

U.S. Department of Education
2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) Elementary Middle High K-12 Other
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal: Mr. Gregory Eversoll

Official School Name: Chandler View Elementary

School Mailing Address:
7800 South 25th Street
Omaha, NE 68147-2125

County: Sarpy State School Code Number*: 28-0001-075

Telephone: (402) 734-5705 Fax: (402) 734-5609

Web site/URL: www.ops.org/elementary/chandlerview/ E-mail: Gregory.Eversoll@ops.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent*: Dr. John Mackiel

District Name: Omaha Public Schools Tel: (402) 557-2001

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Sandra Kostos-Jensen

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

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

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

Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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 one or more of 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.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals 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 and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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 (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:
- | | |
|-----------|---------------------|
| 62 | Elementary schools |
| 11 | Middle schools |
| | Junior high schools |
| 7 | High schools |
| 3 | Other |
| 83 | TOTAL |
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9521

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 9712

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 area
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural area
 Rural
4. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
- 17 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
PreK			0	7			0
K	42	51	93	8			0
1	53	48	101	9			0
2	56	42	98	10			0
3	50	49	99	11			0
4	59	39	98	12			0
5	44	42	86	Other			0
6	37	38	75				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							650

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <u> 1 </u> | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| <u> 2 </u> | % Asian |
| <u> 13 </u> | % Black or African American |
| <u> 50 </u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u> </u> | % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |
| <u> 34 </u> | % White |
| <u> </u> | % Two or more races |
| <u>100</u> | % Total |

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting 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.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 18 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	64
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	48
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	112
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	618
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.181
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	18.123

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 33 %

Total number limited English proficient 212

Number of languages represented: 10

Specify languages:

Arabic, Chinese, Dinka, French, Nuer, Filipino, Somali, Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 66 %

Total number students who qualify: 431

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 free and reduced-price school meals 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: 16 %

Total Number of Students Served: 104

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

<u>5</u> Autism	<u>1</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>11</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>27</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>9</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>50</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>1</u> Developmentally Delayed

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

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>26</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>21</u>	<u>6</u>
Support staff	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>
Total number	<u>79</u>	<u>15</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 25 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	95%	94%	94%
Daily teacher attendance	95%	94%	93%	95%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	11%	14%	3%	6%	12%

Please provide all explanations below.

Student attendance rates were below 95% from 2003/2004 and 2004/2005, there is no clear distinction as to why attendance dipped below 95% those years, During the 2005/2006 school year, Omaha Public School district instituted a stricter attendance policy and it has been subsequently followed ever since.

Daily teacher attendance rates were below 95% in 2005/2006 and 2006/2007. A staff member was pregnant that year, decreasing attendance during 2005/2006. No clear reason why our teacher attendance was at 94% last year.

Teacher turnover rate was above 12% during the 2006/2007 school year due to several retirements and several professional transfers for family reasons.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	<u>0</u> %
Enrolled in a community college	<u>0</u> %
Enrolled in vocational training	<u>0</u> %
Found employment	<u>0</u> %
Military service	<u>0</u> %
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	<u>0</u> %
Unknown	<u>0</u> %
Total	<u>100</u> %

PART III - SUMMARY

Chandler View Elementary, a Title I Schoolwide Program Plan school, is located at 7800 South 25th Street, within the city limits of Bellevue, Nebraska; however it is an Omaha Public School District school (OPS). We serve students in kindergarten through the sixth grade. Our membership includes two district behavioral skills classrooms for children identified with behavior disorders. The school opened in January 1969 and was built to accommodate 245 students. Commencing in November 2000, extensive renovation and construction of a new addition more than doubled Chandler View's square footage by 2003. The enrollment has steadily increased to 650 students, changing our ethnically diverse population and socio-economic status. The neighborhood is comprised of an array of dwellings from low income housing complexes, to median income residences. Moreover, 250 of our students reside outside the immediate neighborhood in more urban areas of south Omaha that are affected by higher levels of violence and poverty. Transportation is provided to students who choose Chandler View as an option school rather than their home attendance area school. As our membership grows, so does the percentage of English language learners, children with special needs, students qualifying for free or reduced lunch, and children of migrant workers.

Chandler View is an exemplary school that focuses on creating an environment that supports diverse learners. Our mission is to provide educational opportunities that enable all students to achieve to their highest potential, become responsible citizens, and life long learners. To fulfill this purpose, our vision includes:

- A leadership team that facilitates and values a collaborative and safe learning environment with high academic expectations and shared instructional focus
- A staff that effectively teams up to incorporate innovative teaching strategies with technology and nurtures individual talent
- A student body with well developed leadership skills and the necessary resources to accept responsibility for their education
- An interactive community partnership that encourages diverse educational opportunities and supports our mission

Chandler View promotes a safe, secure, and disciplined learning environment by implementing the Life Skills model that emphasizes respecting others and accepting responsibility for one's actions. Furthermore, our Cougar Eyes program recognizes and rewards good citizenship. All staff members take a personal interest in fostering positive relationships with our students. In 2006, our school counselor piloted a program for staff members to mentor at-risk students. Since the program was so well-received, we have continued it and added a peer mentoring component. Our professional team of teachers, support staff, and parents meets regularly to assure that the climate at our school is positive and our students are safe and respected.

Traditionally, we have expected our students to achieve above the 50th percentile on standardized tests, and attain results that surpass the district scores. Our school motto reflects this expectation; Cougars *ROAR*, Respect Others Accept Responsibility. As our school's demographic profile changed, the number of classrooms, as well as class membership, increased. Accordingly, we began to utilize research and multiple measures of data analysis in making school improvement decisions and action plans. Our professional development activities became site-based and were selected with teachers. The activities promoted collaboration and the sharing of research-based instructional strategies for both teachers and paraprofessionals to enhance their skills. Some teachers pursued Master's Degrees in Education and ESL endorsements. Resolutely, the staff embraced a balanced literacy model of instruction, adopted block scheduling, and transitioned from chapter driven instruction to goal oriented, standard directed curriculum that focused on our students' needs.

Chandler View's success can be attributed to the commitment of our students, teachers, support staff, parents, community, and district leadership to provide all students educational opportunities to achieve their highest potential in a safe and secure learning environment.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Information on Nebraska's state assessment system is available at <http://www.nde.state.ne.us> or <http://www.reportcard.nde.state.us>.

Accountability for student achievement in Nebraska is guided by two systems:

- A state system called STARS, School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System and
- A federal system called Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), which is part of No Child Left Behind legislation

STARS requires public school districts to report student achievement in the areas of reading and language arts, writing, and mathematics to the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) at the end of grades four, eight, and eleven. Omaha Public Schools (OPS) district standards have been evaluated by the NDE and deemed as rigorous or more rigorous as state standards. Prior to 2005-2006 grade four achievement was reported to the federal government in the areas of reading and language arts, mathematics, and writing to meet NCLB guidelines. In 2005-2006 grades three through six began reporting student progress for NCLB. Criterion Referenced Tests (CRTs) have been established to assess student grade level proficiency of standards for both STARS and NCLB. Our OPS District developed tests have been rated exemplary by the state. OPS student achievement is assessed and categorized as advanced, proficient, progressing, or beginning. In 2007-2008 Chandler View had 99% student participation on assessments and scored above the state and district averages on CRTs.

As of 2007-2008, 95% of Chandler View students in grades three through six scored in the proficient plus advanced category on reading CRTs. Over five years a notable increase of 23% was gained in the proficient plus advance category for all students, and an increase of 21% in the advanced category for all students was achieved. Five out of six of our subgroups showed a 21% - 42% increase in the proficient plus advanced category over five years, our Special Education subgroup showed the greatest gain of 42%. Our Free and Reduced Lunch Students subgroup showed a 25% increase, followed by our Hispanic and African American subgroups groups with 24% gains. Our English Language Learner (ELL) subgroup showed an impressive 34% increase over the previous three years in the proficient plus advanced category. We were unable to provide a five year comparison due to scores being masked.

As of 2007-2008, in the area of mathematics, 98% of all students in grades three through six scored at the proficient plus advanced level on mathematics CRTs. These scores demonstrated a 16% increase over five years, and a 34% increase in the advanced category for all students. Four out of six of our subgroups showed a 14% - 22% increase in the proficient plus advanced category over five years, with our Free and Reduced Lunch Students subgroup showing the greatest gain of 22%. During the previous three year period our ELL subgroup showed a 23% increase in the proficient advanced category and our Special Education subgroup increased their scores by 25%. Again, we were unable to provide a five year comparisons due to scores being masked.

Grades two and five participated in the nationally normed California Achievement Test (CAT). Second and fifth graders at Chandler View students consistently scored above the national average in mathematics. Our second graders typically scored above the national average in reading, whereas our grade five student scores were inconsistent and often lower. All second grade students moved from the 52%tile to the 58%tile in reading, and from the 76%tile to the 84%tile in mathematics over five years. All fifth graders struggled with continually improving their scores in reading on the CAT over a five year period. In mathematics all of our fifth grade students demonstrated an improvement from the 45%tile to the 59%tile over a five year period. Only our fifth grade Special Education subgroup scored below the 50%tile in 2007-2008, but moved from the 21%tile to the 41%tile over five years.

On the Nebraska Statewide Writing Assessment in 2008, 92% of all our fourth graders scored proficient, with at least 62% of the students in each subgroup scoring above the cut score. Over five years we've increased the all group category of students scoring proficient by 2%.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Formative and summative assessment data at Chandler View is analyzed and used to improve student learning, plan for changes, and focus on implementation strategies. To determine academic readiness, assessments occur before, during, and after instruction. Formal assessment results from the CAT, the CRTs, the district Third Grade Reading Test, and Statewide Writing Assessment are critically examined. Chandler View's Academic Data Representative attends district-level meetings to interpret data and present the results to teachers during staff meetings, grade level team meetings, and individually. Teachers receive information disaggregated by subtest, skill, standard, or cut score. These results are used to celebrate successes, determine strengths and areas needing improvement. Long range planning takes place, standards are changed into classroom targets, and instructional strategies are selected for implementation, so that students are informed and involved. We help our students understand what is expected of them and then set individual goals.

As a result of data analysis, a variety of proactive measures occur to improve instruction and student achievement. Teachers keep data folders that include examples of pupils' daily work and student completed success graphs. Title I and ESL funds are used to hire additional paraprofessionals, who receive training in guided reading practices. Paraprofessionals spend a minimum of 90% of their time working with students. Retired teachers are hired for small group re-teaching and practice groups. Benchmarking students' reading progress has led to expanding every classroom's library and greatly enhancing the materials in our leveled reading bookroom across the curriculum. Title I funds are utilized for after-school tutoring and Chandler View's summer school program with enrichment activities. We are making advancements with computer technology in that two mobile computer labs were added to utilize Reading A – Z, Fastt Math, PowerMediaPlus.Com, and other motivational resources to promote success and foster achievement.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

The ultimate goal of reporting assessment results to students, parents, school personnel, and the community is to enhance a student's ability to learn. Chandler View utilizes numerous approaches to share assessment results. Omaha Public Schools website has a link to the NDE State of the Schools Report Card. Our district provides letters of explanation in English, Spanish, or Nuer that complement the individual CAT data, CRT results, Statewide Writing Assessment score, or Third Grade Reading Test. All student results are shared with our parents. Our overall school performance and grade level performances are communicated throughout the school via media technology, CVTV – Friday Follies. The Bellevue Leader and Omaha World-Herald newspapers publish all formal assessment results. Omaha Public Schools and Chandler View's newsletter includes academic data information and is distributed to students, parents, staff, and the community. Chandler View's newsletter and Letter from the Principal are printed in both English and Spanish. We use school-to-home folders so our parents know where to look for valuable information. Chandler View staff fosters a team approach to success by keeping the lines of communication open on a regular basis. Our full-time bilingual liaison assists teachers and staff with telephone calls, notes to parents, and translating conversations about student progress and academic goals. During parent-teacher conferences assessment information is shared along with examples of student work and the progress report card. Some of our intermediate grade students lead the conferences with their parents. Parents attending Curriculum Night learn about: the importance of test data, our school's plans to improve instruction, and ways they can actively participate in enhancing their child's success. Communication about performance and achievement is an essential element of assessment.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Chandler View students' success is due to a school-wide team effort. We have shared our vision, strategies for small group instruction, curricular activities, after school tutoring, and methods of recording student progress with other schools at district level, elementary principals, academic data representatives, and instructional facilitators meetings. Frequently, we have been contacted about our after-school tutoring program, "Gear It Up". We have invited principals and teachers to come, observe, and discuss our criteria for student participation. We share our objectives for the program and the materials we use.

In the event that Chandler View is awarded Blue Ribbon status we would readily share our success. Both the Omaha World-Herald and the Bellevue Leader newspapers are interested in academic achievement accounts. Our CVTV-Friday Follies student broadcasting team would report on Chandler View's success and their media clip would be posted to our school website. Our Parent -Teacher Organization would enthusiastically embrace a celebration involving the community.

As a successful learning community, we would support others with professional development opportunities and collaboration, where all members strive to ensure that all students are the best they can be.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Chandler View curriculum is determined and driven by OPS standards and grade level expectations. Teachers use long range plans, district Course Guides, and assessment planning guides, along with the adopted district materials to plan daily lessons. The Title I budget has provided the means to purchase additional resources to supplement the district materials, provide for differentiation, and facilitate student success. Teachers are encouraged to attend professional development conferences for additional teaching strategies and all staff has been trained in and use the Gradual Release Model of delivering instruction: modeled, shared, guided, and independent. The core curriculum consists of the following:

Reading and Language Arts includes the teaching of reading, spelling, grammar, and writing. A “balanced literacy approach” is in place to ensure all components of a strong program are taught. Through balanced literacy, students receive grade level instruction using the district basal reading series. Small group differentiated instruction using leveled readers and guided reading also occurs daily. Extensive classroom libraries have been purchased to provide books at all levels for independent reading and take-home reading programs. Writing is taught at all grade levels, in all classrooms. The district has provided Writing Course Guides and teachers have had training in the Six Trait Writing Process. On-going assessment of student writing provides the data which results in additional small group instruction for students with specific needs. Grammar is taught through the writing editing process and mini-lessons. A concern for new strategies for teaching spelling has resulted in implementation of the Sitton Spelling Program at all grade levels. Chandler View intermediate students participate in the annual Spelling Bee.

The district adopted math program emphasizes problem-solving strategies and algebraic logic. Daily lessons include Problem of the Day. Students are taught grade level skills and standards, followed by small group instruction based on ability and remedial or enrichment need. Manipulatives are used for hands-on learning along with math centers that focus on previously taught skills. A determined need for basic knowledge of math facts resulted in a computer program: Fast Math, a mastery program used three to five times a week in all classrooms, grades two through six.

The OPS Social Studies curriculum at all grade levels combines the study of culture, history, geography, economics and citizenship. The district materials are used as a basis for class projects, group research, reading group topics, and units of class study. Field trips and assemblies are planned to support social studies units such as Native American Studies in the fourth grade, and the Omaha Unit in the third grade. Weekly magazines such as Time For Kids, Scholastic News, and Weekly Reader are purchased to provide students with additional knowledge of national and world current events. The Chandler View Guided Reading Bookroom supplements the curriculum with social studies leveled readers such as National Geographic.

The Science curriculum is determined by district grade level standards. A hands-on scientific inquiry process is taught for each standard in addition to science concepts specific to each grade level. Authentic activities provide real-world experiments, lessons, and methods used by scientists. Field trips to area space museums, zoos, and farms provide additional learning experiences for our students.

Chandler View’s specialists work collaboratively with teachers to enhance classroom learning. All special classes have grade level standards and include art, physical education, music, library media, and technology. Art instruction is discipline based and students learn about influential artists and art forms. The library media specialist plans with teachers on research projects, reading skills, and technology. Vocal music is offered for all, along with band and strings for intermediate students. The physical education program emphasizes team skills, individual skills, and good health practices.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

Reading: The changing demographics at Chandler View have resulted in a greater emphasis on reading and language arts instruction. A minimum of three hours a day in each classroom is dedicated to the teaching of reading and writing, using the balanced literacy model. The approach to comprehension instruction has evolved after two years of professional development focusing on teaching comprehension strategies. Students are taught to make connections between text to self, text to text, and text to world. More experienced teachers have integrated/connected subjects throughout the day. Strategies for higher level thinking skills are used in all subject areas. As the poverty level and number of ELL students attending Chandler View have increased, providing lessons that are language and vocabulary rich with an increased focus on building background knowledge and schema has become a priority.

The balanced literacy model provides teachers with a daily plan that ensures all components of reading and writing are taught. The three hour language arts block is divided into comprehension, word work, differentiated/leveled reading, independent reading, and writing. Using the Gradual Release Delivery Model of Instruction, comprehension strategies are taught during modeled and shared lessons. Guided lessons to practice these strategies are taught during the small group leveled reading time, coordinating with ESL and resource teachers. Teachers use benchmark data and running records to record student progress. This data reveals individual strengths and weaknesses in fluency, accuracy, and comprehension. Small group skills instruction is determined by these on-going assessments. Independent reading occurs daily, and includes student responsibilities of keeping book logs and response journals, and conferencing with teachers about books read in the classroom.

Students and families participate in a Take Home Reading Program. Classroom Libraries have been purchased and in most cases, paraprofessionals organize the program which includes keeping book logs, and conferencing with students about the books read at home. Teachers use a variety of incentives and activities to promote reading such as book clubs, literature circles, word walls, read alouds, Reader's Theaters, and The Daily Five management model.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Chandler View's technology goal is to create an environment which empowers students with the knowledge to use emerging technology to access and manage electronic information in order to enhance, as well as support, the curriculum and standards for:

- Learning
- Critical thinking
- Problem solving
- Communicating
- Expressing creativity in our changing world

Technology opens up new opportunities for all students to become engaged learners by:

- providing connectivity to electronic networks to access information and cultural resources from the latest primary resources
- incorporating technology-enriched activities to the content standards in order to maximize learning and facilitate higher order thinking skills
- identifying and utilizing assistive technologies to meet the special physical needs of students
- encouraging student-centered activities and lessons in which students apply technology tools and resources to increase the time, depth, and scope of meaningful learning tasks

Every class, kindergarten through sixth grade, comes to the lab each week for 45 minutes. Moreover, students in second through sixth grade are scheduled for an additional 20 minutes a week to complete a session in Fastt Math. This program is designed to help students with math fluency.

Teachers bring technology into the classroom by utilizing our mobile labs and wireless network. During computer lab our students are taught proper internet use and online safety together with learning a variety of skills:

- computer basics
- ways to navigate through and use websites
- keyboarding
- how to use writing and drawing tools
- utilizing web quests to learn new information
- making imovies and using garage band
- recognizing and deciding if an internet source is valid and truthful

Additionally, kindergarten students and first graders check-out academic software to use on their computers at home. Recently, Promethean global interactive boards with learning response systems, resources, and lessons were installed in every classroom.

4. Instructional Methods:

Chandler View teachers realize that differentiation is not a method of teaching. It is a way of thinking about students and the flow of instruction in the classroom. Differentiation acknowledges the diversity in the classroom and assures continuous progress for every child. Our goal in differentiating is about raising student achievement by meeting students at their readiness level. As a district we've learned that one size doesn't fit every child, so differentiated instruction is already built into the reading series and the math series. Our use of a balanced literacy model correlated with block scheduling allows our specialists to work with flexible, small groups of students.

Chandler View classroom teachers include differentiated instruction that is adjusted in content, process, product and/or environment, to create appropriately different learning experiences for our diverse students. The experiences reflect the readiness, interests, and/or learning profiles of our students. Our teachers use a range of instructional and management strategies such as:

- Anchor activities and charts
- Various graphic organizers
- Varied text and supplementary materials – leveled fiction and non-fiction materials
- Tiered lessons and products
- Learning contracts
- Remedial and enrichment small group instruction with support teachers
- Varied questioning strategies, encouraging higher levels of thinking
- Adapted homework and compacting
- Independent study, as well as learning buddies
- Pre/post assessment, checklists, portfolios, rubrics for progress
- Academic competitions: spelling bee, math and reading competitions, and activities sponsored by The Office of Gifted and Talented Education

Our classroom teachers represent the first line of intervention and implementation of instruction matched to our students' learning needs. The progress of all students is closely monitored. Data collected by our classroom teachers is shared at grade level team meetings, so they can collaborate, plan interventions, and additional instructional options with ESL, resource, gifted and talented, and support teachers. There is consistent use of best instructional practices and materials that are substantiated in research. Differentiated instruction provides challenging, meaningful, respectful, learning for all our diverse students.

5. Professional Development:

The Chandler View professional development program focuses on current best educational practices that strengthen the teaching skills of staff and are aligned with our school improvement plan, resulting in higher achievement for our students. Title I dollars are invested in conferences and seminars that occur at all levels: national, state, district, and within our school. Teachers are encouraged to attend such conferences. Within the school environment, teacher in-services are held in a variety of venues: staff meetings, grade-level team meetings, in-service days, summers, and weekends. District professional development is offered quarterly and during the summer for both grade level and school-wide needs. Some of the professional development over the last few years has included:

- Guided Reading/Running Records
- Balanced Literacy
- Gradual Release of Responsibility Model
- Comprehension Strategies
- Differentiation
- Promethean Training
- Safe and Secure Schools- Jim Fay's Love and Logic
- Professional Book Club
- Sitton Spelling
- Six-Trait Writing
- Math Problem Solving
- Technology Workshops

In addition to the opportunities listed above, many of the Chandler View staff have sought professional development by obtaining advanced degrees in education and endorsements such as ESL and early childhood. Several have received the ESL endorsement offered through OPS with a local university. As Chandler View's ESL population grows, more teachers see this endorsement as a necessity for current teaching practice and student success.

The professional development program has impacted the AYP success in reading, writing, math and science. Two examples are increased proficiency on the third grade district reading test and on the state writing test in fourth grade. We have also had consistent achievement growth on our Criterion Reference Tests, which are mastery tests for content standards.

All professional development is aligned with and recorded in our EXCELS School Improvement Plan, and also recorded with the district. Teachers are encouraged to seek development opportunities for on-going growth and knowledge that will continue to increase student achievement.

6. School Leadership:

One of our recently retired principal's roles was that of instructional leader of the school. Penny Jones applied her communication skills, collaboration skills and community outreach to shape a vision of success for all our students. She worked diligently to make the shared vision a reality.

Mrs. Jones appointed a Leadership Team composed of the assistant principal, instructional facilitator/academic data representative, counselor, resource teacher, and ESL/reading teacher to assist her by attending various district level meetings, analyzing student achievement data, and evaluating progress. The Leadership Team communicated to the staff which critical adjustments would be needed to raise the academic achievement of all students.

- Our AYP Plan for Success was created. Each grade level completed a portion of the plan and selected students for intervention based on criteria and targets for success. Grade level teachers met with Mrs. Jones

and specified teachers to form flexible groups for re-teaching, as well as enrichment groups for students mastering the content standards.

- Before, during, and after school opportunities for students in grades three through six, who did not make adequate yearly progress in reading, writing and/or mathematics were implemented, such as: Math Munchers, Writers' Lunch Bunch, and Gear It Up.

Our EXCELS Plus School Improvement Plan team was comprised of staff, parents and community members to monitor student achievement, diagnose, plan, and coordinate reflective adjustments.

Mrs. Jones' knowledge was invaluable when determining appropriate instructional methods and practices to best meet the needs of various types of learners during Student Assistance Team (S.A.T.) meetings, grade level and individual discussions. Our administrators monitored instruction through observations, looking for evidence of differentiation and offering constructive feedback.

Mrs. Jones ensured an effective learning environment through the selection, development, and management of the teachers and staff. She arranged for meaningful professional development. She involved parents and community in the educational process and encouraged participation in school activities. Consequently, student achievement improved with authentic instruction and collective teamwork in which leadership and responsibility were shared.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: CRT - STARS
 Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	98	92	92	82
% Advanced	46	64	44	33	29
Number of students tested	100	75	73	84	77
Percent of total students tested	96	100	99	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	97	90	89	79
% Advanced	42	61	42	29	25
Number of students tested	71	49	47	52	53
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	98	89	95	86
% Advanced	43	61	42	35	24
Number of students tested	51	32	28	24	16
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	94	82	80	74
% Advanced	44	50	34	22	27
Number of students tested	19	17	11	21	14
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	97	86	87	89
% Proficient plus % Advanced	32	59	40	24	23
Number of students tested	34	17	19	20	19

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Test: CRT-STARS

Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing

Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	79	73	75	74
% Advanced	56	65	34	43	32
Number of students tested	96	75	73	84	80
Percent of total students tested	100	99	98	99	97
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	75	71	71	74
% Advanced	55	62	29	38	27
Number of students tested	71	49	47	52	56
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	70	74	79	78
% Advanced	47	49	36	36	36
Number of students tested	51	32	28	24	17
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	58	25	59	56
% Advanced		44	7	27	27
Number of students tested	19	17	11	21	14
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	63	61	65	82
% Proficient plus % Advanced	35	42	10	21	26
Number of students tested	34	17	19	20	19

Notes:

#3 Subgroup data has been masked to protect the identity of students in the Advanced category.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: CRT - STARS

Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing

Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	99	93	92	88
% Advanced	86	83	55	53	64
Number of students tested	87	84	80	77	70
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	99	90	91	82
% Advanced	85	80	49	48	54
Number of students tested	59	61	54	58	42
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	93	94	82
% Advanced	94	80	55	52	57
Number of students tested	51	33	29	21	21
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	99	83	69	72
% Advanced	73	73	32	31	38
Number of students tested	18	14	19	11	12
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	82	88	67
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	76	35	36	36
Number of students tested	18	16	19	13	11

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: CRT-STARS

Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing

Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	94	80	75	79
% Advanced	56	65	49	40	46
Number of students tested	88	84	80	77	70
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	90	93
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	93	72	73	73
% Advanced	55	61	41	34	32
Number of students tested	60	61	54	58	42
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	92	79	79	69
% Advanced	41	64	46	44	29
Number of students tested	39	33	29	21	21
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	80	55	42	48
% Advanced	32	43	19	21	27
Number of students tested	19	14	19	11	12
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	59	64	43
% Proficient plus % Advanced	22	50	23	13	11
Number of students tested	18	16	19	13	11

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: CRT - STARS

Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing

Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	80	82	81
% Advanced	72	61	31	31	28
Number of students tested	83	87	83	71	62
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	97	79	76	74
% Advanced	66	56	27	28	19
Number of students tested	58	59	61	45	33
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	95	81	78	77
% Advanced	63	57	28	23	22
Number of students tested	41	33	28	28	13
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	94	67	72	
% Advanced	53	44	13	17	
Number of students tested	15	21	21	13	
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	90	65	73	
% Proficient plus % Advanced	65	42	10	14	
Number of students tested	17	12	13	16	

Notes:

Data from 2003/2004 was masked because there were less than 10 students.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Test: CRT - STARS

Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing

Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	91	73	67	63
% Advanced	39	56	32	28	20
Number of students tested	83	87	83	71	63
Percent of total students tested	100	99	98	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	90	70	59	57
% Advanced	34	51	25	17	13
Number of students tested	58	59	61	45	33
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	85	74	58	57
% Advanced	29	43	29	14	9
Number of students tested	41	33	28	28	13
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	85	41	34	33
% Advanced		38	15	7	7
Number of students tested	15	21	21	13	10
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	65	47	44	
% Proficient plus % Advanced	12	21	8	8	
Number of students tested	17	12	13	16	

Notes:

Data from SubGroup # 3 and # 4 has been masked to protect the identity of students in the Advanced category.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6 Test: CRT - STARS

Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing

Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	80	78	76
% Advanced	89	74	42	25	35
Number of students tested	81	85	69	64	76
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	1	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	0	100	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	95	77	72	70
% Advanced	87	70	35	15	30
Number of students tested	53	65	41	41	44
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	95	77	71	82
% Advanced	85	71	35	14	44
Number of students tested	34	33	27	13	14
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	95	53		24
% Advanced	75	68	12		5
Number of students tested	16	19	12		13
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	94	71		
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	55	27		
Number of students tested	11	16	18		

Notes:

Data from subgroups # 3 and # 4 was less than 10 students therefore were not reported.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6

Test: CRT - STARS

Edition/Publication Year: Ongoing

Publisher: Omaha Public Schools

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	92	82	66	72
% Advanced	58	59	50	24	29
Number of students tested	81	85	69	64	77
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	98	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	1				
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	91	77	58	65
% Advanced	51	53	42	17	21
Number of students tested	53	65	41	41	44
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	95	78	58	74
% Advanced	47	62	45	10	33
Number of students tested	34	33	27	13	14
3. (specify subgroup): Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	80	56		21
% Advanced	19	43	17		5
Number of students tested	16	19	12		13
4. (specify subgroup): English Language Learners					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	92	74		
% Proficient plus % Advanced		54	33		
Number of students tested	11	16	18		

Notes:

#3 and #4 subgroup data has been masked to protect the identity of students in the Advanced category.

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject: Mathematics
 Grade: 2 California Achievement Test
 Edition/Publication Year: 5/1991
 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled score ___ Percentiles X

SCHOOL SCORES					
	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing month - March					
Total Score	84	84	80	78	76
Number of students tested	94	85	68	77	72
Percent of total students tested	100	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. Students eligible for free/reduced lunch					
Total Score	78	84	80	71	72
Number of students tested	63	58	46	50	44
2. Hispanic					
Total Score	76	80	74	78	69
Number of students tested	50	38	27	23	22
3. Special Education students					
Total Score	80	69	63	76	61
Number of students tested	16	20	12	4	14
4. English Language Learners					
Total Score	74	78	70	62	70
Number of students tested	36	32	16	20	21

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

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	50%tile	50%tile	50%tile	50%tile	50%tile
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%

Subject: Reading
 Grade: 2 California Achievement Test
 Edition/Publication Year: 5/1991
 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled score ___ Percentiles X

SCHOOL SCORES					
	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing month - March					
Total Score	58	56	54	48	52
Number of students tested	94	85	68	78	72
Percent of total students tested	100	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. Students eligible for free/reduced lunch					
Total Score	49	53	51	42	47
Number of students tested	63	58	46	51	44
2. Hispanic					
Total Score	45	41	43	43	41
Number of students tested	50	38	27	24	22
3. Special Education students					
Total Score	55	49	26	29	34
Number of students tested	16	20	12	4	14
4. English Language Learners					
Total Score	39	38	34	29	34
Number of students tested	36	32	16	21	21

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

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	50%tile	50%tile	50%tile	50%tile	50%tile
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%