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

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

Name of Principal: Mr. Russ Painter

Official School Name: Manchester Gate

School Mailing Address:
2307 East Dakota Avenue
Fresno, CA 93726-4001

County: Fresno State School Code Number*: 10 62166 6103832

Telephone: (559) 248-7220 Fax: (559) 222-8854

Web site/URL: http://www.fresno.k12.ca.us/schools/manchester.html E-mail: Russell.painter@fresnounified.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.

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Mr. Michael Hanson

District Name: Fresno Unified Tel: (559) 457-3000

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.

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Valerie Davis

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.

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

**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:

67	Elementary schools
15	Middle schools
0	Junior high schools
8	High schools
19	Other
109	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 8284

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 8117

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

   [X] 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. 17 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

   0 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	0	0	**7**	0	0	0
K	0	0	0	**8**	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	**9**	0	0	0
2	35	26	61	**10**	0	0	0
3	49	48	97	**11**	0	0	0
4	81	86	167	**12**	0	0	0
5	104	93	197	**Other**	0	0	0
6	94	106	200				
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					722

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
11 %	Asian
8 %	Black or African American
33 %	Hispanic or Latino
3 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
45 %	White
0 %	Two or more races
100 %	**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: 2 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	2
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	10
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	12
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	739
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.016
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	1.624

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

Total number limited English proficient 2

Number of languages represented: 2
Specify languages:

Spanish and Hmong

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 34 %

Total number students who qualify: 247

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: 1 %

Total Number of Students Served: 10

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

0	Autism	0	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	3	Other Health Impaired
0	Deaf-Blindness	0	Specific Learning Disability
1	Emotional Disturbance	8	Speech or Language Impairment
0	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
0	Mental Retardation	2	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0	Multiple Disabilities	0	Developmentally Delayed

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

	Number of Staff	
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	2	0
Classroom teachers	27	2
Special resource teachers/specialists	0	0
Paraprofessionals	0	12
Support staff	5	3
Total number	34	17

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 **27 :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	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%
Daily teacher attendance	94%	95%	93%	94%	94%
Teacher turnover rate	8%	15%	4%	0%	0%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

At the end of the 2006 school year 5 teachers retired and 1 teacher was promoted to an administrative position. In June of 2008 3 teachers retired after long careers at our school.

Our district calculated daily teacher attendance that did not include attendance at inservice opportunities. Teachers did participate in a wide variety of inservice opportunities or were presenters at inservice opportunities that took them out of their classrooms.

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	0	%
Enrolled in a community college	0	%
Enrolled in vocational training	0	%
Found employment	0	%
Military service	0	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0	%
Unknown	0	%
Total	**100**	%

PART III - SUMMARY

"Children are our most valuable resource. It is our objective to motivate and challenge these children to strive toward their full potential; therefore, we will develop the curriculum and environment to meet the special needs of our gifted childrens' social, emotion and physical development."

Manchester GATE Elementary School is located in the Fresno Unified School District in the San Joaquin Valley, the agricultural heart of California. Manchester is a magnet school that attracts students in grades 2-6 from each of the 67 elementary schools in the district. The magnet program is designed to meet the special needs of students eligible for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)--students like Arena, Annie and Fernando.

Arena's family lives in a huge apartment complex dominated by Southeast Asian gangs. Her family sees education as Arena's ticket to a better life. Ever since she started kindergarten at her neighborhood school, Arena has been a standout in class. Even though English is not her native language, Arena learned quickly and soon was ahead of all her classmates, so the teacher at the neighborhood school had her spending much of her time helping fellow students struggling with English. Arena liked helping the other kids, but sometimes it was pretty boring. Annie's was a different story. She had grown to hate school in kindergarten and first grade. Her teachers kept giving her worksheets that were boring and asked her the answers to questions that she already knew. The worst thing was the teasing, but Annie decided that maybe if she got in trouble, the other children would not think she was such a "nerd" after all. Fernando was another case. In his neighborhood, smart was not cool. You couldn't get good grades; if you did, your friends wouldn't talk to you, or worse. Play dumb and no one would know the difference. Last spring, Arena, Annie and Fernando got a letter inviting them to visit Manchester GATE School. When they each made the decision to give Manchester a try, they discovered a whole new kind of school.

Manchester GATE School, now in its 28th year, offers gifted learners the right to participate in an appropriate academic environment. Students thrive in a vast range of accelerated learning opportunities. Their critical and creative thinking skills are cultivated as teachers encourage them to discuss, debate and question. The standards-based curriculum is tied to a teaching-learning-assessment cycle, in which teachers use feedback to inform, plan, and assess instruction. The underlying goal is to provide opportunities for students to construct meaning and then apply what they are learning in meaningful, real life situations. As a result, Manchester has been named a California Distinguished School three times--1987, 1995 and 2000, and in 2001 it was named as a National Blue Ribbon School.

Many parents feel that one of the best things about Manchester is that the school reflects the diversity of the community. Approximately 38% participate in the free or reduced lunch program. Fourteen of our seventeen English Learners have reclassifications pending while approximately 100 students have already been reclassified. The student attendance rate of 97% is the best in the district. A key to the overwhelming success of the Manchester magnet program has been the dynamic, energetic staff. Their commitment and expertise, and the support and involvement of our entire school community have contributed to the highly effective program at Manchester GATE School. The staff is continually striving to refine classroom instructional practices, enhance student engagement, and to "connect" with our community, better meeting the needs of students at Manchester GATE School.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

Manchester GATE School has a rich tradition of excellent academic achievement. The assessment results from the five-year period of 2003-2008 continue to tell a very positive story. In each of these years achievement levels have placed our school among the top schools in California. Based on data our school has been designated as a Title 1 High Achieving School for four consecutive years. In fact, in 2007 we were named one of two state recipients of a Title 1 National Distinguished School Award. These awards are all based on the academic achievement of our students.

School-wide, our students' performance on state summative assessment tests in English Language Arts (California Standards Test or CST) continues to show improvement. In 2008, 95% of our students were "proficient" and 69% were "advanced". When data from our subgroups and grade levels are analyzed they reveal some great trends. Our socioeconomic subgroup showed 91% scoring advanced. Last year 100% of our 2nd graders were proficient while 96% were advanced. In 3rd grade, 93% of our students were proficient with 63% scoring at an advanced level. In the 4th grade 96% were proficient while 80% scored advanced. 5th and 6th grade show the same trends with over 90% scoring proficient while over 60% were advanced. All of our significant subgroups—socioeconomic disadvantaged, Hispanic and White students all reflect the same achievement levels. In fact, regardless of the number of students in a subgroup, the data story is the same—a high percentage of students are proficient and 50-75% are advanced. All grade levels show growth in the number of students scoring proficient or advanced between 2003 and 2008. At each grade level the number of students scoring in the highest band has also increased—from 57% to 96% in grade 2 and from 38 to 63% in grade 3.

In mathematics the story is equally impressive. 95% of our students school-wide scored at proficient or advanced levels with 68% scoring advanced. Subgroup data reveals more impressive information. Our socio-economically disadvantaged subgroup had 93% scoring proficient while 58% scored advanced. 100% of our 2nd graders scored proficient with 91% scoring advanced. 3rd grade had 99% proficient with 89% advanced. 4th grade had 95% proficient and 70% advanced! 5th and 6th grade showed similar achievement—over 90% proficient and close to 60% advanced. All of our significant subgroups reflected the same type of achievement levels and all showed growth over the five-year period analyzed.

In California 5th graders are also assessed in Science. Our 5th graders have increased their proficiency levels from 79% in 2005 to a whopping 96% in 2008. 52% scored advanced.

These results speak well for the curricular program that is implemented for our students that features writing across the curriculum, a differentiated curriculum, and effective instructional practices.

Manchester GATE School participates in the California STAR Testing program each spring. Assessments in English-Language Arts, Mathematics and Science are used to determine performance levels that include advanced and proficient to designate mastery and basic, below basic and far below basic to indicate students with gaps in their learning. These results are used to determine an overall "Academic Performance Index" for each school with 1000 being the highest score possible and 800 being the target. Over the last five years Manchester's API has increased from 942 to 977. Our API of 977 was one of the top 15 scores among all elementary schools in California!!

Test data is one window we look through to determine our program's effectiveness. Information about California's Accountability Progress Reporting can be found at cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ar/. Information about the statewide testing system can be found at cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

A cornerstone of our system is data and its analysis. The Fresno Unified School District provides the school site with a variety of data, such as results from the California Standards Testing (CST) and other STAR testing data. Our district's Assessment Information System (AIS) enables staff to review benchmark and summative data to analyze our school program's strengths and weaknesses. It also enables teachers to do the same type of analysis for their own classroom program in mathematics and language arts. Reports for each teacher help assess student strengths and weaknesses and to monitor student progress toward meeting standards. This helps teachers map their curriculum and instructional emphasis for the year. For example, in reading we emphasize direct instruction toward vocabulary development and interpretive comprehension skills since they are relative weaknesses for many of our students. We also receive disaggregated scores that help us review the impact of our curricular program on various groups and specific targets that comprise our student body. These reports are reviewed periodically for any instructional implications. Students are selected for our Intervention Program in part based on these test scores and any deficiencies or gaps they reveal. By studying these results, Manchester's teachers can improve the alignment between their teaching and the rigorous state standards to eliminate any gaps in student learning.

The tri-annual administration of "benchmark" assessments provides another tool. Teachers are provided with timelines that assist them in planning the pacing of their instruction. Then, periodically, they administer a version of the benchmark test comprised of items that assess the standards covered during that period. Results are reported for each student, and for each teacher and grade level by standard and/or substandard tested. By using benchmark data teachers are able to locate general weakness and strengths, and to align the curriculum and their instruction.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Manchester School communicates a variety of assessment results to parents. Results of the annual STAR testing are mailed directly to parents within two weeks of the release of this information. A discussion of these results is also part of the parent-teacher conference held at the end of the first quarter. This year 99% of all of our parents attended their parent conference. The purpose of these communications is to inform parents about the achievement levels of their children when measured against state standards. Benchmark test results in math and English language arts are also shared with parents in order to inform them of their child's progress. Teachers also send home either weekly or bi-monthly reports for each student so that parents can monitor progress in meeting grade-level standards. Many teachers are posting important classroom information on their webpage or sending home narrative letters each week to help their parents stay informed. By clear, regular two-way communication with our stakeholders we facilitate their partnership with us in monitoring the progress of their children. Assessment results also inform teachers as they plan curriculum and instructional strategies.

Our state, district and school place the highest priority on students demonstrating mastery of grade level standards. Teachers discuss effective methodology. Grade level standards are posted and parents are made aware of things that their child should know and be able to do at their grade level. All the students at Manchester School receive a curriculum that is fully aligned with the most current frameworks and state standards. Manchester's curriculum focuses on the mastery of traditional academic skills through direct instruction within the context of meaningful, student-centered learning that utilizes higher-level thinking skills.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Manchester has maintained a high-profile in terms of sharing with other schools and teachers. Many of our teachers have served as mentor teachers in our district where they share their expertise and best practices. Our teachers serve on district-level adoption committees and many serve as presenters at conferences and other schools in the areas of authentic assessment, literacy, math, science, physical education and technology. Still others are involved in the development of curriculum and pacing guides for our district. Presenting at parent

workshops, involvement with professional organizations (GATE Teachers, California Association for the Gifted, Computer Using Educators, National Science Teachers Association) and advisory committees give additional opportunities for teachers to demonstrate and share their instructional leadership and share our success.

Manchester's staff welcomes site visits. We have had teachers from San Francisco, Clovis, San Luis Obispo and of course from Fresno Unified visit our school to observe teaching and discuss best practices. Local supervisors of student teachers often bring their student teachers to Manchester to observe high quality teaching. This year we have had ten teachers serve as master teachers for student teachers from Fresno State University. We also have five teachers who are regularly used as presenters at seminars for student teachers at Fresno State University.

Our local Principal's Learning Team has also visited our campus to observe classrooms as part of their training. Later this year, another cohort of 30 Principals will visit our classrooms as part of our district's "Skillful Leader" project. This will help principal's better implement effective instructional practices on their sites.

Finally, our school's website is used by teachers from all over our district and the country as a resource for their own classrooms. This website is maintained by our Technology teacher on a regular basis.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

The students at Manchester School participate in a thinking, meaning-centered curriculum that is aligned with the most current frameworks, and rigorous state standards. Manchester's curriculum focuses on the mastery of traditional academic skills through direct instruction within the context of meaningful, student-centered learning that utilizes higher level thinking skills. Students develop personally and intellectually through a balanced and comprehensive curriculum that recognizes the gifted students' needs for challenging experiences and meets the needs through a differentiated curriculum featuring elements of depth, complexity, novelty, and acceleration.

At Manchester GATE School, students are prepared for the workplace and for higher education by acquiring marketable skills, such as word processing, the ability to use spreadsheets and databases, and facility with Internet research. They write across the curriculum and meet high standards of fluency, accuracy and versatility in writing. Our curriculum is structured so students learn to work cooperatively and collaboratively on short term and long-term projects. They learn to ask important questions, use logic and multiple problem solving strategies, meet deadlines on time, and to achieve the standard of excellence on a given task.

Manchester GATE School features a Language Arts program that has strong components in reading, writing, speaking and listening. We utilize an effective literature-based program wherein students first refine their literacy skills while using the Houghton-Mifflin Reading Program, and then their interpretive comprehension skills through the reading of novels. The use of good literature allows teachers to utilize a thematic approach to meet and exceed state standards. Teachers teach the writing process including pre-writing, writing, editing and rewriting. Our students are given a variety of opportunities to practice the conventions as they write across the curriculum.

Manchester has maintained a mathematics curriculum that is rigorous in all strands. State-adopted instructional materials form the core of our Mathematics program. The use of ongoing investigations, math journals, projects, and a hands-on approach to learning and mastering concepts and skills is deeply embedded in the course of study. It is not unusual to see our students building robots from self-made blueprints, or to see second graders studying mass by "growing Gaters". In the third grade students study measurement by having a "snail Olympics" with pet snails, while sixth graders participate in "Boxville" where they learn economic concepts by becoming merchants for a week. Fifth graders learn about fractions and decimal conversions, by making accurate circle graphs as part of a simulation. Fourth graders culminate a study of geometry concepts by building a futuristic city in "Polyhedraville".

Social Science is an area where we differentiate the curriculum to provide a more stimulating and challenging curriculum--one where our students can utilize accelerated resources to study things in more depth and with more complexity. This is an area where our teachers also utilize quality literature to assist students in their understanding of a historical period.

In science, our goal is to enable students to construct meaning in earth, physical and life sciences as they utilize scientific processes. Students and teachers also benefit from the expertise of the Science Lab teacher who provides hands-on activities to support and augment classroom concept acquisition. All students access both the Science Lab and the Computer Lab on a weekly basis.

The arts play a valuable role in the enriched curriculum at Manchester. Students in all grade levels have opportunities to participate in an arts education curriculum including elements of music--both instrumental and vocal--theatre, and the visual arts. The consistent use of Visual and Performing Arts standards continues to grow, and many teachers are utilizing these standards to enhance curriculum integration.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

Our technology program has been used a great deal to support and enhance teaching and learning, to differentiate learning experiences for our gifted students, and to motivate and challenge them. Our web site (http://www.fresno.k12.ca.us/schools/s031) demonstrates the many ways that the use of technology enhances the curriculum and students' ability to meet standards. Second graders learn about skeletons using interactive sites. Third graders master standards related to telling time or making change. Fourth graders access information about missions and the people and events of that time period. Fifth graders track hurricanes at the National Weather Service site as part of their study of weather. Sixth graders see plate tectonics illustrated. All grade levels use web sites designed by textbook publishers to give interactive reinforcement of math and ELA standards. Students extend their learning time by accessing the school's website from home.

Our Technology Plan outlines a scope and sequence of skills based on the ISTE National Educational Technology Standards for students. All students are trained in keyboarding, word processing, the use of spreadsheets, and presentation/graphics tools in the Technology Lab. The availability of on-line resources has challenged the staff to increase instruction to navigate the World Wide Web and to evaluate sources to make it a more efficient tool. Students now learn how to use search engines, web indices and other curricular support material on-line. A recent development in our staff development has been the schoolwide use by teachers of new laptops, document cameras and data projectors to further enhance the attainment of grade level standards. These new electronic resources allow students to engage as they use electronic resources provided by publishers and the internet where appropriate and to help create a learning environment that is consistent with the 21st century.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

The unique academic, social and emotional needs of gifted students form the basis for our program at Manchester School. The staff uses a wide-range of instructional methods to meet the learning needs of all students. Much of the initial instruction takes place in a direct-teaching model using a variety of grouping strategies.

Initially, academic support is provided by using grade level content and performance standards as a foundation and then incorporating the components of a differentiated curriculum--depth, complexity, novelty and acceleration—to meet their academic needs. Among many characteristics of the gifted learner are four that have implications for our instructional approach. •Students have heightened powers of concentration. This allows the Manchester teacher to focus on in-depth work in areas of interest and to challenge the student using flexible scheduling for curriculum work. •Students have the ability to make connections and establish relationships among disparate data. This allows our teachers to utilize integrated curriculum incorporating the humanities and the arts. •Gifted learners have the ability to memorize rapidly and well. This allows our teachers to accelerate the presentation of basic skills and concepts, thereby providing time to study curricular areas in depth. •Our students also have multiple interests and a broad information base. Teachers therefore provide an opportunity for students to select areas of interest to study. Teachers accelerate the curriculum where appropriate. Students study topics in depth to help them construct meaning for future application in solving problems. Students are allowed and encouraged to study more complex topics to add to their knowledge base and see different points of view.

Formal interventions are provided to students based on periodic benchmark data. The Title 1 program provides interventions to enable all students to successfully access the accelerated curriculum. Our English Learner population also receives sheltered instruction as well as targeted English Language Development instruction when necessary.

5. **Professional Development:**

Manchester's teachers are avid, enthusiastic learners who bring a high degree of professionalism to work each day. All teachers are highly qualified based on NCLB criteria. Many have served as mentor teachers. Each year the teachers and leadership team collaborate to determine focus areas of the curriculum for professional development based on the needs of the students and the skills of the staff. These needs are determined through a review of summative data, benchmark results, classroom work as well as district initiatives.

Over the past several years, with the increased emphasis on rigorous performance and content standards, we have targeted areas that will help our high-achieving students such as strategies for vocabulary development and for comprehension of narrative and expository text.

Manchester's teachers have become prolific readers of professional development resources—an important component of our professional development. Among the titles studied by the entire staff recently are:

- •Mosaic of Thought (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997)
- •A Framework for Understanding Poverty (Payne, 1996)
- •Classroom Instruction That Works (Marzano, 2001)
- •Strategies that Work (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000)
- •How to Teach So Students Remember (Sprenger, 2005)

Most recently our staff is focusing on increasing student engagement by studying "Tools of Engagement" by Eric Jensen.

We have also invested a substantial amount of professional development time in technology. Teachers have learned how to integrate technology into their classroom curriculum by discovering websites that can extend learning opportunities. They are becoming adept at power point presentations and in using digital presentation skills. Increased student engagement is a visible example of the impact of the infusion of technology into the curriculum.

Our staff members take advantage of collaborative opportunities that are provided regularly to meet in grade level professional communities to discuss assessments, design lessons and plan. Teacher collaboration is encouraged so that faculty members share and develop their expertise.

6. **School Leadership:**

The leadership style of the principal is one of high visibility and easy accessibility to students, staff and parents. The Principal and Vice-Principal are highly involved with students and able to address most by their name. Always "filtering" information related to the school program, the principal helps establish the instructional emphasis for the school and keeps goals in focus. Each teacher is an instructional leader within their classroom while at the same time being an integral part of our schoolwide professional learning community. Manchester is a supportive, energy-filled location of staff members with a "can-do" attitude.

The principal and the leadership team share instructional leadership. The principal works with the leadership team and all stakeholders to determine the direction and goals for the school. They also help chart the course for necessary staff development in light of school needs and district initiatives.

The school leadership team believes it is important to share the vision and mission of the school. Before the school year even begins the principal meets with groups of staff to discuss issues of importance. During the first staff meeting of the school year, the principal takes time to "chart the course" to help bring the school's achievement goals into focus. He also shares this "course" with parents at our annual Back to School Night.

The Principal facilitates regular 'action planning" where teachers review data to determine academic focus areas for improved student achievement. "Action planning" is part of our "cycle of continuous improvement" where we periodically analyze progress toward our learning goals and look for gaps in achievement and areas that we need to emphasize in our instructional program.

By sharing information and facilitating these periodic improvement processes, the principal moves the Manchester School community forward as a "professional learning community".

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	100	98	97	93	95
Advanced	91	80	68	61	68
Number of students tested	45	59	59	57	60
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced		96	92	85	100
Advanced		80	48	35	59
Number of students tested		27	25	20	22
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient + Advanced		95	91	91	100
Advanced		65	52	38	36
Number of students tested		20	21	21	11
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced		100			
Advanced		90			
Number of students tested		10			
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	100	100	100	100	92
Advanced	90	91	88	86	70
Number of students tested	31	23	25	22	34

Notes:

The Asian subgroup had fewer than 10 students in the years where no data is shown.

Subject: Reading Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	100	97	97	91	90
Advanced	96	83	66	60	57
Number of students tested	45	59	59	57	60
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced		93	92	80	86
Advanced		74	52	35	41
Number of students tested		27	25	20	22
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient +Advanced		100	95	81	91
Advanced		80	57	48	46
Number of students tested		20	21	21	11
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient +Advanced		90			
Advanced		80			
Number of students tested		10			
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	100	100	100	100	89
Advanced	97	91	77	80	67
Number of students tested	31	23	22	25	37

Notes:

Subgroups had fewer than 10 students where no data is posted.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	99	98	97	98	98
Advanced	89	80	75	68	78
Number of students tested	120	119	114	120	118
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	100	98	98	96	93
Advanced	83	24	68	54	69
Number of students tested	41	63	50	48	45
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient + Advanced	100	98	95	94	94
Advanced	85	75	65	45	62
Number of students tested	39	44	43	31	34
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	100	100	100	100	100
Advanced	85	72	93	69	73
Number of students tested	13	18	14	13	22
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	98	100	100	98	98
Advanced	95	88	85	80	90
Number of students tested	60	43	40	64	52

Notes:

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	93	84	87	80	85
Advanced	63	45	45	33	38
Number of students tested	120	119	114	120	118
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	90	76	78	75	73
Advanced	51	24	22	19	20
Number of students tested	41	63	50	48	45
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient + Advanced	95	77	77	71	79
Advanced	59	31	37	23	24
Number of students tested	39	44	43	31	34
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	85	78	86	62	77
Advanced	46	22	36	23	27
Number of students tested	13	18	14	13	22
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	97	95	98	88	92
Advanced	75	70	68	42	58
Number of students tested	60	43	40	64	52

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	95	95	96	96	90
Advanced	70	60	67	76	55
Number of students tested	167	164	164	161	163
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	93	91	94	93	87
Advanced	58	48	52	66	43
Number of students tested	74	81	66	74	79
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient + Advanced	95	90	89	92	90
Advanced	66	47	56	72	45
Number of students tested	56	62	55	50	51
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	96	92	100	100	80
Advanced	70	57	78	71	50
Number of students tested	24	26	18	28	26
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	97	100	99	97	92
Advanced	78	80	73	80	68
Number of students tested	69	54	73	69	64

Notes:

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	96	84	95	95	90
Advanced	80	74	72	76	62
Number of students tested	167	164	164	161	163
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	93	88	89	91	84
Advanced	66	61	55	60	49
Number of students tested	74	81	66	74	79
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient + Advanced	98	92	93	96	86
Advanced	73	68	55	66	53
Number of students tested	56	62	55	50	51
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	100	92	94	89	81
Advanced	88	65	78	68	42
Number of students tested	24	26	18	28	26
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	99	100	97	97	95
Advanced	90	93	82	90	75
Number of students tested	69	54	73	69	64

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	92	92	97	96	90
Advanced	57	50	65	57	40
Number of students tested	192	199	187	188	192
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	88	91	94	94	88
Advanced	45	39	56	45	33
Number of students tested	83	91	86	82	86
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient + Advanced	87	93	95	97	87
Advanced	38	43	53	53	28
Number of students tested	71	70	60	58	75
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	96	85	100	97	96
Advanced	71	44	78	45	50
Number of students tested	28	27	32	35	28
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	100	94	100	95	93
Advanced	78	59	72	68	48
Number of students tested	67	81	76	75	73

Notes:

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient +Advanced	93	94	91	93	90
Advanced	64	57	59	60	57
Number of students tested	192	199	187	188	192
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	88	89	84	84	81
Advanced	47	44	44	45	38
Number of students tested	83	91	86	82	86
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanics					
Proficient + Advanced	92	91	87	91	87
Advanced	51	46	55	53	44
Number of students tested	71	70	60	58	75
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	93	89	91	80	86
Advanced	54	44	41	40	50
Number of students tested	28	27	32	35	28
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	99	96	99	99	97
Advanced	91	73	82	75	77
Number of students tested	67	81	76	75	73

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	95	95	95	95	95
Advanced	58	55	57	49	54
Number of students tested	201	195	196	191	191
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	93	91	94	90	93
Advanced	54	43	50	39	50
Number of students tested	83	81	92	79	90
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanic					
Proficient + Advanced	93	93	91	95	94
Advanced	55	50	46	44	51
Number of students tested	73	67	77	61	63
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	96	100	100	86	100
Advanced	54	73	77	46	58
Number of students tested	26	37	30	35	33
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	96	99	99	97	93
Advanced	63	63	66	52	57
Number of students tested	82	75	73	73	83

Notes:

Subject: Reading Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Annually Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient + Advanced	96	94	90	93	90
Advanced	62	62	58	56	50
Number of students tested	201	195	196	191	191
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient + Advanced	92	89	83	87	83
Advanced	48	49	40	47	30
Number of students tested	83	81	92	69	90
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): Hispanics					
Proficient + Advanced	92	92	87	95	87
Advanced	48	43	47	54	41
Number of students tested	73	61	77	61	75
3. (specify subgroup): Asian					
Proficient + Advanced	92	95	90	83	86
Advanced	46	62	50	40	36
Number of students tested	26	37	30	35	28
4. (specify subgroup): White					
Proficient + Advanced	100	99	96	95	97
Advanced	82	83	75	60	60
Number of students tested	82	75	73	73	83

Notes: