U.S. Department of Education
2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I   [ ] Charter   [ ] Magnet   [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Kelcy Maren Currin Tapp
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

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

School Mailing Address 400 Cedardale Road
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Papillion   State NE   Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 68046-2850

County   Sarpy   State School Code Number* 77-0027-009

Telephone 402-898-0449   Fax   402-898-0453

Web site/URL   http://www.paplv.org/Carriage Hill   E-mail ktapp@paplv.org

Twitter Handle
https://twitter.com/plvch

Facebook Page
https://www.facebook.com/Carriage
Hill Elementary   Google+ N/A

YouTube/URL
www.youtube.com/user/plvschools   Blog N/A

Other Social Media Link
N/A

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date_____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Andrew Rikli, Ed.D.   E-mail: arikli@paplv.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Papillion-La Vista School District   Tel.   402-537-6200

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date_____

(Superintendent's Signature)

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

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date_____

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

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

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) 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 configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

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

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.

6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.

7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.

8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

9. The 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district   14 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
   (per district designation):   2 Middle/Junior high schools
      2 High schools
      0 K-12 schools

      18 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

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

3. 4 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

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

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	21	13	34
K	32	33	65
1	34	17	51
2	31	24	55
3	28	25	53
4	31	31	62
5	37	24	61
6	41	33	74
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	255	200	455

5. Racial/ethnic composition of   0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
   the school: 1 % Asian
                                    5 % Black or African American
                                    9 % Hispanic or Latino
                                    0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
                                    80 % White
                                    5 % Two or more races
                                    100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 9%

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

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	**Answer**
(1) Number of students who transferred *to* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	23
(2) Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	14
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	37
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	421
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.088
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	9

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
                                                    2 Total number ELL
   Number of non-English languages represented: 2
   Specify non-English languages: Nuer, Spanish - A decimal is not an option. With 2 ELL students, the percent is greater than 0, but less than 1% when rounded to the nearest 10th of a percent. (.47%)

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 42 %

   Total number students who qualify: 176

   If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.
   Note: n=421 is the denominator in that Pre K do not qualify for free/reduced lunch or the ELL program, and are not included in State reporting for mobility or Special Education.
   However, Pre K are included in our state's ethnicity counts (Fall membership) as notes in #5.

9. Students receiving special education services: 15 %

                                                          62 Total number of students served

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

4 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	5 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	28 Specific Learning Disability
6 Emotional Disturbance	15 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
3 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
1 Multiple Disabilities	0 Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of
    personnel in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	21
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	17
Paraprofessionals	20
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	3

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the
    school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1   20:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**
    Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

Post-Secondary Status	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.
    Yes_   No <u>X</u>

    If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

Carriage Hill Elementary School is 1 of 14 elementary schools in the Papillion–La Vista School District, which is a growing suburban area. Carriage Hill was built in 1969 with the latest addition in 1995. The school serves 421 K-6 students with an average class size of 20 students. They also have a Pre-school serving an additional 34 students. Carriage Hill is a school-wide Title I building with 42% of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch. Their mobility rate is 9% and the special education rate is 15%, which includes speech language impairments. Finally, Carriage Hill holds the highest level of accreditation from the Nebraska Department of Education and the North Central Association (District-wide AdvancED accreditation, 2010).

Carriage Hill's vision/purpose statement suggests that a partnership of school, family, and community will do whatever it takes to ensure that all students learn academic and life skills in a safe and nurturing environment.

Carriage Hill Elementary, a collaborative learning community, is committed to the following beliefs: success and growth are measured on an indvidual basis, all students need to experience success, parents are a valuable resource, all students can learn and are valuable, and all students have the right to be in a safe and nurturing environment.

Carriage Hill Elementary has a systematic process in place to review and revise the school's purpose and direction for continuous improvement. Our purpose and direction equate to a clear and laser-like focus on student achievement. Carriage Hill's purpose and direction is evident through grade level and Professional Learning Community (PLC) discussions and actions. We see an opportunity for growth by including all stakeholders in our conversations about our purpose and direction.

In addition to our current parent involvement through events and the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), parents and staff participated in our "We are Carriage Hill" nights in October of 2013. At this event, stakeholders engaged in conversations regarding our strengths, opportunities for growth, and developing a plan of action that is supported by measurable objectives and resources. As a result of this event, value statements were developed and will be integrated into our purpose and direction as a building.

On November 11, 2013, Title I buildings were showcased at the Board of Education meeting illustrating with longitudinal assessment data from our data dashboards that Carriage Hill and other buildings are closing the achievement gap. In addition, the adult actions currently being implemented with fidelity were presented at that meeting. These adult actions, we believe, are making the difference because of our clear purpose and direction. The adult actions include, but are not limited to, our PLCs, a focus on a continuous improvement process (CIP), development and analysis of formative assessments, and ongoing and embedded professional development. Carriage Hill is committed to active student engagement based on utilizing evidence based instructional practices implemented with fidelity. Each Carriage Hill staff member holds one another accountable for collectively supporting student achievement, sustaining ownership of the school's purpose and direction.

In support of the whole child, Carriage Hill is committed to meeting each individual student's needs (i.e. social, emotional, physical, academic, and behavioral). This information was communicated to stakeholders in February 2014 at the Board of Education meeting and also at ongoing PTO meetings. Furthermore, our school has a systematic process for continuous improvement which is documented through our District's I.D.E.A.L. (Identify, Describe, Evaluate, Act, & Learn) action research model. This process allows for continuous improvement at all levels throughout the building, such as our CIP building goals, classroom goals, and our individual intervention plan (IIP) which addresses students' specific academic and behavioral needs.

Our CIP has three components: 1.) Data Analyses: A district CIP leadership team identifies Tier I indicators by analyzing performance data from multiple sources, including but not limited to standards & common summative assessments, norm-referenced tests, Nebraska State Accountability tests (NeSA), and

demographic data. Achievement data is now "real time" and can be utilized by any staff member in a timely and on-going basis. 2.) Building Goals: Every school is responsible for monitoring Tier I indicators. Each building also identifies Tier II indicators based on their data analyses. An investigation into areas of strength and concern regarding student learning leads to goal setting. 3.) Classroom Goals: Every teacher works in a team to develop a goal for improving student learning based on daily student performance. Evidence-based instructional strategies are implemented by the teacher to improve student learning using the I.D.E.A.L. action research model to monitor the progress of adult action toward improving student outcomes. The Tier I and II indicators focus on reading, writing and math as monitored by NeSA, and local common summative assessments. Carriage Hill collaborates with the four other Title I buildings to research, plan, implement, and monitor professional development needs such as double scoring writing assessments, Math Talk Moves, FOSS science inquiry, authentic literacy opportunities, and note booking to name a few best practice strategies.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

A. Our District adopted the revised state standards beginning with reading for the 2009/2010 school year. A new assessment system was implemented that year coined Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA). Performance levels have been established for all four tests (writing will not be addressed) The Reading, Math, and Science NeSA tests all have the same performance levels based on scale scores ranging from 0-200. The following scores indicate the three ranges that are used to gauge students' performance on the standards: Below = 0-84; Meets = 85-134; and Exceeds = 135-200.

The 2009/2010 school year was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The NeSA assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all districts created their own common assessments. Math standards were revised in 2010/2011 and a new test and baseline was established. With revised standards, a common state test, and a new baseline for both reading and math, previous comparisons of student achievement data would not be appropriate.

Our District's (and school's) target is for 100% of students to be in the meets category; our mutual goal is continuous improvement, which is what you will observe when you review the trend data across all grades. In addition, our District also utilizes local common summative assessments to monitor students' progress across all content areas that are also aligned to the state standards. Our district common assessments offer a balanced approach to assessment with multiple-choice and performance opportunities at a variety of depth of knowledge levels and level of difficulty. Locally, we utilize a truncated, equal interval scale to communicate students' mastery levels from beginning, progressing, proficient, and advanced. Collectively, we are then better able to know what students know and are able to do.

B. In reviewing the data trends noted in (NeSA) reading, the following is noted: (Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome.) When communicated to the public, values below 10 must be masked.

Grade 3 – Students' reading proficiency went from 65% in the base line year of 2009/2010 to 91% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category went from 8% to 32%. A similar trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 57% to 94% and the exceed category increased from 0% to 29%.

Grade 4 – Students' reading proficiency went from 60% in the base line year of 2009/2010 to 89% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category went from 14% to 32%. A similar trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 48% to 88% and the exceed category increased from 11% to 25%.

Grade 5 – Students' reading proficiency went from 71% in the base line year of 2009/2010 to 89% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category went from 16% to 32%. A similar trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 59% to 89% and the exceed category increased from 6% to 10%.

Grade 6 – Students' reading proficiency went from 76% in the base line year of 2009/2010 to 90% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category was sustained at 30%. A similar trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 68% to 79%.

In reviewing the data trends noted in NeSA-math, the following is noted:

Grade 3 – Students' math proficiency went from 54% in the base line year of 2010/2011 to 94% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category went from 8% to 34%. A similar

trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 50% to 97% and the exceed category increased from 11% to 34%. The achievement gap between all students has been closed in the free and reduced lunch sub-group.

Grade 4 – Students' math proficiency went from 52% in the base line year of 2010/2011 to 88% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category went from 4% to 35%. A similar trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 50% to 83% and the exceed category increased from 0% to 35%.

Grade 5 – Students' math proficiency went from 57% in the base line year of 2010/2011 to 82% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category went from 12% to 22%. A similar trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 50% to 83% and the exceed category increased from 4% to 14%.

Grade 6 – Students' math proficiency went from 58% in the base line year of 2010/2011 to 81% in 2012/2013. In addition, the percentage of students in the exceed category went from 10% to 30%. A similar trend was noted in the free and reduced sub-group, where proficiency went from 45% to 63% and the exceed category increased from 15% to 21%.

Our school is getting very positive results by focusing on what matters most: a viable curriculum implemented with fidelity, quality instruction and using assessment results to inform teaching and learning, authentic literacy opportunities in all content areas, PLCs, a focus on the whole child, parent involvement, and data informed -continuous improvement.

2.   Using Assessment Results:

Our district has a comprehensive and balanced assessment system. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), curriculum guides, and learning plans support every classroom teacher to guarantee a viable curriculum for all students. Our continuous improvement process (CIP) leadership team monitors assessment data based on District Tier I indicators that surfaced as an academic achievement area of concern for all students and specific sub-groups. Not only are local common assessment data analyzed regularly in "real time" and longitudinally, as available; other assessment data such as Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) in Writing, Reading, Math, and Science and the Terra Nova and InView (norm-referenced tests) are also tracked. A communication survey (climate) is also administered annually to inform decision-making.

Data collected through the CIP in the areas of student achievement, instruction, and program evaluation that support learning are used to identify strategies for improvement. Data is triangulated, when possible, and reviewed regularly to inform decision-making systemically and systematically. Action plans are developed to improve teaching, learning and school effectiveness utilizing the district's I.D.E.A.L. (identify, describe, evaluate, act, learn) action research model. This is a systemic and systematic process used to evaluate, interpret, and inform instructional decision making based on a variety of data. This model is embedded at every level of the organization from the district continuous improvement all the way down to the student level using the Individual Intervention Plan (IIP). In addition, PLCs and teachers also have classroom goal action plans that again align with student needs. Annually, principals share an Accountability in Action report to demonstrate what worked, what didn't and what next. Teachers also reflect on their goal progress on a regular basis and annually as well. The continuous improvement process is used by principals and grade level teams/PLCs to monitor readiness for and success at the next level of learning.

All teachers had the opportunity to participate in assessment literacy training in 2013/2014, which entailed depth of knowledge, item difficulty, quality items, assessment method effectiveness on a multiple choice assessment, etc. PLCs also engage in conversation regarding their classroom goals and track students' progress using an Excel graphing template. Some staff members utilize an item analysis in conjunction with the graph. In 2012, our CIP leadership team received additional training on using the dashboard to inform action plan development. Data analyses capacity building continues with regular training for principals, and CIP teams, adding the 'real time' and profile option in 2013/2014.
Student achievement and program results are communicated at many different levels. The communication

department publishes a comprehensive annual report and maintains the website with pertinent information in that regard. The Nebraska Department of Education has a website with district and school data for parents and the public to view. This data indicates student growth over time. A "State of the Schools Report" is shared with the Board of Education annually. In addition, principals prepare Accountability in Action reports, which are shared with District stakeholders for feedback and direction. This same presentation is then shared with school staff, PTOs and at Liaison Lunches which include the Superintendent and Board members.

Parents have access to local student achievement data on a quarterly basis via a traditional report card with student-led conferences taking place in the fall and spring. In addition, NRT (Terra Nova) reports are sent to parents in grades 3 and 5 in the fall and NeSA Individual Student Reports (ISR) from spring testing of the previous year are included in the fall conferencing format so questions can be addressed on an individualized basis. Informally, teachers communicate progress and achievement information on a regular basis through phone calls, emails, and notes home.

3.   Sharing Lessons Learned:

Carriage Hill Elementary has created impressive student learning results over the last three years with all students and particularly with students identified for special education and free/reduced lunch. These results can be directly attributed to purposeful adult actions, such as clear alignment of state indicators within units, creating common formative assessments that align with state indicators, and re-teaching of indicators based on formative assessment. Students identified for special education are served in a Least Restrictive Environment that has components of inclusion and purposeful pullout, which is determined by individual student need. All staff members are invested in the success of all children and each child is seen as an important member of the Carriage Hill family as well as someone who can perform on grade level.

All of these philosophical beliefs and adults actions have been topics of presentations given by the staff to the Papillion-La Vista (PLV) School Board. Carriage Hill has had multiple teachers from outside districts come to observe how the general education and special education teachers work together to meet the individual needs of students. Each year, there are also individual teachers within the district that spend time at Carriage Hill learning from the staff.

Within the PLV School District, Carriage Hill is in an array with five other schools, all of which are Title 1 buildings. The five principals meet on a weekly basis for a principal PLC to plan professional development, analyze building and array data, and to share strategies and ideas that they are finding successful. This has been a time when the Carriage Hill principal has talked about the specific strategies and interventions at Carriage Hill that are getting results. There is also an elementary principal meeting at the district level, once a month, with a curriculum and instruction focus where all 14 principals meet. This is another opportunity for the Carriage Hill principal to share ideas and strategies that are working as well as learn from others.

Array professional development days also allow Carriage Hill teachers to collaborate with other Title 1 teachers from across the district and share information based on results. The teachers have spent time developing common formative assessments, sharing re-teaching strategies and activities, and discussing action research goals during their time together. The staff at Carriage Hill recognizes that powerful results are achieved through sharing and collaboration and this must be done within and outside the building.

4.   Engaging Families and Community:

Establishing a partnership between school and home, strengthening relationships within the community, and making connections between parents are top priorities with the Carriage Hill staff. Over the years the staff has implemented a variety of strategies to increase parent involvement and improve the areas mentioned above.

One strategy that has proven to be the most effective is having students involved in the event or learning with their parents. It is because of the success of this strategy that each grade level now has an individual math morning where students and parents learn about the math curriculum, how they can support their

child's learning, and play math games together. Carriage Hill also has an evening and morning literary event for kindergarten, first, second graders and their parents to take time to enjoy books together using this strategy. This year the Carriage Hill staff will also be changing the annual curriculum night to include more student involvement with the hope of increasing parent attendance.

Another strategy the staff has found to be successful is establishing close, personal relationships between staff and parents. One of the ways this is done is through home visits. Home visits have been done by a variety of staff at various grade levels. The contact is made in person or on the phone. All staff members that have participated have found families are more invested in the staff and school after home visits.

Making personal contact and invitations for high priority events is another strategy that the staff has found successful. In October of 2013, Carriage Hill hosted a two night community forum. The purpose was to celebrate what is going well, identify the areas in need of improvement, and brainstorm solutions for those areas in need of improvement. There were approximately 50 people in attendance between parents and staff on both nights. Prior to the event, each staff member personally invited five parents to attend the evening, which they attribute to the success of attendance. The information gathered on both nights has been a driving force for our Continuous Improvement Team with direct applications to the building action plan.

It is because of these strategies and the close relationships between school and home that Carriage Hill is finding great success with student learning. Parents and teachers are better able to support children at home and at school because of a deeper understanding of one another.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The curriculum department supports student achievement by working with teams of teachers to develop a coherent K-12 curriculum framed around state standards, providing instructional materials and professional development that support the curriculum. Curriculum has been structured so that students receive an education that is well-articulated in which content and skills have been thoughtfully laid out to support continuous growth and acquisition of skills from year to year. The curriculum is written by teachers from across the District utilizing the Understanding by Design framework (Wiggins and McTighe). The curriculum guide is designed to help teachers identify what content will be taught in each subject area at specific grade levels or courses. Our District understands that curriculum is not just the words in a document but the actions that occur in the classroom. Teachers use the curriculum guide to design learning plans and lessons that focus on grade level and subject level standards, concepts and indicators.

To ensure all classrooms have the same quality curriculum, instruction and assessments, grade level teachers and department teams collaborate with each other as PLCs -teams of education experts working toward a common focus using the curriculum guide to build a meaningful sequence of learning activities so all students are learning. PLCs use student achievement data to determine what's working and what's not. Learning teams provide the structure for all teachers to implement the intended curriculum with fidelity. Ongoing collaboration takes place among grade level teachers, department teams, school to school teams and district teams.

The curriculum design process is accomplished through stages which focus on these questions. What do we want students to learn? How will we know students are learning? How will we implement the intended curriculum with fidelity? What are we going to do if students don't learn it? What are we going to do if students already know it? How will we know what is working and what is not? A district leadership team representing classroom teachers from across the district develops curriculum guides and district assessments which outline the intended curriculum for all teachers. They utilize the Understanding by Design framework to guide the curriculum development process.

Using a systematic 7 year process, the process begins with Stage I by reviewing and aligning each curricular area with the Nebraska State Standards. The curriculum team for English Language Arts cycled to Stage 1; In 2007-08. Literacy by Design, Fountas and Pinnell Guided Reading Model, Words their Way and Lucy Calkins' Units of Study were adopted as core instructional resources. The standards were revisited for alignment in 2010-11 and curricular guides, assessments, and curriculum resources were revised and updated. We will again begin the curriculum development process in Stage 1 in 2014-15.

The District followed the same curriculum development process in the area of math and in 2009-10 began implementing Calendar Math (K-6), Investigations in Number, Data, and Space (K-5) and Connected Mathematics 2 (6th) as core instructional resources. These programs align with the Nebraska State Standards, NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics and Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics.

In 2010-11, with the adoption of new state standards in science the elementary curriculum team began the curriculum process and recommended the purchase of FOSS (K-5) and Pearson (6th) to support the implementation of the district curriculum.

In 2013-14, the curriculum team has completed Stage I and 2 for social studies, recommending the selection of myWorld by Pearson. We are in the process of training all staff for full implementation in the fall of 2014.

The curriculum development and implementation process is the same for all elementary curricular areas including health, art, vocal and instrumental, physical education, media, and guidance, taught by highly qualified staff with licensure in their content area. The vocal, instrumental, and visual arts department rely

upon the Nebraska State Fine Arts Standards in conjunction with their national organizations' standards to guide the curriculum development process. Students attend either art, PE, media, or guidance for 40 minutes daily. Students in sixth grade have a small group lesson and large group rehearsal weekly in band. Finally, technology is embedded into the curricular areas and supported through building level library/media specialists and a district Technology Instructional Facilitator. The Technology Instructional Facilitator works collaboratively with media specialists and classroom teachers to ensure the integration of technology into the day to day learning in our classrooms.

2. Reading/English:

PLSD's ELA curriculum is aligned to the state standards. The purpose of ELA instruction is to cultivate critical thinking through literature, oral and written communication, reading, and research skills; and to provide experiences for the application of these skills accomplished through an integrated model of literacy, the use of authentic literacy with a shared responsibility for each child's literacy development and success; all of which is based upon an intense review of research and best practices.

To achieve our mission, we create learning environments where instruction is differentiated to meet the needs of all students; reading and writing instruction is a balance of modeling, vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension; active learning engages the students with the teacher as a facilitator; critical thinking skills developed through activities such as research, analysis of texts, and discussion; study and time management skill development; and ongoing assessment and feedback.

All staff works interdependently to implement the curriculum; implement formative and summative assessments that clearly measure targets which inform and guide instruction and provide sufficient information to evaluate student mastery of the standards; continuously implement instructional practices that are responsive to student needs; monitor classroom data and each student's individual progress; and embed PD into daily activities.

In order to meet the diverse needs of students, a minimum of 150 minutes of daily instruction is committed to ELA instruction. The reading workshop includes a large group explicit mini-lesson; small group instruction including direct instruction via guided reading and collaborative work time; and then back to large group to share and reflect. The writer's workshop includes a large group explicit mini-lesson; independent and small group writing and conferences; and large group sharing of writing. Students are flex-grouped and instruction is the shared responsibility of the grade level team.

School staff employ the PLC process to improve all students' reading skills. They utilize well-crafted formative and summative assessments to determine students' specific strengths and needs. They develop Individual Intervention Plans for any student who is not on target or is at-risk of not being on target, utilizing a variety of evidence based interventions. A child's teacher can detail a child's progress, instructional plan effectiveness and evidence to inform decision making at any time. K-3 teams have two 40 minute and 4th-6th has one 40 minute daily scheduled intervention/enrichment block built into the instructional day, so students don't miss other core instruction.

3. Mathematics:

PLSD's math curriculum is aligned to state standards. Math instruction provides a high quality, rich environment, where all students are challenged and equipped with mathematical skills and strategies, empowering them to successfully apply mathematics; all of which is based upon an intense review of research and best practice.

Instruction is differentiated; students use multiple strategies to solve problems and are actively engaged; learning is both conceptual and procedural; timely feedback supports risk-taking and perseverance; students work collaboratively and communicate mathematically; and teachers and students relate math in real-world contexts.

Calendar Math (K-6), Connected Mathematics 2–CMP2 (6th) and Investigations were adopted to meet

diverse students' needs. Investigations and CMP2 were developed at TERC in Cambridge aimed at improve teaching and learning. These resources support students' mathematical thinking, computational fluency and understanding of rational numbers, geometry/measurement, data analysis/probability, and algebra. Teacher pedagogy supports students' mathematical reasoning, communication, and engagements.

The curriculum supports the development and expansion of mathematical ideas that students have and teachers are engaged in ongoing learning about mathematics content and how students learn mathematics. Investigations are carefully designed to engage all students —regardless of strengths, needs, and/or interests.

Students work individually, in pairs or small groups, and as a whole class. Math Workshop is a structure that allows students to work on a set of related activities that focus on similar mathematical content, allowing students to take responsibility for their own learning. Whole-class discussions provide students the opportunity to articulate, represent, connect, and consolidate mathematical ideas. It is important for teachers to: build a mathematical community in which students are prepared to listen actively and contribute ideas; focus discussions on key mathematical ideas; and encourage the participation of all students.

4.   Additional Curriculum Area:

a) In 2010-11 the elementary curriculum team began the curriculum process, and while studying research and best practices during the curriculum process, the teacher leaders decided a major change must occur in our science classrooms if our students were going to be successful-students do not learn by reading about science-they learned by doing science. To meet these high standards, they recommended FOSS (K-5) and Pearson (6th) to support the implementation of the district curriculum and philosophy.

The FOSS program was developed at the Lawrence Hall of Science under three grants and were dedicated to the proposition that students learn science best by doing science. Teachers and students do science together, engaging in enduring experiences that lead to deeper understanding of the natural world. The FOSS program uses several instructional pedagogies: inquiry-based learning (each investigation is guided by questions), hands-on learning and active investigation (students work with materials and conduct investigations to attempt to answer questions), student-to-student interaction, writing (students keep careful notes in science notebooks), and research/reading (readings are included to enhance or underscore active investigation—students work with materials prior to doing any reading).

Students are learning in science the skills and knowledge that support building and district goals. Authentic literacy is one of Schmoker's essential's for schools and provides a logical partnership for an integrated learning environment in literacy, mathematical skills, pedagogy, processes, and instructional strategies. Examples of this can be found in program goals such as scientific literacy-preparing all our students to be scientifically literate so they are able to make thoughtful, informed decisions. Another program goal supports, through instructional efficiency, all teachers with a curriculum resource that reflects current research on learning, including collaborative learning, student discourse, and embedded assessment, and uses effective instructional methodologies, including hands-on active learning, inquiry, integration of disciplines and content areas, and multisensory methods – all supporting instructional goals in other content areas.

During science students are deeply embedded in reading, research and writing to extend their experience beyond the limits of the classroom; they can enhance their understanding of concepts by exposure to related ideas and share in the lives of real and fictitious people who played roles in scientific discovery or applied scientific ideas to life situations. Science Stories were written to add this dimension to the science program. Carefully selected reading materials, provided after an activity-based foundation is in place, can add a very effective dimension to science learning.
(http://www.delta-education.com/science/foss/index.shtml)

b) The purpose of the Papillion-La Vista Early Childhood (PLEC) program is to prepare every student for a successful transition into the next phase of his/her life. The PLEC program supports its purpose and direction through a comprehensive continuum of resources and services to ensure success for all young students and their families. Early intervention programs and services have a profound impact on young

students and families living in the (PLSD) attendance area.

The Early Childhood purpose is achieved through implementation of evidence-based early intervention practices with children and families in conjunction with high quality learning environments and a rigorous curriculum. The Early Childhood program uses The Creative Curriculum for Preschool which, according to its Research Foundation, is based on five fundamental principles: positive interactions and relationships with adults, social-emotional competence, constructive/purposeful play, quality physical/classroom environments, and partnerships between families and teachers. Children learn through inquiry-based activities and discussion. Science and Social Studies content is explored through the integration of communication, social, motor and self-help skills. Some of the process skills children learn through their experiences in PLSD classrooms include observing and exploring, connecting information, problem solving, organizing information, and communication and representing through drawing, writing, dramatizing, explaining, and making graphs and models to share what they have learned.

The Early Childhood program covers the entire district. There is not one specific "building" that defines the Early Childhood program. Rather, the program encompasses all young students and families under the age of five within the PLSD boundaries. Based on Kindergarten enrollment at the start of the 2013-2014 school year (which was 814 students), it is estimated that there are at least 2,400 students ages 3-5 in the PLSD community. If you expand to include students under age 3, the projected number of young students living in the PLSD attendance area jumps to 4,000. The Early Childhood team, in accordance with student find regulations, is required to screen and evaluate all young students suspected of having a disability. Results of the 2012-2013 Early Intervention Family Survey indicate 95.1% of families who responded report it was easy to find out information about early intervention services.

5. **Instructional Methods:**

The PLSD's purpose is to prepare every student for a successful transition into the next phase of his/her life. Our target is 100% of students being proficient, with a goal of continuous improvement. – Our direction is to prepare every student for success through superior educational programs delivered by highly effective educators who use innovative, research-based strategies in a safe and supportive environment in collaboration with family and community.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) strengthen everything teachers do to ensure high levels of student learning. Teachers engage in PLCs as grade level teams, departments (special education), at the building level and across buildings (array) to improve student learning. Carriage Hill is getting results due to focusing on what matters most. All teachers understand the content in the curriculum guide; are implementing a common, quality, coherent, viable curriculum with fidelity; are implementing the elements of an effective lesson -– using instructional practices that have the greatest impact on learning; are using assessment results to guide instruction and provide feedback to students; understand and effectively implement the elements of authentic literacy; and understand the continuous improvement process and use the I.D.E.A.L. process to analyze common data sources and evaluate instructional and program effectiveness to determine the impact on learning.

The District Curriculum Toolbox process involves teachers who develop and align curriculum and common assessments to provide a guaranteed, viable curriculum. They utilize-on-going formative and summative assessments to determine students' strengths and needs, and are very intentional in their instruction. Teachers develop Individual Intervention Plans (IIP) for students who are not on target or are at-risk and they develop Gifted Education Plans for gifted students, which include goals, progress monitoring and measurements of success. Progress is monitored in the classroom and in the intervention to make decisions and differentiate learning. At all times, a Carriage Hill teacher can provide details of a child's instructional plan and evidence to support the child's progress. K-3 teams have two 40 minute and 4th-6th has one 40 minute daily scheduled intervention/enrichment block built into the instructional day, so students don't miss other core instruction. Teachers utilize research and evidence-based interventions that are designed to support the students' individual needs. Some of these interventions include: Leveled Literacy Intervention, Do the Math, Corrective reading, pre-teach/re-teach, and double dipping of core instruction such as guided reading. The student needs are met through a variety of instructional strategies by a dedicated core of

support staff. The teachers have focused on high impact strategies that are supported through research. Two leaders that are frequently looked to for determining level of impact are Hattie and Marzano. All teachers at Carriage Hill identify, communicate, and focus teaching on clear learning targets that have been identified to students. They use repeated readings and use clear concise language, supporting students through direct instruction and vocabulary development. Teachers are involved in focused conversations about critical learnings and design instruction that is clearly aligned to those goals. They are able to identify misconceptions and give students frequent specific feedback to clarify the misunderstandings because of common team developed formative assessments. A team of 5.5 special education teachers, 1 Title I teacher, paraprofessionals, High Ability Learner facilitator, and classroom teachers are essential to the differentiation in temporary flexible grouping that occurs based upon a student's needs.

6. Professional Development:

Carriage Hill Elementary devotes monthly professional development (PD) days, PLC and weekly meetings for PD. This includes district, array and building-wide PD and capacity building opportunities for CIP and curriculum toolbox members, PLCs, and job embedded development through a Literacy Facilitator (LF) and Math Coach (MC)– all based upon goals and needs.

At the district level, PD activities are presented when all teachers system-wide need to have common learning, including assessment literacy, in-depth horizontal and vertical math standards analysis, literacy strategies/instruction and other topics. The District also supports PD by providing graduate courses on campus and providing a stipend. The courses are Primary and Intermediate Guided Reading and Inquiry in the Math and Science Classrooms.

The elementary schools are divided into arrays based upon building similarities. Carriage Hill is a member of the Title I team (5 schools). The principals meet bimonthly in a PLC to share data, discuss needs, and plan PD accordingly, such as workshop model activities, double scoring, standard alignment work, learning plan development, or formative assessment development.

The principal, LF, MC and CIP team are instrumental in identifying, planning, and implementing PD at the building, department, or individual level. The LF and MC are instrumental in embedding PD into the classroom. At Carriage Hill, Lesson Study is part of the culture and expectation. The LF or MC schedule release time for grade level teams, and special education and Title I support team to do an in-depth study of lesson planning focused on standards and student needs and instructional strategies followed by one of the teachers implementing the lesson while the team observes. The team then reflects on the action of the teacher and students to make adjustments in the lesson for the next teacher to implement. This continuous cycle of improving teaching and learning has had a significant impact on student achievement.

The District also values the expertise of their leaders and provides systematic PD for principals. The principals meet once a week with each department curriculum/instruction/assessment, human resources, and technology/school improvement. The meetings focus on building their capacity within curricular areas so they can be knowledgeable, confident instructional leaders and can inform district level decisions. The curriculum department provides focused PD to provide principals with the expertise necessary to provide teachers with specific feedback on their implementation of district curriculum with fidelity. For example, we have provided training on small group instruction of literacy and the mathematical practices. Through the training, we provide the background information to support the instructional model and strategies, provide "look for" observation forms, view video clips of lessons as a team, and discuss as teams. Principals identify strategies to reinforce and identify talking points to move staff forward. The district partnered with a University of Nebraska-Lincoln professor to support our PD work on mathematical practices-relying upon the expertise of those in the field. We focus training on principals being effective stewards of data, how to use the district Dashboard to monitor grade level, program, teacher, and student data. Principals collaboratively revised the district instructional schedule, making it equitable across all 14 schools. Through district level PD for our instructional leaders, they are equipped with the knowledge and expertise critical for providing staff with the feedback to support a strong instructional core through walk-throughs and formal observations.

7. **School Leadership**

PLSD believes principals are instructional leaders in their school. Their responsibility is to ensure students are meeting achievement and social/emotional targets. For this to happen, the principal, all staff and families must focus on continuous improvement and the principal must have teacher leaders, support staff and resources with which to share their leadership. This is evident when observing the principal, LF, MC, and CIP team working with the Carriage Hill family to create a laser like focus on what is critical, while balancing the sense of urgency that students deserve.

The principal is vested in monitoring the implementation of the building, grade level, teacher, and student improvement plans. She monitors the actions of her teachers through walk-through and formal observations, providing teachers with specific and timely feedback, attending PLC meetings and being visible in the building. She monitors data with her team so she can coach, monitor progress, and advocate for resources to support the goals of the building.

The principal believes in shared leadership and empowering her teacher leaders to inform decisions. She meets weekly with her coaches to provide direction, develop individual or group teacher plans, reflect, evaluate and monitor student and staff performance. The coaches share the leadership role as they provide classroom-embedded professional development to impact the actions of the adults. They also participate in PLC discussions to support their team in improving instruction to meet student needs.

Teachers share in the leadership of the school through involvement in viable committees such as CIP, curriculum toolbox, and specialized committees. Teachers are inspired to take the initiative to research and recommend actions that will impact teaching and learning.

The principal values the need for a true partnership between home and school. The "We Are Carriage Hill" parent strategic planning event was just one way in which she engages families in a meaningful and purposeful alliance between all stakeholders for the purpose of improving opportunities for students. The principal and staff provide parents with the tools and knowledge they need to play a major role in and have a voice in their child's education.

Students, parents, and staff would all agree students are successful at Carriage Hill because of the clear and consistent goals of the school's leadership and the relentless belief that every child is important and they have it within their power to make that difference – one child at a time.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data Recognition Corporation

Test: Nebraska State Accountability
Edition/Publication Year: 2010

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	94	70	54	100	96
% Exceeds	34	19	8	54	40
Number of students tested	67	59	61	52	82
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	1	0	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	2	0	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	97	60	50	100	97
% Exceeds	34	15	11	45	13
Number of students tested	32	20	18	22	30
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	80	44	0		100
% Exceeds	0	11	0		21
Number of students tested	10	9	7		14
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or					

Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	93	74	59	100	98
% Exceeds	34	21	9	61	49
Number of students tested	58	47	54	38	57
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

In 2009-2010, Special Education data was not available (masked) on the State of the Schools Report.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data Recognition Corporation

Test: Nebraska State Accountability
Edition/Publication Year: 2010

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	88	88	52	100	99
% Exceeds	35	22	4	96	93
Number of students tested	62	64	56	71	74
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	3	1	0	0	2
% of students tested with alternative assessment	5	2	0	0	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	83	91	50	100	100
% Exceeds	35	23	0	90	89
Number of students tested	31	22	22	31	19
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	100	63	63	100	
% Exceeds	11	0	0	81	
Number of students tested	9	8	8	16	
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	88	90	66	100	98
% Exceeds	39	25	5	96	98
Number of students tested	49	57	38	52	51
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data comparisons would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

The Papillion-La Vista School District (PLSD) prides itself in inclusive practices that attract children with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Unlike any other district in the metropolitan Omaha area, all students in PLSD attend their neighborhood school from grade Kindergarten through twelve. As stated, this opportunity is not available for them in any other district in the metropolitan area as all surrounding districts choose to serve certain students in cluster sites. As a result, the 1% limit was exceeded (>2% Blue Ribbon guideline).

In 2008-2009, Special Education data was not available (masked) on the State of the Schools Report.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data Recognition Corporation

Test: Nebraska State Accountability
Edition/Publication Year: 2010

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	82	84	57	99	100
% Exceeds	22	20	12	84	
Number of students tested	72	56	65	67	59
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	2	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	83	74	50	95	100
% Exceeds	14	16	4	79	
Number of students tested	29	19	26	19	18
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	60	90	36	100	
% Exceeds	0	20	0		
Number of students tested	10	10	14	14	
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	86	94	65	98	100
% Exceeds	27	26	16	89	
Number of students tested	59	38	49	45	49
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

The Papillion-La Vista School District (PLSD) prides itself in inclusive practices that attract children with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Unlike any other district in the metropolitan Omaha area, all students in PLSD attend their neighborhood school from grade Kindergarten through twelve. As stated, this opportunity is not available for them in any other district in the metropolitan area as all surrounding districts choose to serve certain students in cluster sites. As a result, the 1% limit was exceeded (>2% Blue Ribbon guideline).
Where the cells are empty, the data was masked on the State of the Schools Report.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data Recognition Corporation

Test: Nebraska State Accountability
Edition/Publication Year: 2010

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	81	77	58	97	100
% Exceeds	30	23	10	95	
Number of students tested	53	65	62	61	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	2	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	2	3	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	63	69	45	96	100
% Exceeds	21	14	15	91	
Number of students tested	19	22	20	23	
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	76	30	16		
% Exceeds	13	0	8		
Number of students tested	8	10	12		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	88	82	71	100	100
% Exceeds	34	28	10	98	
Number of students tested	35	50	41	51	43
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

The Papillion-La Vista School District (PLSD) prides itself in inclusive practices that attract children with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Unlike any other district in the metropolitan Omaha area, all students in PLSD attend their neighborhood school from grade Kindergarten through twelve. As stated, this opportunity is not available for them in any other district in the metropolitan area as all surrounding districts choose to serve certain students in cluster sites. As a result, the 1% limit was exceeded (>2% Blue Ribbon guideline).

Where the cells are empty, the data was masked on the State of the Schools Report.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA   **Test:** Nebraska State Accountability
All Students Tested/Grade: 3   **Edition/Publication Year:** 2009
Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data
Recognition Corporation

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	91	81	64	65	95
% Exceeds	32	20	10	8	88
Number of students tested	66	59	61	51	82
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	1	0	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	2	0	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	94	80	67	57	97
% Exceeds	29	15	0	0	77
Number of students tested	31	20	18	21	30
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	89	56	29	50	100
% Exceeds	0	0	0	0	93
Number of students tested	9	9	7	2	14
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	93	81	67	72	98
% Exceeds	32	26	11	11	93
Number of students tested	57	47	54	38	57
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data comparisons would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA   **Test:** Nebraska State Accountability

All Students Tested/Grade: 4   **Edition/Publication Year:** 2009

Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data Recognition Corporation

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	89	80	65	60	100
% Exceeds	32	33	11	14	7
Number of students tested	63	64	56	65	74
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	2	1	0	1	2
% of students tested with alternative assessment	3	2	0	1	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	88	77	55	48	84
% Exceeds	25	27	0	11	0
Number of students tested	32	22	22	27	19
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	80	38	50	18	90
% Exceeds	20	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	10	8	8	11	20
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	88	79	71	67	94
% Exceeds	36	35	13	18	0
Number of students tested	50	57	38	49	51
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data comparisons would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

The Papillion-La Vista School District (PLSD) prides itself in inclusive practices that attract children with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Unlike any other district in the metropolitan Omaha area, all students in PLSD attend their neighborhood school from grade Kindergarten through twelve. As stated, this opportunity is not available for them in any other district in the metropolitan area as all surrounding districts choose to serve certain students in cluster sites. As a result, the 1% limit was exceeded (>2% Blue Ribbon guideline).

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA   **Test:** Nebraska State Accountability
All Students Tested/Grade: 5   **Edition/Publication Year:** 2009
Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data
Recognition Corporation

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	89	91	57	71	100
% Exceeds	32	34	14	16	100
Number of students tested	72	56	65	62	59
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	3	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	5	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	89	84	43	59	100
% Exceeds	10	21	8	6	100
Number of students tested	29	19	26	17	18
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	50	80	21	11	
% Exceeds	0	30	0	0	
Number of students tested	10	10	14	9	
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	92	97	63	81	100
% Exceeds	36	34	18	23	100
Number of students tested	59	38	49	40	49
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data comparisons would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

The Papillion-La Vista School District (PLSD) prides itself in inclusive practices that attract children with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Unlike any other district in the metropolitan Omaha area, all students in PLSD attend their neighborhood school from grade Kindergarten through twelve. As stated, this opportunity is not available for them in any other district in the metropolitan area as all surrounding districts choose to serve certain students in cluster sites. As a result, the 1% limit was exceeded (>2% Blue Ribbon guideline).

In 2008-2009, Special Education data was not available (masked) on the State of the Schools Report.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA   **Test:** Nebraska State Accountability
All Students Tested/Grade: 6   **Edition/Publication Year:** 2009
Publisher: Nebraska Department of Education/Data Recognition Corporation

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets % Exceeds	90	78	70	76	100
% Exceeds	30	30	16	30	100
Number of students tested	53	66	61	54	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	3	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	2	5	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	79	77	75	68	100
% Exceeds	5	27	10	26	100
Number of students tested	19	22	20	19	22
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets % Exceeds	76	30	27	50	
% Exceeds	13	10	9	50	
Number of students tested	8	10	11	4	
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Meets % Exceeds	100	82	76	78	100
% Exceeds	40	35	18	35	100
Number of students tested	35	51	40	46	43
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: To protect the identity of individual students, the Nebraska Department of Education did not report district information if fewer than ten students were tested at any grade level or if all students in a grade scored in any single proficiency level. Special education n values by grade are commonly below 10. The rule of thumb is that n values below 30 are not necessarily representative of the group's outcome. When communicated to the public, these values below 10 must be masked.

In 2009-2010, the state standards in reading were revised, which led to the need for a NeSA reading test. This was the first year that all schools across the state were required to take the same tests in grades 3-8 and 11. The math standards were revised in 2010-2011. This assessment system replaced Nebraska's School-based Teacher-led assessment and Reporting System (STARS), where all schools created their own common district assessments. A new baseline for reading was established in 2009-2010, so comparisons to previous student achievement data would not be appropriate. The new baseline for math was 2010-2011.

The Papillion-La Vista School District (PLSD) prides itself in inclusive practices that attract children with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Unlike any other district in the metropolitan Omaha area, all students in PLSD attend their neighborhood school from grade Kindergarten through twelve. As stated, this opportunity is not available for them in any other district in the metropolitan area as all surrounding districts choose to serve certain students in cluster sites. As a result, the 1% limit was exceeded (>2% Blue Ribbon guideline).

In 2008-2009, Special Education data was not available (masked) on the State of the Schools Report.