**Part-time**
Administrator(s)	1	
Classroom teachers	9	1
Special resource teachers/specialist	2	4
Paraprofessionals	5	2
Support Staff	1	1
Total number	18	8

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 — 18 **: 1**

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Please explain a high teacher turnover rate. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy in attendance, dropout or the drop-off rates. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates, and only high schools need to supply drop-off

	2006-2007		2005-2006		2004-2005		2003-2004		2002-2003	
Daily student attendance	95	%	96	%	95	%	97	%	96	%
Daily teacher attendance	98	%	98	%	97	%	96	%	99	%
Teacher turnover rate	0	%	6	%	6	%	12	%	12	%
Student drop out rate (middle/hig	0	%	0	%	0	%	0	%	0	%
Student drop-off rate (high school	0	%	0	%	0	%	0	%	0	%

Please provide all explanations below

PART III - SUMMARY

Franklin Elementary School is located in Franklin, Nebraska, a farming community of 1,200 in the south central part of the state. The school has a long history of academic success and strong community and parental support. Upon entering our school, visitors immediately sense a safe, caring, personalized environment. Our philosophy of combining high expectations with high support instills trust between staff, students, and parents allowing us to set and meet challenging professional, academic, and behavior expectations. Everyone in the building is viewed as a capable person and entrusted to make good decisions for themselves and the school resulting in shared responsibility and collaboration.

Our district's mission is to equip all students with the skills and competencies needed to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century. We strive to provide the many benefits of an education in a small, rural setting including small class sizes, close relationships between school and home, and educators who live and raise their own families in the community they serve. At the same time, we offer the diverse, progressive, challenging curriculum required to prepare our students for success in the global community. Over the last ten years, as our farming community has struggled economically, our school population has changed and we've been challenged to meet our district's mission. The percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced school lunch has risen from 27% to 45%. The number of students from traditional families has dropped, mobility has increased, and students are coming to school less prepared for academic success. Realizing established strategies would no longer yield comparable academic results and meet the needs of our students; an assessment of current practices became necessary. Our staff embraced the opportunity to identify strategies to meet new challenges and high standards. Yearly retreats provided us the opportunity to review and analyze a variety of data, identify areas of strength and weakness, brainstorm strategies to meet areas of need, and set annual school-wide goals. Ideas originated at all levels and were put into practice through the collaborative efforts of staff and administration.

The past five years have seen the implementation of a variety of new programs and strategies. We have focused on individualizing classroom instruction and increasing collaboration between support programs to ensure that all students in our school progress academically from year to year. New ideas have included the implementation of Individualized Guided Reading instruction, Reading Recovery, and other research based programs to supplement and reinforce the acquisition of early literacy skills. We measure student progress toward math, reading, and writing with regular, short probes and track student progress throughout the year. We use the same system to identify students at risk for failure and measure the effectiveness of remediation strategies. While many of our efforts are designed to help at-risk students meet grade level expectations, we want all students to experience a diverse and challenging curriculum and measurably progress from year to year. We've met that goal with an expansion of our gifted program, the use of computer-based curriculum to supplement traditional curriculum, the use of Smart Boards and other technology to enhance instruction, and a commitment to providing high quality fine arts, physical education, and cultural learning opportunities.

Our commitment to setting outcomes and measuring progress has created a data driven school that views students as individuals. Our ground-up approach to change has built staff buy-in and ensured new strategies are effectively implemented. The changes have paid off. Data from standardized, classroom, and state standards' assessments show that students in our school meet high academic expectations. The Nebraska Statewide Standards and Assessment System (STARS) awarded Franklin Elementary School an Exemplary, the highest possible rating, for both its Reading and Math Standards Assessment Plan Portfolios and student achievement. Surveys of student, parent, and teacher satisfaction with the school have yielded positive feedback. Our community school has met new challenges head on and successfully addressed them.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1 **Assessment Results:**

Over the last ten years, Franklin Elementary School has grown into a data-driven school. Our initial efforts to track assessment data focused on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills results and comparing our students' progress against the progress of students across the nation. We looked at the ITBS data in two ways: the average percentile score of students and the percentage of students scoring above the national average. Five years ago, this data supported teachers' observations that our students were not responding to traditional strategies as well as they had in the past and alerted us to the need to make changes. After peaking in the late nineties, our scores began a steady downward trend. We realized that we needed more information to find out what was causing the drop in average school-wide scores and determine how best to remediate the problems. We began to look for ways to measure and track individual student progress from one year to the next as well as carefully diagnose skill deficiencies to guide our choices of effective strategies to remediate those problems. This led us to add the Basic Reading Inventory and then the Dibels Reading measurement to our school-wide assessment plan.

The additional data helped us realize that an increasing number of our students across all subgroups were not progressing as desired. We were surprised to realize that our strongest students were sometimes stagnating in classrooms. We began to look for ways to individualize classroom reading instruction and implemented our Guided Reading program which tracked student reading levels, added additional time to reading instruction, and allowed students the opportunity to study and practice at a rate that was best for them. Our Title I reading program added additional services such as the Jump Start summer school program, after-school tutoring, and homework assistance. Title I also began to focus on diagnosing and remediating reading problems in addition to helping students with classwork. Scores began to rise.

State standards and assessments were adopted five years ago. Student scores are broken into four quartiles: beginning, progressing, proficient, and advanced. Students must score at the proficient or advanced level to meet the standard. Standards are reported to the state in the 4th, 8th, and 11th grades. Our efforts to perform well on the data we were already tracking helped us steadily increase the number of students passing state standards in reading and math. The state-wide writing test scores have steadily risen after the implementation of and professional development for curriculum and instruction that better aligns with the outcomes measured by that assessment.

In the last few years, we have added the AimsWeb online Curriculum Based Monitoring system. These regular probes of reading and math skills have helped us identify students at risk of failing before they begin to struggle, measure the effectiveness of the strategies we implement to assist them, and quickly modify interventions that are not working.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Each August, the staff at Franklin Elementary School participates in a data retreat to review information from a variety of sources. We gather data from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills norm-referenced test, criterion-referenced tests including the Dibels and AimsWeb probes of reading and math skills, and subjective assessments provided by teacher and parent observations. We look at data that compares our kids to students across the nation (ITBS, Dibels, AimsWeb), to students across the state (State Standards Assessments of Writing, Math, and Reading), and to other students in their classroom (classroom tests, Dibels, AimsWeb). We compare results and work to triangulate assessment data to determine students' strengths and areas of need. Staff members review their personal performance data as well as information about students who will be entering their classroom. Teachers group and regroup a number of times to discuss results and brainstorm strategies with grade level colleagues as well as reading, Special Education, and Title I specialists. We use data to set individual, class-wide, and school-wide goals.

We begin our Curriculum-Based Monitoring (CBM) process by probing all students within the first month of school, again in January, and finally in late April. The CBM process helps us identify students in need of additional support services. Students who receive supplemental services are probed more often to measure the effectiveness of the services they are receiving (Response to Intervention-RTI). Our Student Assistance Team, made up the principal, our school psychologist, Title I and Special Education staff, and classroom teachers reviews the CBM and RTI data each month and works with classroom teachers and parents to adjust instructional strategies and services as necessary.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

We share information using a variety of formats to appeal to a wide range of communication preferences. Grades and progress reports are available to parents and students daily through our online data management system as well as sent home both mid-term and quarterly. Individual student progress toward state standards is available throughout the year on our online system and also reported on students' year-end report card. Contact information for all staff is shared in our elementary newsletter and parents and teachers communicate regularly by phone and e-mail. Over 95% of parents attend Parent-Teacher Conferences each fall and spring. Telephone conferences are provided for the small number of parents who can't attend. In a small community where teachers, parents, and students attend that same ballgames, churches, and grocery stores, we enjoy a regular, relaxed rapport between home and school.

We use the local paper, quarterly newsletters, and postings in the school and around town to make community members aware of school progress toward meeting improvement goals and standards as well as financial and demographic information. Patrons can also check our school's website to access a wide range of information about our district as well as our annual report card. Monthly coffees with the Superintendent allow patrons an opportunity to share ideas or concerns. School staff are active members of community organizations and visible throughout the community.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Members of our staff are active in professional organizations related to their content area or grade level. Through these organizations, staff have presented at schools, workshops, and conventions on a number of educational topics and issues including: Early Childhood Literacy, Classroom Technology, Assessment Quality, Classroom Management, Storytelling of Oral Traditions, Full Day Kindergarten, Grade Level Acceleration and Gifted Education Practices, and Curriculum Implementation. Our educators are also active presenters and participants at area Educational Service Unit workshops and University classes, and members of State Department of Education review and advisory panels. Most recently, our school has been asked to present at two statewide conferences about our efforts to implement Curriculum Based Monitoring and Response to Intervention. Nearly half of our staff have recently completed their graduate degrees at colleges across the state and used that opportunity to share information with teachers from other schools as well as bring new ideas and strategies back to our district. This networking has encouraged teachers and administrators from other schools to visit to observe curriculum and instructional practices.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

Franklin Elementary students enjoy a well-rounded, differentiated curriculum that is supplemented and enhanced with a wide range of field trips, guest presenters, and cultural events. Technology is infused throughout the curriculum. Our Title I and Special Education programs work hand-in-hand with our classroom teachers to meet the needs of students. Our Gifted program ensures that every student in our school is challenged and engaged. Students are eligible to participate in gifted activities regardless of whether they formally qualify for the program.

We provide grade level and individually leveled reading instruction to ensure that students at all levels are challenged to progress. Phonics instruction is presented in grades K-2. Our use of the Six-Trait writing curriculum and the 'Step Up to Writing' instructional strategies has created confident K-6 writers and prepared them to succeed on our Statewide Writing Assessment. Writing instruction occurs across the curriculum in all grade levels using shared terminology and strategies that classroom teachers as well as Title I and Special Education staff reinforce. Our Future Problem Solving and Minds On gifted programs provide regular opportunities for the application of high-level reading and writing skills.

We use the Saxon Math Curriculum and have chosen the accelerated program for grades 4-6. We credit this curriculum for our high scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and state standard assessments. When asked, many students name math as their strongest subject. Science and Social Studies instruction is provided at all grade levels. We are especially proud of our upper elementary programs, which use hands-on, real-life activities like 'Crime Scene Investigations', 'Product Testing', 'Survival of the Mayflower Colonists Online Simulation Game', and foreign pen pals to bring the content to life. Many of our students choose to participate in our Invention Convention gifted activity and two of our students recently received National Recognition for their invention.

Last year, we added daily Spanish language instruction to our elementary curriculum beginning in Kindergarten. Our goal is to provide the opportunity for early language acquisition to increase later conversational fluency. Classroom activities promote awareness of Latin American and Spanish cultures. Students receive music instruction every day and an extended art class once a week. Nebraska Arts Council grants and the Nebraska Arts are Basic program help us bring in cultural, artistic, and musical workshops throughout each school year. This year, we are very excited to bring Liz Shea-McCoy, nationally recognized artist, into our classrooms to work with students for the 'Bitty Bi-Plane' project. This project is modeled after similar citywide, collaborative art endeavors in Lincoln, Nebraska and Chicago, Illinois. Students will design large bi-planes, a school and community symbol, in the style of famous artists. The bi-planes will be displayed throughout the community, beautifying the town and increasing art awareness.

Physical activity and health are an important part of our curriculum. Students receive PE instruction every day in addition to classroom health instruction and recess. Our PE curriculum focuses on age appropriate motor skill acquisition, healthy lifestyle habits, good sportsmanship, and problem solving. Students also enjoy physical education field trips such as the 'UNK 4th Grade Fitness Day' and our Track and Field day devoted to fun, physical activities and competitions.

Teachers across all content areas and grade levels infuse a wide range of technology throughout instruction. Our well-equipped, up-to-date elementary computer lab provides a setting for large group instruction. Every teacher has a personal computer and a bank of classroom computers for small group activities. Digital, interactive SmartBoards have replaced classroom chalkboards, greatly enhancing instruction and increasing student engagement. We use the A+ Online Computerized Curriculum to supplement classroom curriculum, remediate students who are falling behind, and accelerate curriculum for our strongest students. It allows teachers to set up highly specialized programs for individual students as well as provide material to supplement large group classroom instruction.

2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading:**

Our lower elementary reading curriculum is highly individualized. Classroom basal instruction provides all students the opportunity to experience grade level curriculum while small group center time allows for differentiated instruction. We use Curriculum Based Monitoring to track students' individual reading levels and pinpoint specific skills in need of remediation. CBM data guides collaborative efforts between our classroom teachers, special education, and Title I staff to group and re-group students within and across

grade levels to create instructional time efficiently aligned with individual needs. Supplemental phonics instruction is provided in grades K-2. Reading Recovery is provided for students in need of intensive, one-on-one remediation. Our goal is to create independent, strategic, and engaged readers.

Upper elementary uses a two-pronged approach to classroom reading instruction combining grade level basal curriculum with the opportunity for students to learn and practice at their individual reading level during Guided Reading time. This individualized approach allows students at all instructional levels to be challenged without being overwhelmed. Our Guided Reading closet is stocked with books at all reading levels covering a variety of topics and areas of interest to motivate students to view reading as an enjoyable activity. Title I and special education staff collaborate with teachers during Guided Reading time to provide small group, individualized instruction that meets specific needs. Expanding vocabulary and increasing reading fluency is the focus of our upper elementary reading curriculum. Care is taken to equip students with the 'reading to learn' skills they will need to succeed at the middle school level and create life long readers.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

Our Writing Curriculum has grown and improved over the past five years into a well-coordinated K-6 program. Previously, teachers independently integrated writing instruction into their classroom language arts curriculum. Although there were effective writing instruction practices around the school, there was a lack of continuity and sequence from one grade to the next. This changed with the implementation of the Six-Trait Writing instructional method. The Six-Trait model provided a common language for teachers and students to use as well as a sequential method of instruction that flowed from one grade to the next. After the introductory professional development and implementation of the program, teachers engaged in two follow-up learning opportunities to reinforce and expand their knowledge of the Six-Trait approach. An expert instructor was brought to the school one year following the implementation to work individually with teachers at each grade level. Three years after the implementation, classroom teachers and specialists attended a four-day workshop 'Step Up to Writing' which provided additional instructional strategies that greatly increased the effectiveness of the program.

We gather writing assessment data from local, area, and state level sources to evaluate the effectiveness of our program. Classroom teachers gather writing samples for review at our yearly data retreat. Each fall, our fourth grade students send a writing sample to the central Nebraska educational service unit for review by area fourth grade teachers. In the spring, fourth graders send a writing sample to the state to assess their progress toward state writing standards. All of our staff members have participated as state level raters and are able to bring that perspective and knowledge of quality writing practice into their classroom and to our local review efforts.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

We believe no single method can successfully teach all children and are proud to employ a staff that embraces a 'whatever it takes' philosophy of teaching. School-wide expectations are met by providing teachers ongoing professional development on a wide-range of instructional strategies and the freedom to personalize their learning environments to reflect their teaching strengths and best meet individual student needs. As a result of our data-driven approach, teachers have an intimate knowledge of the academic needs of the children in their classrooms. This information guides collaboration between classroom, Title I, and Special Education teachers to group and regroup students throughout the day for differentiated instruction. Students move from full class instruction to small group learning centers to computer assisted independent learning. We group both heterogeneously and homogeneously in and out of the regular classroom as well as within and across grade levels to ensure that instruction is both efficient and effective. Every day, each classroom employs a variety of methods to engage students' personal learning styles. We use direct as well as indirect instruction including Cooperative, Problem-Based, and Hands-On Discovery Learning. Technology is infused into every curricular area of our school. With the A+ Online Curriculum, teachers create independent computer assisted instructional programs so students can enjoy highly differentiated content delivery. Our Smartboards make it easy for teachers to integrate audio/visual material such as movies or graphs from the A+ Curriculum and the internet into lectures to ensure that they are engaging and up-to-date. They specifically engage our tactile learners as they physically interact with information on the board. Our gifted program has provided opportunities for our students to create Podcasts and Digital Storytelling lessons. Classroom instruction is supplemented with a variety of opportunities outside of the regular classroom. Our Minds-On program identifies students gifted in Math,

Science, Language Arts, Drama, and Leadership and provides challenging, accelerated curriculum workshops. Every grade level and curricular area enjoys regular field trips to historical and cultural attractions around the state.

5. **Professional Development:**

Our Professional Development plan spreads responsibilities across the staff and empowers all members to guide district goals, strategies, and decisions. Throughout our school you will find staff members chosen as district-wide experts based on their personal strengths and areas of interest. A few examples include: Kindergarten teacher, Shelley Kahrs, serves as our preschool transition liason; Second grade teacher, Dianna DeJonge, guides our lower elementary curriculum decisions; Fourth grade teacher, Angel Dreher, stays current with state standards and assessments; Sixth grade teacher, Linea Bonham, ensures that our staff uses successful writing curriculum and instruction; Para-professional, Ingrid Lennemann, addresses playground safety issues; and Title I teacher, Polly Sindt, makes sure our teachers are using effective instructional practices in the area of reading. These staff members are entrusted to guide the district toward the purchase of effective programs and training in best practices. They attend external workshops and bring the information back to present to our staff, invite presenters to local in-services, or identify workshops for the whole staff to attend. Recent initiatives have included: Nebraska's Reading First Initiative, Reading Recovery, Boy's Town Reading, Step Up to Writing, Curriculum Based Monitoring/Response to Intervention, SmartBoard training, A+ Online Curriculum, the Love and Logic approach to student management, the Gallup Personal StrengthFinder, and Effective Teaching for Students with Aspergers and Autism.

This approach to professional development combined with our staff's practice of gathering and analyzing data allows us to move quickly to address problems in our school. Those closest to the students guide decisions for improving student services and achievement. It also increases the speed with which new initiatives are accepted and successfully implemented as well as the effectiveness of new practices. It is this practice that alerted us to the need to address our changing student population, successfully choose and implement new materials and practices, and efficiently use limited resources.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoed throughou				
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	94	91			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	50	47			
Number of students tested	18	29			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	90	50			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	30	50			
Number of students tested	10	14			
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 4 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoe	d throughou	d throughou	d throughou	d throughou
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	98	89	83		79
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	50	47	45		50
Number of students tested	29	25	22		20
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1		0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	5		0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	100	100	77		100
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	77	56	46		22
Number of students tested	13	10	13		10
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 5 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoed throughou				
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	100	83			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	65	39			
Number of students tested	24	23			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	5			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	100	70			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	44	15			
Number of students tested	10	13			
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 6 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoed throughou				
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	87	87			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	83	30			
Number of students tested	23	23			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	5	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	75	82			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	67	18			
Number of students tested	12	11			
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoed throughou				
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	100	93			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	67	76			
Number of students tested	18	29			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	100	79			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	60	71			
Number of students tested	10	14			
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math Grade 4 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoe	d throughou	d throughou	d throughou	d throughou
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	100	99	86	80	
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	90	74	73	50	
Number of students tested	29	25	22	22	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	5	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	100	100	78	78	
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	85	89	62	56	
Number of students tested	13	10	13	10	
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math Grade 5 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoed throughou				
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	100	83			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	79	61			
Number of students tested	24	23			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	5			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	100	62			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	78	38			
Number of students tested	10	13			
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Math Grade 6 Test Central Nebraska Authentic Assessment Consortium Online Te

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	d throughoed throughou				
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	87	91			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	65	74			
Number of students tested	23	23			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	5	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	75	82			
% "Exceeding" State Standards Advanced	50	55			
Number of students tested	12	11			
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Subject Reading (ELA) Grade 4 Test Nebraska Statewide Writing Assessment

Edition/Publication Year Publisher

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	February	February	February	February	February
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards Proficient & Advanced	93	81	78	71	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	29	25	22	21	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	5	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1.lly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced pr					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard Proficient & Advanced	85	67	77	55	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	13	10	13	10	
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate table for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page. Explain any alternative assessments.

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	63	59	51	46	51
Number of students tested	19	31	28	22	23
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	95	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	55	56	53	34	
Number of students tested	10	14	53	10	9
2.			53		
Number of students tested			53		
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	70	56	55	50	51
Number of students tested	19	26	28	22	23
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	95	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	59	50	53	37	
Number of students tested	10	14	53	10	9
2.			53		
Number of students tested			53		
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 4 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	70	56	60	54	52
Number of students tested	29	23	23	22	21
Percent of total students tested	100	100	95	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	64	59	51	41	
Number of students tested	13	12	51	11	9
2.			51		
Number of students tested			51		
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Math Grade 4 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	77	75	71	63	77
Number of students tested	29	23	23	22	21
Percent of total students tested	100	100	95	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	66	73	58	53	
Number of students tested	13	12	58	11	9
2.			58		
Number of students tested			58		
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 5 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	74	60	62	61	65
Number of students tested	25	23	23	20	30
Percent of total students tested	100	95	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	70	56	57		60
Number of students tested	10	12	57	7	13
2.			57		
Number of students tested			57		
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Math Grade 5 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	84	71	71	78	72
Number of students tested	25	23	23	20	30
Percent of total students tested	100	95	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	83	56	66		66
Number of students tested	10	12	66	7	13
2.			66		
Number of students tested			66		
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Math Grade 6 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	67	64	73	74	80
Number of students tested	24	23	20	33	25
Percent of total students tested	95	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	57	61		65	64
Number of students tested	12	11		17	10
2.					
Number of students tested					
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 6 Test Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

Edition/Publication Year 2000 Publisher Riverside Publishing

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	50	58	64	69	67
Number of students tested	24	23	20	33	25
Percent of total students tested	95	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. ly Disadvantaged-Eligible for free/reduced p	41	57		59	57
Number of students tested	12	11		17	10
2.					
Number of students tested					
3.					
Number of students tested					
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					