

U.S. Department of Education
2015 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Mrs. Janet Gengozian

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Manchester Gate Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 2305 East Dakota Avenue

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Fresno State CA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 93726-4001

County Fresno County State School Code Number* 10 62166 6103832

Telephone 559-248-7220 Fax 559-222-8854

Web site/URL https://www.fresnou.org/schools/manchester E-mail janet.gengozian@fresnounified.org

Facebook Page
https://www.facebook.com/ManchesterGATER
Twitter Handle S Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

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

Date _____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Mr. Michael Hanson, N/A E-mail: Michael.Hanson@fresnounified.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Fresno Unified School District 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 it is accurate.

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mr. Cal Johnson, N/A
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

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

Date _____

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

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

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below, concerning the school’s eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education and National Blue Ribbon Schools requirements, are true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2014-2015 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2009 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school’s application and/or rescind a school’s award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 64 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 17 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 15 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 96 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
 - Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - Suburban
 - Small city or town in a rural area
 - Rural
3. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 35 | 40 | 75 |
| 3 | 60 | 63 | 123 |
| 4 | 84 | 74 | 158 |
| 5 | 106 | 89 | 195 |
| 6 | 104 | 88 | 192 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Students | 389 | 354 | 743 |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 11 % Asian
 - 4 % Black or African American
 - 42 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 42 % White
 - 0 % Two or more races
 - 100 % Total**

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

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2013 - 2014 year: 3%

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

| Steps For Determining Mobility Rate | Answer |
|--|---------------|
| (1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year | 0 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year | 23 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 23 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 759 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.030 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 3 |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
4 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 2
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish, Khmer(Cambodian)
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 100 %
 Total number students who qualify: 349

Information for Public Schools Only - Data Provided by the State

The state has reported that 47 % of the students enrolled in this school are from low income or disadvantaged families based on the following subgroup(s): Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals

9. Students receiving special education services: 3 %
21 Total number of students served

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

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>2</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>0</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>3</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>15</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>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

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

| | Number of Staff |
|---|------------------------|
| Administrators | 2 |
| Classroom teachers | 27 |
| Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc. | 3 |
| Paraprofessionals | 8 |
| Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 0 |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 29:1

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

| Required Information | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 97% | 97% | 97% | 97% | 97% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2014

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

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.

Yes X No

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award. 2009

15. Please summarize your school mission in 25 words or less: To motivate and challenge by developing the curriculum and environment to meet the special needs of our gifted students' social, emotional, academic, and physical development.

PART III – SUMMARY

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 64 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 could not get good grades; if you did, your friends would not 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 34th year, offers gifted learners the right to participate in an appropriate academic environment. Program participants are selected by lottery from a list of students that are identified as gifted using the district's criteria which includes assessment results and a district given GATE test which is a nationally-normed test of reasoning abilities. 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 cycle of continuous improvement, in which teachers use feedback to inform, plan, and assess instruction. The teachers also meet weekly as a collaborative grade level to plan assignments, projects, and assessments related to the Common Core State Standards. 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 five times--1987, 1995, 2000, 2008 and 2014. In 2001 and again in 2009 it was named as a National Blue Ribbon School. These recognitions, have validated the teachers' approach to curriculum and instruction--using literature and writing to implement the Common Core State Standards effectively over the last few years with an integrated approach to curriculum development. In a program-improvement district, Manchester has been a bright spot, and these recognitions have discouraged those who would like to eliminate this program. Rather, our teachers have become models for the implementation of "best practices".

Many parents feel that one of the strengths of Manchester is that the school reflects the diversity of the community. Approximately 47% of the students qualify for the free or reduced lunch program. Approximately 105 FEP students have already been reclassified. The student attendance rate of 97% is the best in the district.

Students also have the opportunity to participate in many co-curricular activities where they have the opportunity to develop and use new skills. These include a top-notch Music program that has band, orchestra and vocal components; intramural and interscholastic athletic teams in flag football, volleyball, basketball, softball, cross-country and track & field that engage many students. These teams have won numerous league and district championships. The chess program gives learners of all levels the chance to compete in regional tournaments. Science Olympiad, the Spelling Bee and several dramatic productions, including Shakespeare, give additional chances for students to develop socially and academically.

Manchester GATE School is truly a special place for students; one that gives them an opportunity to grow and develop their potential.

PART IV – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Core Curriculum:

To assist students in meeting the Common Core State Standards and to help eliminate achievement gaps, teachers use grade level content and performance standards as the foundation and then incorporate the components of a differentiated curriculum--depth, complexity, novelty and acceleration. Students develop personally and intellectually through an integrated, comprehensive curriculum that recognizes the gifted students' needs for challenging experiences.

Our school's Language Arts program has strong components in reading, writing, speaking and listening. We utilize an effective literature-based program wherein students utilize basal materials to first refine their skills, and then develop their interpretive comprehension skills through the reading of novels. Whether it is an author study--Eric Carle (second grade), Christopher Van Allsburg (4th grade) or Lawrence Yep (6th grade), or a novel study--Island of the Blue Dolphins (fourth grade), Charlotte's Web (third Grade), Light in the Forest (fifth grade), or Book Thief (sixth grade), the use of good literature allows teachers to utilize an integrated, thematic approach to meet and exceed state standards. Teachers have also implemented strategies based on research and recent staff development study to assist students in improving comprehension by accessing their schema, developing vocabulary, developing their questioning skills, and helping them infer, analyze, and synthesize while reading.

Teachers teach the writing process in informational, narrative and opinion/argument genres called for in the anchor writing standards of the Common Core. Our students are given a variety of opportunities to practice the conventions as they write across the curriculum in order to share their thinking and learning. In this way we not only strengthen and give purpose to our Language Arts program, but we also strengthen students' involvement with other curricular areas. For example Social Studies students in grades 5 and 6 utilize primary source documents as part of document-based question units (DBQ) that develop research, analysis, and writing skills.

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 structured lesson design, math journals, projects, and a hands-on approach to learning and mastering mathematical practices is deeply embedded in the course of study. It is not unusual to see our students solving real-life problems by applying their skills; second graders study mass by "growing Gaters", third grade students study measurement by having a "snail Olympics" with pet snails, while sixth graders participate in International Boxville where they learn economic concepts by becoming merchants for a week. Fifth and sixth graders learn about fractions and decimal conversions while studying the stock market while sixth graders make scaled blueprints for a dwelling.

In science, our goal is to enable our students to construct meaning in earth, physical and life sciences as they utilize scientific processes to develop their "STEM" skills. You might see fourth graders studying electrical circuits by building circuit boards or fifth graders studying body systems or learning the periodic table. While attending an outdoor camp, sixth graders study the environment and geology concepts. Third graders study habitats and environments by studying goldfish and crayfish, while 2nd graders identify characteristics of river plants by bringing samples into their classrooms.

Our social science curriculum follows the scope and sequence outlined in the California Social Science Framework and helps students meet Common Core literacy standards as well. Again, this 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 concepts in more depth and with more complexity. Teachers utilize quality literature to assist students in their understanding of an historical period. By utilizing research skills and writing in-depth reports, students apply skills learned in other curricular areas.

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 a 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.

2. Other Curriculum Areas:

Other curricular areas give Manchester's students a chance to explore areas of interest and give them a plethora of opportunities to apply skills and knowledge they have learned in the core-curriculum.

Our technology program has been used a great deal to enhance teaching and learning, to differentiate learning experiences for our gifted students, and to motivate and challenge them. Our web site (<https://www.fresnou.org/schools/manchester>) demonstrates the many ways that the use of technology enhances the curriculum and students' ability to meet standards. Second graders learn about U.S. Presidents using interactive sites. Third graders master standards related to telling time or making change. Fourth graders create powerpoint presentations about rocks and minerals. Fifth graders track hurricanes at the National Weather Service site. Sixth graders see plate tectonics illustrated. Students extend their learning time by accessing the school's website from home. Some of our teachers are also utilizing student "blogs" for writing and responding to literature and to have on-line response groups.

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 on how to navigate the internet safely, and how to evaluate sources. Students now learn how to use search engines, web indices and other curricular support material on-line. On-line resources are also used for vocabulary development and to meet individual academic needs.

The Arts also play a valuable role in the curriculum of our school. Students in all grade levels in our school have opportunities to participate in an arts education curriculum including elements of music--both instrumental and vocal--theater, dance 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. Our acclaimed instrumental music program that involves about 450 students in band and orchestra, and our itinerant art teacher, also help students meet standards in this area. These programs inspire our children and give them another outlet for their abilities. Many teachers utilize Disciplined Based Art Education (DBAE) or Picturing Writing which enhance writing skills through artistic representation. The drawing of colonial self-portraits teach fifth graders mathematical proportion and the history of limners, as well as the art processes of drawing and watercolor. Second and third graders study famous artists and their techniques and then get a chance to try those methods.

Our standards-based Physical Education program stresses the physical health of our students. Fifty percent of our PE time is spent engaged in cardiovascular health activities. In the most recent California Physical Performance Testing between 56% and 86% of our students were in the "healthy zone" on the specific tests administered in the California Physical Performance Tests. The physical education component compliments the health topics that students study in class. Second graders focus on the skeleton, while other grade levels focus on a variety of bodily systems as the students learn how their body works. All grade levels study making nutritionally healthy choices.

Ours is a system that values and facilitates equity and has closed any achievement gaps. We want each student to participate in this "buffet" of curricular offerings that is enhanced by our community's diversity. All of our ethnic subgroups and significant subgroups have reached 98% in proficiency levels. Implementing the Common Core State Standards has allowed our teachers to increasingly use their creativity to enhance the entire daily curriculum that students are exposed to, and relate all offerings back to basic standards that students should meet. Fifth graders participate in simulations related to Native Americans while second graders celebrate Chinese New Year. Cinco de Mayo and other important events

such as Black History Month and Women in History are also highlighted. Sixth graders study comparative religions and parents come to school to present information about their culture and customs and relate it to specific learning in social studies. We live our diversity each day when children from diverse backgrounds work together in multidisciplinary projects teaching each other how cultures think and what they value.

3. Instructional Methods and Interventions:

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. 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 methods. First, 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. Second, students have the ability to make connections and establish relationships among disparate data. This allows our teachers to utilize integrated curriculum strategies incorporating the humanities and the arts. Third, 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. Fourth, 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.

With the advent of the Common Core State Standards, teachers utilize direct instruction, and a variety of practice techniques, and then give students opportunities to apply their learning to solve problems. Students are taught the “criteria for success” and review rubrics that will be used to evaluate their learning. Writing across the curriculum is used to assess learning as much as possible.

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

PART V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results Narrative Summary:

Manchester GATE School has a rich tradition of excellent academic achievement. The assessment results from the five-year period of 2009-2013 continue to tell a very positive story of student achievement. In each of these years achievement levels have placed our school among the top ten schools in California.

School-wide, our students' performance on state summative assessment tests in English Language Arts continues to show very high levels. In 2013, 99% of our students were proficient and 80% were advanced. When data from our subgroups are analyzed they reveal some great trends. Our socioeconomic subgroup showed 85% scoring advanced. All of our significant subgroups—socioeconomic disadvantaged, Hispanic, Asian, 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—over 98% are proficient and 60-85% are advanced.

In mathematics the story is equally impressive. 98% of our students school-wide scored at proficient or advanced levels during the 2013 testing year (the most current year summative data was administered in California) with 80% scoring advanced. Subgroup data reveals more impressive information. Our socio-economically disadvantaged subgroup had 99% scoring proficient while 86% scored advanced. All of our significant subgroups reflected the same type of achievement levels.

In California fifth graders are also assessed in Science. Our fifth graders have increased their proficiency levels from 79% in 2005 to a whopping 97% in 2013. 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.

We are proud of our assessment results! In 2012 our Academic Performance Index was 998 which was the 2nd best mark in the state of California. Our API of 996 in 2013 was again among the top five schools in the state. These results are a tribute to the dedication and commitment of our students and teachers.

2. Assessment for Instruction and Learning and Sharing Assessment Results:

A cornerstone of our system is data and its analysis. Our district's Information System (Atlas) enables staff to review a variety of 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 available help assess and monitor student strengths and weaknesses and their progress toward meeting standards. This helps teachers map their curriculum and plan instructional strategies. 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 then receive disaggregated assessment scores that help us review the impact of our curricular program on various groups and students. By studying these results, Manchester's teachers can improve the alignment between their teaching and the rigorous Common Core State Standards to eliminate any gaps.

Teachers have begun to use "common assignments" related to the CCSS to provide further analysis of teaching and learning. Grade levels administer a common assignment each quarter and then utilize a rubric to score them. Teachers compare results to instructional strategies used and meet with colleagues to discuss their effectiveness.

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 and they are discussed during parent conferences. Teachers communicate with parents through the use of Atlas' Parent Portal, or weekly 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.

Part VI School Support

1. School Climate/Culture

In addition to a challenging, engaging curricular program, and since gifted students bring a wide variety of interests and abilities to our school, co-curricular activities are critical to students' emotional, social, and physical well-being. As a result, Manchester GATE School provides many opportunities for our students to participate in co-curricular activities including performing arts, athletics, student government, and academic competitions. Since teachers are critical components of our co-curricular offerings it also creates many opportunities for positive relationships with students outside the classroom environment.

Our Instrumental Music program is highly developed. Over 100 students in the fourth-sixth grades are in beginning band classes, while approximately sixty students are in our Concert Band. Many of those students will also play in the Jazz Band. Our orchestra program is offered to students in second-sixth grade and features about 100 students in beginning classes, while another group of about thirty students participate in intermediate and advanced classes. All of these students participate in three concerts each year. Over 100 of our students participate in a choral music program by rehearsing and performing with the Manchester Melodies. Our Art teacher works with each student in our school.

Our athletic program features interscholastic competitions and intra-mural activities during the noon hour. Interscholastic teams in football, volleyball, basketball, and softball have won several league and district championships. One-hundred and fifty students have participated on our school's championship cross-country and track teams. The intramural program is very broad based. Most of the third and fourth graders play on class teams that compete in a range of activities. Fifth and sixth graders participate in their intramural program in more highly organized flag football, volleyball, basketball, and co-ed softball leagues. This athletic program assists in the social/emotional development of our students, and helps them develop a positive self-image about their physical abilities.

Our students have opportunities to participate in competitions and activities that feature their academic abilities. Over seventy of our students participate in the Peach Blossom Oral Interpretation Festival. Many students participate in the Science Olympiad each year, while a Chess Club gives students the opportunity to develop and apply problem solving strategies. The Journalism Club helps produce the quarterly school newspaper, The GATER Gazette. A newly formed robotics club is gaining momentum as well!

A comprehensive co-curricular program develops a sense of community at our school, fosters school pride, and gives additional ways for students to apply and utilize their abilities while being engaged with their school. This helps make Manchester GATE School a great place for students and teachers alike and creates a climate of engagement, enthusiasm and accomplishment.

2. Engaging Families and Community

We have several strategies and activities in place at Manchester School to ensure that families are engaged as collaborative partners with us in the education of their children. This process begins even before students are formally enrolled when we host information nights to help parents and prospective students understand our school's program so they can make an informed decision about whether to attend. By making the parents part of the recruitment and orientation process, they become an active part of the team that is working on behalf of their children. The welcome back "ice-cream social" further enhances this sense of community. At our annual Back to School/Curriculum Night, between 70-95% of the students are represented by their parents who participate in a presentation about the curriculum that will be presented in that classroom. The principal hosts a session to discuss the school's vision and the issues important to the total school program. All of our parents and students receive and sign a parent/teacher/student/administrator compact which outlines the expectations of all groups. One hundred percent of our parents participate in parent conferences at the end of the first quarter. Quarterly report cards are issued. Many of the teachers utilize regular weekly reports which enable parents to know and understand the progress their children are making. Each Monday the students take home pertinent information about

school activities that gives school leadership a chance to communicate with the school community about issues of importance.

All parents are also encouraged to lend help and/or expertise in the classroom. A survey is sent home the first day of school to solicit and encourage parents to share their expertise. Many parents serve as resources for our classrooms. Parents speak about archaeology, blood and the circulatory system in classrooms. Parents from other cultures also share information with students. Parent volunteers also comprise an integral part of our school and its success, and allow many parents to be involved with their children's education.

Statistics that we monitor provide some illumination. In our Spring 2014 Parent Survey 98% thought that we do an exemplary job of making parents feel welcome at the school. 93% said they participated in school-sponsored activities. At Grandparents Day, held each November, almost 400 students have grandparents attend a special lunch in their honor and then escort them on tours of their classrooms. All of these activities help engage parents and help families feel like they are part of the educational process in place at Manchester School.

3. Professional Development

The school's professional development model has enabled teachers and administrators to identify needs as they emerge, and has also allowed teachers to develop and refine skills necessary to meet our unique student needs.

Our staff members are active participants in our Professional Learning Community and enjoy opportunities to meet in grade level accountable community meetings. On all of these occasions there is respect for ideas from all sources and a willingness to share successes and discuss areas for improvement. Teacher collaboration is encouraged so that faculty members can share and develop their expertise because, "What you get should not be determined by who you get."

During the last several years, with the increased emphasis on rigorous performance and content standards, and now with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards in California, we have targeted areas that help our already high-achieving students, i.e. strategies for vocabulary development and strategies for comprehension of narrative and expository text. These are traditionally areas where data has indicated an opportunity for improvement. The staff has also studied resources related to improving our differentiated curriculum for GATE students, improving writing skills, strategies for reading expository text, Marzano's strategies for improving student achievement, summarization and strategies that proficient readers utilize. All of these have increased our teachers' skill sets.

Among the titles studied by the entire staff recently are: *Non-Fiction Matters* (Harvey, 1998), *Mosaic of Thought* (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997), *Strategies that Work* (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000), *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* (Payne, 1996), *Tools of Engagement* (Jensen, 2003), *Skillful Teacher* (Saphier, 2008), *Mindset* (Dweck, 2006), *Notice & Note* (Beers and Probst, 2013), *Pathways to the Common Core* (Calkins, 2012) and most recently, *Assignments Matter* (Dougherty, 2012). The content of these books has given teachers many strategies that are seen in classrooms on a daily basis.

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. Teachers have learned how to use the internet to supplement their curriculum, help them focus on standards, and find new strategies or lessons. They have learned to create rubrics, use interactive web sites to help their students increase their engagement and achievement, and as an effective way for students to share knowledge. Increased student engagement is a visible example of the impact of the infusion of technology into the curriculum.

4. School Leadership

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 initial staff meeting of the school year, the principal takes time to “chart the course” to help bring the school’s achievement goals into focus. She also shares this vision with parents at our annual Back to School Night.

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. While practicing “management by walking around,” the principal is always filtering information related to the school program. In this way, the principal helps establish the instructional emphasis for the school and keeps goals in focus. In addition, each teacher is an instructional leader within their classroom while at the same time being an integral part of our schoolwide professional learning community.

The principal and the leadership team share instructional leadership with grade levels' Accountable Communities. 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 Principal facilitates regular action planning within the accountable communities 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”—another critical component of Leadership. School leadership also plans for the use of speakers who work with our faculty, selected staff attendance at conferences, and professional reading. These strategies help us attain our school goals and also help create additional leadership opportunities for teachers. By keeping the vision of the school in focus, encouraging involvement and ownership in setting goals, having a positive attitude, and developing our human resources by implementing pertinent staff development, the school’s leadership continues to strive toward the realization of our school’s mission.

PART VIII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Math</u> | Test: <u>California Standards Test (CST's)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 95 | 92 | 97 | 95 | 96 |
| Number of students tested | 121 | 114 | 99 | 98 | 96 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 95 | 90 | 96 | 90 | 97 |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 41 | 23 | 20 | 30 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 97 | 92 | 96 | 95 | 90 |
| Number of students tested | 34 | 36 | 26 | 21 | 19 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 67 | 80 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 8 |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 96 | 94 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Number of students tested | 77 | 67 | 63 | 61 | 58 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CST's or any summative assessment in 2014, but rather field tested (with no results provided) the SBAC assessment of the Common Core State Standards. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Math</u> | Test: <u>California Standards Test (CST's)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 99 |
| Advanced | 89 | 93 | 91 | 89 | 93 |
| Number of students tested | 164 | 163 | 162 | 158 | 159 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 98 | 94 | 97 | 98 |
| Advanced | 81 | 91 | 87 | 83 | 88 |
| Number of students tested | 70 | 67 | 47 | 65 | 64 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 98 | 100 | 98 | 98 |
| Advanced | 87 | 95 | 92 | 86 | 85 |
| Number of students tested | 61 | 60 | 49 | 44 | 53 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 80 | 96 | 100 | 96 | 93 |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 24 | 16 | 24 | 14 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 97 | 96 | 99 | 100 |
| Advanced | 93 | 90 | 88 | 90 | 96 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 69 | 86 | 70 | 80 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CST's or any summative assessment in 2014, but rather field tested (with no results provided) the SBAC assessment of the Common Core State Standards. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Math</u> | Test: <u>California Achievement Test (CAT)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 97 | 96 | 98 | 94 |
| Advanced | 66 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 60 |
| Number of students tested | 187 | 180 | 185 | 180 | 195 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 97 | 98 | 95 | 98 | 92 |
| Advanced | 60 | 65 | 71 | 64 | 48 |
| Number of students tested | 88 | 65 | 88 | 81 | 90 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 96 | 98 | 97 | 97 | 92 |
| Advanced | 60 | 64 | 65 | 69 | 49 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 67 | 66 | 64 | 75 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 90 | 77 | 82 | 74 | 71 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 17 | 27 | 19 | 24 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 95 | 99 | 100 | 99 |
| Advanced | 64 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 74 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 85 | 74 | 85 | 74 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CST's or any summative assessment in 2014, but rather field tested (with no results provided) the SBAC assessment of the Common Core State Standards. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Math</u> | Test: <u>California Standards Test (CST's)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>6</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 97 | 99 | 95 | 97 |
| Advanced | 79 | 74 | 73 | 70 | 66 |
| Number of students tested | 197 | 198 | 200 | 200 | 198 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 96 | 99 | 93 | 95 |
| Advanced | 76 | 75 | 63 | 65 | 61 |
| Number of students tested | 83 | 93 | 100 | 100 | 92 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 99 | 99 | 93 | 93 |
| Advanced | 73 | 76 | 65 | 66 | 59 |
| Number of students tested | 69 | 74 | 71 | 84 | 75 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 97 |
| Advanced | 81 | 85 | 70 | 72 | 70 |
| Number of students tested | 21 | 27 | 23 | 25 | 30 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 97 | 100 | 98 | 100 |
| Advanced | 82 | 71 | 83 | 78 | 73 |
| Number of students tested | 93 | 77 | 90 | 68 | 70 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CST's or any summative assessment in 2014, but rather field tested (with no results provided) the SBAC assessment of the Common Core State Standards. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u> | Test: <u>California Standards Test (CST's)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Jan | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 99 | 95 | 99 | 99 |
| Advanced | 82 | 75 | 81 | 85 | 87 |
| Number of students tested | 121 | 114 | 100 | 99 | 96 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 98 | 96 | 95 | 97 |
| Advanced | 80 | 68 | 61 | 75 | 80 |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 41 | 23 | 20 | 30 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 77 | 69 | 81 | 91 | 68 |
| Number of students tested | 34 | 36 | 26 | 21 | 19 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 80 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 67 | 80 | 100 | 100 | 88 |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 8 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 100 | 93 | 98 | 100 |
| Advanced | 86 | 79 | 76 | 81 | 95 |
| Number of students tested | 79 | 67 | 58 | 64 | 58 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CST's or any summative assessment in 2014, but rather field tested (with no results provided) the SBAC assessment of the Common Core State Standards. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u> | Test: <u>California Standards Test (CST's)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 99 | 98 | 99 | 99 |
| Advanced | 92 | 96 | 86 | 95 | 89 |
| Number of students tested | 165 | 164 | 162 | 159 | 159 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 97 | 100 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Advanced | 94 | 99 | 79 | 94 | 83 |
| Number of students tested | 72 | 68 | 47 | 65 | 64 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 88 | 97 | 84 | 96 | 93 |
| Number of students tested | 62 | 60 | 49 | 45 | 53 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 93 |
| Advanced | 100 | 96 | 100 | 92 | 64 |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 24 | 16 | 24 | 14 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 91 | 96 | 86 | 96 | 93 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 70 | 86 | 71 | 80 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and the Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CAT in 2014, but rather field tested the SBAC assessment for the Common Core State Standards with no results provided to the school. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u> | Test: <u>California Standards Test (CST's)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 99 | 98 | 99 | 94 |
| Advanced | 77 | 82 | 83 | 74 | 68 |
| Number of students tested | 187 | 180 | 185 | 181 | 195 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 98 | 100 | 97 | 99 | 92 |
| Advanced | 77 | 71 | 81 | 62 | 62 |
| Number of students tested | 88 | 65 | 88 | 82 | 90 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 96 | 98 | 97 | 100 | 95 |
| Advanced | 81 | 76 | 73 | 69 | 64 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 67 | 66 | 64 | 75 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 100 | 95 | 100 |
| Advanced | 69 | 82 | 93 | 63 | 63 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 17 | 27 | 19 | 24 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 95 |
| Advanced | 75 | 88 | 89 | 84 | 81 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 85 | 74 | 85 | 74 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CST's or any summative assessment in 2014, but rather field tested (with no results provided) the SBAC assessment of the Common Core State Standards. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u> | Test: <u>California Standards Test (CST's)</u> |
| All Students Tested/Grade: <u>6</u> | Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u> |
| Publisher: <u>Educational Testing Service</u> | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 98 | 98 | 97 | 97 |
| Advanced | 83 | 77 | 75 | 74 | 69 |
| Number of students tested | 198 | 198 | 200 | 200 | 198 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 98 | 97 | 96 | 94 |
| Advanced | 75 | 74 | 70 | 63 | 59 |
| Number of students tested | 83 | 93 | 100 | 100 | 92 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 99 | 97 | 99 | 98 | 96 |
| Advanced | 77 | 74 | 73 | 68 | 59 |
| Number of students tested | 69 | 74 | 71 | 84 | 75 |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 96 | 96 | 97 |
| Advanced | 91 | 85 | 61 | 60 | 73 |
| Number of students tested | 21 | 27 | 23 | 25 | 30 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |

| School Year | 2013-2014 | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 |
| Advanced | 85 | 78 | 81 | 86 | 80 |
| Number of students tested | 93 | 77 | 90 | 68 | 70 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| Proficient and above | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: California and Fresno Unified School District did not administer the CST's or any summative assessment in 2014, but rather field tested (with no results provided) the SBAC assessment of the Common Core State Standards. 5 years of data are shown beginning with 2009's data under 2010, 2010's data in 2011 and so on.