

U.S. Department of Education

2003-2004 *No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program* Cover Sheet

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

Official School Name Leland High School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 6677 Camden Ave.
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

San Jose CA 95120-2198
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (408) 535-6290 Fax (408) 927-6448

Website/URL Leland.sjUSD.org E-mail setterlund@sjUSD.k12.ca.us

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

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Linda Murray
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name San Jose Unified School District Tel. (408) 535-6000

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

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

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

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

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

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. 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 the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 31 Elementary schools
 8 Middle schools
 _____ Junior high schools
 7 High schools
 _____ Other (Briefly explain)
- 46 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$5,758
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$5,195

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

- Urban or large central city
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural area
 Rural

4. 4 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 _____ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K				7			
1				8			
2				9	260	218	478
3				10	254	228	482
4				11	231	198	429
5				12	210	226	436
6				Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							1825

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school: 41 % White
2 % Black or African American
13 % Hispanic or Latino
41 % Asian/Pacific Islander
3 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

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

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	39
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	71
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	110
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	1810
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.0607
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	6.07

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 4 %
69 Total Number Limited English Proficient
Number of languages represented: 29
Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 6 %
106 Total Number Students Who Qualify

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

10. Students receiving special education services: 6 %

___111___ Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

<u> 2 </u> Autism	<u> 6 </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> 0 </u> Deafness	<u>142</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> 0 </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u> 45 </u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> 4 </u> Hearing Impairment	<u> 16 </u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> 0 </u> Mental Retardation	<u> 4 </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> 15 </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u> 1 </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness

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

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u> 4 </u>	<u> 1 </u>
Classroom teachers	<u> 82 </u>	<u> 6 </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	_____	<u> 1 </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u> 6 </u>	_____
Support staff	<u> 4 </u>	_____
Total number	<u> 96 </u>	<u> 8 </u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 26.5:1

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

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance in %	96.39	96.93	96.42	96.27	95.97
Daily teacher attendance in %	93.90	95.20	94.80	95.70	94.90
Teacher turnover rate in %	12.34	15.47	7.22	27.71*	15.66
Student dropout rate in %	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.1
Student drop-off rate in %	1.0	-0.8	2.0	2.6	5.1

* Indicates District teacher Golden Handshake retirement package

14. **(High Schools Only)** Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2003 are doing as of September 2003.

Graduating class size	<u>439</u>
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	<u>61</u> %
Enrolled in a community college	<u>31</u> %
Enrolled in vocational training	<u>1</u> %
Found employment	<u>4</u> %
Military service	<u>1</u> %
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	<u>1</u> %
Unknown	<u>1</u> %
Total	100 %

PART III - SUMMARY

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school.

Leland High School distinguishes itself in two interrelated ways. First, it has adopted research-based strategies as its basis for school improvement. Second, parents, students, and teachers are active members of school committees based on each of the adopted strategies. This continuous improvement model has been nationally recognized by the U.S. Department of Education through the New American High Schools initiative and validated by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in its six-year clear accreditation. —Dr. Eileen Warren, Coordinator, New American High School Initiative

Located in the Almaden Valley, a suburban community for the greater Silicon Valley, Leland is southernmost of 7 high schools and enrolls 1825 students, including a 40-student alternative program. SJUSD has an open-enrollment policy, and Leland is continuously at capacity with a waiting list. We are the most diversified school in SJUSD, with students bilingual in 29 different languages. Leland’s largest ethnic groups are White, including Persian, Assyrian, and East Indian, (41%); Asian (41%); and Hispanic (13%). Opened in 1967, Leland has recently undergone \$8,000,000 in modernization. The Leland Foundation raised \$1,600,000 for renovation of our technology infrastructure and the Library/Media Center. Further facilities improvements will result from the district’s passage of measure F.

Leland’s Communication Arts Magnet program includes an award-winning journalism program, a speech and debate program ranked 4th in the nation, and a Specialized Secondary Program in Filmmaking and Animation. Students explore Career pathways in career units at all grade levels through an award-winning Career/College Center and by Internship and Job-shadowing Programs.

Leland was named a NAHS National Demonstration Site in 2000, and it became a California Distinguished School and award-winner for Career and Technical Education in 2003. We are a Very High Performing school based on an API score of 804. In 2003, 362 students took a total of 685 Advanced Placement tests (73% pass rate). Last year 351 students took the SAT with a mean score of 1161. Graduation requirements are the most rigorous in the state requiring 240 units, including 3 years of math, 3 years of lab science, 2 years of foreign language, 2 years of visual/performing arts, and 40 hours of community service. Over 93% of our graduates go on to college, 61% to 4-year colleges and 31% to 2-year colleges.

Leland’s Vision, “With a tradition of excellence, the Leland High School community, a leader in communication and technology, challenges and empowers students to shape the future in an ever changing global landscape through developing creative and critical thought, providing multi-faceted learning opportunities and fostering reciprocal partnerships,” is just part of a restructuring process involving all stakeholders. College partnerships were established, relationships with businesses were initiated, school-to-career programs were begun, business internships were developed, and curriculum was revised to eliminate tracking and stress rigor. Our reform efforts are overseen by Leland’s Transformation Project and financially supported by the Leland Foundation.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Describe the school's assessment results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics.

SAT: Sustained growth best describes Leland High School's assessment results since the school began reform efforts in the mid 1990s. In 1997, 295 Leland students took the SAT with a combined score of 1134. Since then, those numbers continue to increase, and last year 351 students took the SAT with a combined score of 1161 (school population has remained constant). This 21-point increase can be compared to a 2-point increase for the state and a 4-point increase nationally over the same time period.

AP: Leland has seen similar results with Advanced Placement exams. In 1997, we administered 423 AP exams. This has steadily increased to 685 exams in 2003. Leland's pass rate (score 3 or above) has remained consistent in the mid to high 70% range. During this same time period, District and State pass rates have decreased.

CAHSEE: California continues to administer the California High School Exit Exam even though it has postponed activation until 2006. Leland continues to use the test as significant achievement data. At present, 90% of all juniors and seniors have passed the ELA portion, and 87% have passed the Math portion. The vast majority of those students who have not passed both sections of the test are Special Education and English Language Learners (ELL) students. Leland believes that in 2006 when the test results take effect, graduation rate will not be adversely effected.

GPA: For Leland students, 93% of whom go on to post secondary education, grades are important, and Leland continuously monitors grades by course-alike and by teacher. Despite increased expectations and increased graduation requirements, GPA statistics for Leland students have remained consistent for five years. All-school GPA remains consistent at just over 3.0. Of particular significance is that over 40% of all students carry a GPA of over 3.5. Leland particularly monitors the 12% of students whose GPA remains 2.0 or below. These are the students Leland targets for school support strategies.

UC/CSU Eligibility: One of the most gratifying statistics for Leland is the dramatic increase in the percent of Leland graduates eligible for the University of California and the California State University system. In 1998, 62% of Leland graduates were UC/CSU qualified. In 2003, this eligibility was 81%. Higher expectations have clearly given more Leland students the opportunity to enroll in a four-year university.

API/AYP: Leland's Academic Performance Index has averaged 810 over the past four years, making Leland a "Very High Performing School." This year, Leland was the only school in San Jose Unified to meet all AYP targets. Given the work of the Leland's Student Support Committee to "Narrow the Gap" and Leland's school-wide action plan to increase achievement of Hispanic students, it is significant that Hispanic students scoring Proficient or Advanced increased from 38% to 41.9% in 2003. Hispanic students' ELA score improved 12 points and their math score improved 10 points. Disadvantaged students' ELA score improved 16 points and their math score improved 3 points. English Language Learners' ELA score improved 10 points and their math score improved 2 points.

ELL: Leland carries the best redesignation rate of English Language Learner (ELL) in the District. Over the past three years, between 25% and 36% of ELL students have moved to mainstream programs each year. The ELL Coordinator closely monitors these students for two years after mainstreaming to facilitate a smooth transition, provide additional support, and ensure their success.

2. Show how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.

The District provides Leland with timely, disaggregated data that is school-wide, classroom and student-specific. Through the support of SJUSD's Accountability Dept. and the school's ability to query the 5 million-record SJUSD Data Warehouse with 7 years of longitudinal data on our students, Leland is information-rich, tracking the state's Academic Performance Index (API), the SAT9, SABE, CA Standards Tests, CA Exit Exam, SAT and PSAT scores, numbers of students taking and passing AP and Golden State exams, and careful monitoring of attendance data. Leland is organized into academic departments as well as 7 cross-departmental strategy committees to ensure that NAHS strategies for improvement are implemented in all departments rather than being isolated. Among these strategy committees, the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Standards Committee have particular responsibility for addressing how assessment information can be linked to improving student learning and performance. The Curriculum and Standards Committees lead the effort to analyze data from standardized testing and to determine appropriate interventions. Results are discussed during staff development, and the responsibility for developing strategic plans resides with departments and NAHS committees for whole-school strategic planning. An annual retreat by NAHS committee chairs, students, and parents establishes goals for the year and beyond. As a result of our analyses, one striking goal has emerged—for all students to achieve above the 50th percentile on the Reading SAT9. This is particularly important for our Hispanic students, who have consistently scored below the rest of Leland. To better serve these students, 90% of Leland teachers have been SDAIE trained, and support services are provided in English, writing, and math to help Hispanic and other at-risk students meet standards. Also, a 6-year WASC goal of improving Hispanic student achievement was set, a Hispanic student focus group was established, a Hispanic student counselor was contracted, at-risk funding was channeled to support Hispanic achievement, and reading strategy staff development was implemented. Our '03 results are encouraging. Hispanic API score improved by 24 points, Hispanic graduation rate increased by 8%, Verbal SAT of Hispanic students improved 15 points and Math SAT of Hispanic students improved by 4 points. Using all data, teachers make two important types of instructional decisions: 1) to ensure that curriculum and instruction is helping the broadest range of students, and 2) to identify students who are struggling. When students are not meeting the targeted standards, teachers differentiate the curriculum and instruction as appropriate.

3. Describe how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.

The NAHS Extended Support Committee oversees the connection between Leland and the Leland community. This includes the dissemination of student performance and data.

Parent Internet Viewer & Homework Hotline: Leland operates three server computers which connect with the District server. All teachers' gradebooks, including grades, assignments, attendance, and discipline, are viewable on-line 24 hours a day. Next year the system will incorporate "talking grades," a phone system that gives parents without internet connection a verbal report of student progress. The Homework Hotline is a computer-based telephone system giving students and parents phone access to homework assignments, and gives the school out-call ability using a multitude of call groups to announce student achievement.

Leland Web Site: Leland's Web Server gives the Leland community and beyond access to a vast array of student achievement data, including Leland's Student Accountability Report Card (SARC) and the Leland Profile. The site is linked to the District server to provide complete API, SAT, and AP data. Each year more Leland teachers (now over 25%) maintain their own web sites to communicate their programs and data.

Publications: Leland's award-winning school newspaper, *The Charger Account*, is mailed to all parents monthly and contains continuous announcements of student progress. Leland's Extended Support

Committee, the AP of Activities, and the Athletic Director maintain constant contact with local newspapers (*The Almaden Times*, *The Resident*, and *The San Jose Mercury News*) and supply them with announcement articles and achievement information. Leland publishes a student handbook yearly for all students and parents with detailed achievement information, and Leland's Career Center publishes detailed information on colleges, scholarships, and student acceptance.

Newsletters: *The Charger Account* contains a community section, and the Leland Foundation Board publishes a community newsletter. Leland Bridge, an organization of Leland's Chinese community, publishes a Leland newsletter in Chinese to keep this community informed. SJUSD supplies a translation service to make all school documents available in Spanish.

4. Describe how the school will share its successes with other schools.

Leland has always taken responsibility for sharing successes with other schools and Districts. Many of Leland's instructors serve in professional leadership positions on the College Board, in AP scoring design and application, on District curriculum development committees, and on community advisory boards. Leland's AP of instruction trains new District APIs in successful curriculum developments and scheduling. Leland has always been willing to pilot new innovations, especially in technology.

When Leland became a New American High School National Demonstration Site in 2000, we committed to sharing innovations and successes with other schools and Districts. Since then, visitations have occurred from schools within California and even from a school in Japan. Leland's AP of Instruction presented a workshop for all District High School administrators on the Strategies of NAHS and all school improvements based on these strategies.

Leland's outreach also occurs as part of its Specialized Secondary Program (SSP) in Filmmaking and Animation. Built into this grant program is a commitment to serve as a model program to other high schools in the state. This year, as part of this commitment, Leland hosted the Northern California SSP Conference to showcase Leland's Filmmaking and Animation Program. State officials and representative from 15 high schools attended. In addition, when Leland instituted its CISCO Networking Academy, it also became a Northern California Training Center.

Leland's Speech and Debate Program has been ranked 1st in the nation, and its coach, Gay Brasher, has been national coach of the year. Gay has consistently shared her expertise with other schools to help maintain and build speech programs. She has, as a leader in the state speech association, built a library of video tapes to assist speech programs throughout the state. Gay has also developed English Language Learner (ELL) speech competitions and invited all high schools in the county to participate.

Leland's award-winning Career and College Center has become a model for the District. The Center's coordinator is a past president of the California Career and College Association, and as such, has used the successes of Leland as a model program for the state.

Strong coordination exists between Leland, local community colleges and the Central Coast Occupational Center (CCOC). Seventeen Leland classes are now concurrent CCOC satellite classes. Leland has articulation agreements with San Jose City College and West Valley College. Recently, Leland shared in a technology grant with West Valley College, which has expanded the success of both institutions.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Describe the school's curriculum. Outline the core of each curriculum area and show how all students are engaged with significant content based on high standards. Include art and foreign languages in the descriptions.

Leland's graduation requirements correlate with UC eligibility requirements, and require 40 hours of community service. Graduation requirements mandate 240 units, 4 years of English, 3.5 years of social studies, 3 years of math (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2), 3 years of lab science, 2 years of foreign language, 2 years of visual/performing arts, and 2 years of PE/Health. Of the '03 graduating class, 81% met UC entrance requirements. LHS has eliminated remedial classes. All students are expected to achieve, and safety net classes and programs are provided to ensure student success.

All students are engaged in a rich, core curriculum based on State and District board-approved, benchmarked content standards in all subject areas as well as the SJUSD Lifelong Learning Standards (LLS). Our application of the research-based strategies of NAHS (*e.g. All students are expected to master the same rigorous academic material; Curricula are challenging, relevant and cover material in depth; Students' learning is enhanced through real-life experiences; and Core activities concentrate on student learning and achievement*) is creating powerful learning for our students.

ELA: Leland offers *Pacesetter*, a course sponsored by the College Board as an alternative to AP English and standard senior English. This thematic-based curriculum requires students to explore the cultural and historical contexts of literature. Leland's students earn some of the highest scores in the nation.

Math: Overall student achievement is very high in math (601 SAT), and math projects connect standards-based content with real world experiences. Most Leland students take four years of math, and some students take three years of Calculus and Differential Equations.

Foreign Language: Many Leland students take three and four years of French and Spanish. Leland offers two years of Japanese and American Sign Language. We use the *Pacesetter* program for Spanish III. Two staff members are on the College Board National Development Committee.

Visual/Performing Arts: In developing VPA curriculum, Leland has endeavored to gain UC/CSU approval on all courses. In development of the courses for Filmmaking and Animation (Leland's Specialized Secondary Program), all courses were written based on UC/CSU format stressing state visual arts standards. Therefore, students are both preparing for career entrance and post secondary education. Additional Leland VPA courses that meet UC/CSU entrance requirements are drama, music appreciation, choir, orchestra, band, musical theater, jazz band, sculpture, drawing and painting, photography, electronic music, oral interpretation, and multi-media.

Science: Students enter Leland with the option of taking Integrated Science or Biology. They are advised to take a well-rounded program of a biological, chemical, and physical science (either standard or honors). After this, students may choose the AP level of these courses, or they may take biology 3/4, zoology, or physiology.

Social Science: Leland students take anthropology/geography, world history (standard or accelerated), US history (standard or AP), economics (standards or AP), and government (standards or Honors). Students use collaboration, problem solving, critical thinking and independent research in each class. An example of a research project is Project A and Project B in US History, where individuals do a research project using a college format and primary sources. All Leland seniors complete a senior project which is supervised by a senior economics and government teacher.

Academics: The academy, a team-taught school within a school learning environment, was designed to help incoming 9th grade students in their transition to high school. The 9th grade Academy integrates science, math, English and geography, and operates on a flexible block schedule. Following a similar schedule, the 10th grade Academy pairs English and social studies. Project-based learning and technology are infused in Academy curriculum delivery.

Special Programs: For special needs students, Leland offers a complete academic program for Special Education and English Language Learners (ELL) students. All Leland Special Ed students have full access to our rigorous

core curriculum. Students are placed in a challenging academic program that meets the requirements of their IEPs, as well as addressing vocational needs and developing postgraduate goals. With the support of close monitoring and transitional classes, ELL students move quickly to a rigorous mainstream program (over 25% per year) and on to post secondary education.

Concurrent Enrollment: With a 93% post-secondary enrollment, Leland has aggressively opened articulation with colleges and universities. We submit new courses to UC each year. Articulation agreements have been written with community colleges to provide concurrent enrollment in on-campus college classes.

One of the Curriculum Committee's goals is to increase real-life learning experiences and employment skills. SJUSD's Lifelong Learning Standards, which include business-determined workplace/career skills, are incorporated in all subject areas and measured annually in Curriculum Surveys. Our new Specialized Secondary Program in Filmmaking and Animation connects students with employment opportunities in Silicon Valley's entertainment industry. We provide a Certification program in CISCO Networking and have a multimedia articulation agreement with West Valley College and the West Valley Design Center. With a Central Coast Occupational Center partnership, students may attend Leland part-time for academics while preparing for occupations in auto-repair, dental/medical assisting, office procedures, graphic design, etc.

2. **(Secondary Schools)** Describe the school's English language curriculum, including efforts the school makes to improve the reading skills of students who read below grade level.

The English Curriculum offers students four years of UC/CSU qualified courses. All students take heterogeneous college prep. 9th grade English. As sophomores, students choose between standard and accelerated; and both 9th and 10th grade students may opt for a core-integrated and team-taught Academy program using project-based learning and an infusion of technology. Juniors choose between standard and honors, and senior English differentiates with standard, Pacesetter, and Advanced Placement. All courses are standards/literature-based (Steinbeck emphasis) and follow the California State Framework. For special needs students, the department oversees a full range of English Language Learner (ELL) and Special Education courses.

The department uses a variety of learning strategies (oral presentations, collaboration, discussions, investigations, performances, essays, reports, performance tasks, projects, journals, portfolios) in an effort to meet the needs of all students and to involve students actively in the learning process. Ninety percent of the department is ELL trained and has participated in District workshops formulating rubrics and implementing authentic assessment.

Technology is available in all the classrooms and teachers have creatively incorporated it into student learning. The department continues to implement strategies that have proven effective with at-risk students: reinforcement and recognition; cooperative learning; visual learning; setting objectives, providing feedback, and monitoring progress, homework and practice. After school, the department maintains a teacher-staffed English Homework Center.

The department has reviewed and revised its writing curriculum, and has led Leland in the development of writing, oral presentation, and group project rubrics. In junior English classes, students participate in a College and Career Unit. This unit now provides state-of-the-art computer programs and online access. The department has purchased new anthologies for all grade levels which align with the state framework and provide student-directed learning methodology, authentic assessment, and technology.

The department is a vital support in Leland's WASC goal to support students who score below the 50th percentile in Reading on state standardized tests. A school staff development day was dedicated to reading strategies. The NAHS Standards Committee oversees Reading Comprehension Development. The committee continues data analysis of reading assessment and identifies students below the 50th percentile (approximately 60 students). The teachers of these students differentiate instruction and use identified reading strategies for improving their students' reading skills.

3. Describe one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

Since transition from middle school to high school is often difficult, and since a solid start in the 9th grade

is essential to high school success, Leland High School has a long-range goal to develop interpersonal support for incoming freshmen and strategies to meet this goal. A major step toward this goal is the development of an integrated 9th grade Academy program. This curricular program is based on the principles of *Aiming High* and the *New American High School Initiative*. A team of interdisciplinary teachers offers a unique educational experience for freshmen with an emphasis on higher order thinking skills with increased expectations as applied to a traditional college prep core curriculum. The 9th grade Academy integrates science, math, English and social studies, and operates on a flexible block schedule. Centered on Leland's Lifelong Learning Standards that all students will be: Effective Communicators, Informed Thinkers, Self-Directed Learners, Collaborative Workers, Responsible Members of Society, and Information Processors; the Academy gives students

- A sense of community
- A more personalized support system
- A focus on critical and creative thinking
- A program set to meet all University of California A-G requirements
- Peer tutoring
- Team-oriented structure to support high expectations
- Enhanced parent/teacher communication process
- Flexible use of time through Block Scheduling to accommodate a student-centered activity-based curriculum delivery
- Strong support of students who seek university admission upon graduation
- Career and College Center support and exploration
- Developing Technology skills through Project-Based Learning

Housed in a single building, teachers coordinate curriculum using a common meeting time. Project-Based Learning is key to the achievement of Academy students. Technology is infused in most projects using 60 wireless laptop computers for 120 students. Academy students gain the equivalent of Microsoft Office Certification as they learn technology along with their core curriculum of English, anthropology/geography, algebra or geometry, integrated science or biology.

The Academy instructors have full control of their bell schedule independent of Leland as a whole and have the ability to meet the 120 Academy students as a single unit when necessary. Communication with parents operates through Academy parent meetings, Homework Hotline group calling, and a very state of the art Academy Web Site. Through Parent Internet Viewer, students and parents can view grades, attendance and assignments in their teachers' grade books 24/7.

4. Describe the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

Central to Leland's success are instructional methods that involve students in challenging learning experiences. Students understand that oral presentations, individual and group work, discussions, investigations, experiments, performances, essays, reports, performance tasks, projects, journals, portfolios, and open-ended responses are key to their learning Lifelong Learning Standards (LLS) and Content Standards.

Teachers at Leland understand that optimal student learning occurs when students are able to maximize their learning styles. Even specific courses such as American Sign Language have been developed to address learning styles. Teachers work as coaches to facilitate learning as students do research (e.g. Project A and Project B in US History AP using primary sources), inquire, gather, discover, and invent. Above all, Leland is a communications magnet, and communication by presentation is applied school-wide, as modeled by the 300-member speech and debate team.

Students at Leland participate in real-life learning experiences that deepen their understanding. They critique and evaluate their own work and that of peers. Their projects integrate academic and applied content and emphasize higher order thinking skills. Collaboration is key to learning in most classes and

usually involves technology. Specific examples include CISCO Networking Academy, public access television productions by filmmaking students, and a Leland comic book anthology by animation students. The 9th grade and 10th grade Academies integrate core subjects, as a team of teachers collaborate using project-based learning and infused technology.

The capstones for Leland are the senior projects and business internships. All seniors demonstrate a full range of their learning in their senior projects. Last year's projects addressed human rights issues. Leland has connections to over 200 business and industries and over 70 seniors per year participate in business internship during the year or summer, connecting their talent and knowledge to the career world.

5. Describe the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

Leland's NAHS Staff Development Committee, along with a school Professional Development Coach, coordinates staff development. Through staff development days, conferences, content workshops (e.g. College Board AP and Pacesetter workshops), school site and community resource visits, speakers, and presentations to support identified goals, our staff has moved continuously toward standards-based instruction for the past 5 years, following the strategies of NAHS: Core activities concentrate on student learning and achievement. All students are expected to master the same rigorous academic material, Staff development and planning emphasize student learning and achievement, and schools use new forms of assessment. As a result of our '02 WASC self-study, we refocused staff development on standards, project-based learning, and new forms of assessment. For example, we contracted a standards expert to facilitate staff development in backwards-mapping for writing standards-based units of instruction.

Learning is enhanced through real-life experiences, and student achievement is improved when curricula are challenging, relevant, and cover material in depth. Therefore, project-based learning and technology have become a strong focus for Leland. We contracted best practice presentations by Drake High School in San Rafael, Corvallis High School in Oregon, Leslie High School in Texas, the East Bay Learning Center, and Advanced Research Technology from Clovis. The English department provides leadership in the use of standards, cross-curricular reading strategies, rubric assessment, and strategies for collaborative learning, project-based learning, and real-life learning experiences. This has resulted in curriculum development such as CISCO Networking Academy and Filmmaking and Animation Career Pathways. Fifty percent of the staff has been trained in Intel's *Teach To The Future* and teachers are developing personal technology development plans. Half of the staff participated in *Future Connection*, a Silicon Valley job-shadowing program for educators. Six teachers participated in Industry Initiative in Science and Math Education (IISME) institutes.

Leland supports and monitors new teachers with mentors grounded in SJUSD's professional development plan. New teachers are also assigned PARS (Peer Accountability and Review System) support coaches. In addition, they are assigned BTSA mentors who provide 1:1 support and modeling for 2 years as they develop their Individual Growth Plans. Leland's continued improvement in student achievement and success is largely a product of quality instruction backed by sound staff development.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

LELAND		9th Grade			
TESTING MONTH: APRIL					
California Standards Test--ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS					
ENG. LANG. ARTS SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	91%	89%	92%		
% At or Above Proficient	75%	69%	63%		
% At Advanced	42%	33%	27%		
Number of students tested	464	443	432		
Percent of total students tested	97%	99%	91%		
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
ASIAN					
% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	88%	80%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	179	179			
HISPANIC					
% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	46%	37%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	69	52			
WHITE					
% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	74%	67%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	183	184			
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
% At or Above Basic		42%	74%		
% At or Above Proficient	24%	27%	11%		
% At Advanced		6%	0%		
Number of students tested	21	33	27		

LELAND**9th Grade****TESTING MONTH: APRIL****California Standards Test--MATH**

MATH SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	78%	77%			
% At or Above Proficient	56%	53%			
% At Advanced	19%	18%			
Number of students tested	462	442			
Percent of students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

ASIAN

% At or Above Basic	94%	95%			
% At or Above Proficient	79%	76%			
% At Advanced	36%	32%			
Number of students tested	179	178			

HISPANIC

% At or Above Basic	57%	42%			
% At or Above Proficient	29%	15%			
% At Advanced	7%	4%			
Number of students tested	69	53			

WHITE

% At or Above Basic	73%	71%			
% At or Above Proficient	48%	41%			
% At Advanced	9%	9%			
Number of students tested	179	185			

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

% At or Above Basic	45%	47%			
% At or Above Proficient	23%	21%			
% At Advanced	9%	3%			
Number of students tested	22	34			

LELAND**10th Grade**

TESTING MONTH: APRIL

California Standards Test--ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Eng. LANG. ARTS SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	86%	87%	88%		
% At or Above Proficient	64%	64%	62%		
% At Advanced	32%	29%	28%		
Number of students tested	434	448	432		
Percent of total students tested	98%	99%	93%		
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

ASIAN

% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	78%	74%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	187	170			

HISPANIC

% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	36%	42%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	44	67			

WHITE

% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	60%	65%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	180	175			

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

% At or Above Basic		50%	56%		
% At or Above Proficient	22%	16%	8%		
% At Advanced		0%	4%		
Number of students tested	23	32	23		

LELAND**10th Grade****TESTING MONTH: APRIL****California Standards Test--MATH**

MATH SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	76%	82%			
% At or Above Proficient	47%	57%			
% At Advanced	11%	10%			
Number of students tested	403	409			
Percent of students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

ASIAN

% At or Above Basic	90%	97%			
% At or Above Proficient	63%	72%			
% At Advanced	20%	14%			
Number of students tested	184	152			

HISPANIC

% At or Above Basic	52%	82%			
% At or Above Proficient	23%	48%			
% At Advanced	0%	4%			
Number of students tested	31	56			

WHITE

% At or Above Basic	68%	70%			
% At or Above Proficient	36%	49%			
% At Advanced	5%	8%			
Number of students tested	170	169			

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

% At or Above Basic	69%	82%			
% At or Above Proficient	38%	36%			
% At Advanced	6%	0%			
Number of students tested	16	28			

LELAND**11th Grade****TESTING MONTH: APRIL****California Standards Test--ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

ENG. LANG. ARTS SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	85%	87%	90%		
% At or Above Proficient	63%	59%	64%		
% At Advanced	28%	32%	34%		
Number of students tested	409	420	395		
Percent of total students teste	96%	97%	93%		
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

ASIAN

% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	75%	71%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	165	177			

HISPANIC

% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	40%	35%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	52	60			

WHITE

% At or Above Basic					
% At or Above Proficient	60%	56%			
% At Advanced					
Number of students tested	158	163			

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

% At or Above Basic		54%	75%		
% At or Above Proficient	22%	9%	22%		
% At Advanced		0%	11%		
Number of students tested	27	22	19		

LELAND**11th Grade****TESTING MONTH: APRIL****California Standards Test--MATH**

MATH SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	58%	77%			
% At or Above Proficient	41%	53%			
% At Advanced	13%	18%			
Number of students tested	373	392			
Percent of students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

ASIAN

% At or Above Basic	77%	86%			
% At or Above Proficient	62%	67%			
% At Advanced	27%	34%			
Number of students tested	159	173			

HISPANIC

% At or Above Basic	33%	57%			
% At or Above Proficient	17%	33%			
% At Advanced	2%	4%			
Number of students tested	42	54			

WHITE

% At or Above Basic	50%	71%			
% At or Above Proficient	28%	44%			
% At Advanced	3%	5%			
Number of students tested	143	146			

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

% At or Above Basic	15%	81%			
% At or Above Proficient	5%	69%			
% At Advanced	0%	25%			
Number of students tested	20	16			

STATE

9th Grade

TESTING MONTH: APRIL

California Standards Test---ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

ENG. LANG.ARTS SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	69%	63%	60%		
% At or Above Proficient	38%	33%	28%		
% At Advanced	14%	11%	8%		
Number of students tested	481553	435885	415687		
Percent of total students tested	95%	89%	83%		
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
ASIAN					
% At or Above Basic	83%				
% At or Above Proficient	58%	48%			
% At Advanced	28%				
Number of students tested	41592	38146			
HISPANIC					
% At or Above Basic	54%				
% At or Above Proficient	20%	16%			
% At Advanced	4%				
Number of students tested	204924	179420			
WHITE					
% At or Above Basic	83%				
% At or Above Proficient	57%	50%			
% At Advanced	24%				
Number of students tested	167883	160591			
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
% At or Above Basic	53%	44%	42%		
% At or Above Proficient	19%	15%	12%		
% At Advanced	4%	3%	2%		
Number of students tested	183706	158533	143897		

STATE

9th Grade

TESTING MONTH: APRIL

California Standards Test--MATH

ENG. LANG.ARTS SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	54%	53%			
% At or Above Proficient	23%	21%			
% At Advanced	4%	4%			
Number of students tested	454649	422491			
Percent of total students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
ASIAN					
% At or Above Basic	77%				
% At or Above Proficient	49%	47%			
% At Advanced	17%				
Number of students tested	40683	37716			
HISPANIC					
% At or Above Basic	40%				
% At or Above Proficient	11%	10%			
% At Advanced	1%				
Number of students tested	191642	172597			
WHITE					
% At or Above Basic	69%				
% At or Above Proficient	34%	31%			
% At Advanced	6%				
Number of students tested	160458	156334			
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
% At or Above Basic	40%	38%			
% At or Above Proficient	12%	11%			
% At Advanced	1%	1%			
Number of students tested	171520	152658			

STATE

10th Grade

TESTING MONTH: APRIL

California Standards Test--ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

ENG. LANG.ARTS SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	63%	63%	62%		
% At or Above Proficient	33%	33%	31%		
% At Advanced	11%	12%	11%		
Number of students tested	427443	390793	379005		
Percent of total students tested	94%	88%	82%		
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
ASIAN					
% At or Above Basic	77%				
% At or Above Proficient	49%	48%			
% At Advanced	21%				
Number of students tested	38680	36342			
HISPANIC					
% At or Above Basic	50%				
% At or Above Proficient	17%	16%			
% At Advanced	3%				
Number of students tested	170936	150558			
WHITE					
% At or Above Basic	78%				
% At or Above Proficient	50%	49%			
% At Advanced	19%				
Number of students tested	158447	153040			
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
% At or Above Basic	48%	43%	43%		
% At or Above Proficient	16%	14%	13%		
% At Advanced	3%	3%	3%		
Number of students tested	145757	125139	116934		

STATE

10th Grade
TESTING MONTH: APRIL

California Standards Test--MATH

MATH SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	48%	53%			
% At or Above Proficient	20%	21%			
% At Advanced	4%	4%			
Number of students tested	325267	293751			
Percent of total students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
ASIAN					
% At or Above Basic	71%				
% At or Above Proficient	43%	43%			
% At Advanced	14%				
Number of students tested	35149	33091			
HISPANIC					
% At or Above Basic	33%				
% At or Above Proficient	9%	9%			
% At Advanced	1%				
Number of students tested	118457	100684			
WHITE					
% At or Above Basic	61%				
% At or Above Proficient	27%	28%			
% At Advanced	5%				
Number of students tested	128049	122216			
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
% At or Above Basic	34%	37%			
% At or Above Proficient	11%	10%			
% At Advanced	1%	1%			
Number of students tested	102431	85453			

STATE	11th Grade				
	TESTING MONTH: APRIL				
California Standards Test--ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS					
ENG. LANG.ARTS SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	61%	61%	61%		
% At or Above Proficient	32%	31%	29%		
% At Advanced	11%	11%	9%		
Number of students tested	367808	336160	320021		
Percent of total students teste	91%	86%	77%		
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
ASIAN					
% At or Above Basic	75%				
% At or Above Proficient	48%	45%			
% At Advanced	21%				
Number of students tested	35965	35272			
HISPANIC					
% At or Above Basic	47%				
% At or Above Proficient	16%	14%			
% At Advanced	3%				
Number of students tested	137451	119675			
WHITE					
% At or Above Basic	73%				
% At or Above Proficient	46%	45%			
% At Advanced	18%				
Number of students tested	144328	137952			
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
% At or Above Basic	46%	43%	42%		
% At or Above Proficient	16%	14%	12%		
% At Advanced	3%	3%	2%		
Number of students tested	112455	97549	89527		

STATE

11th Grade

TESTING MONTH: APRIL

California Standards Test--MATH

MATH SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
% At or Above Basic	43%	47%			
% At or Above Proficient	18%	18%			
% At Advanced	4%	4%			
Number of students tested	271468	244313			
Percent of total students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					

SUBGROUP SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
ASIAN					
% At or Above Basic	65%				
% At or Above Proficient	40%	39%			
% At Advanced	13%				
Number of students tested	32041	31624			
HISPANIC					
% At or Above Basic	29%				
% At or Above Proficient	7%	7%			
% At Advanced	1%				
Number of students tested	94957	79376			
WHITE					
% At or Above Basic	51%				
% At or Above Proficient	22%	23%			
% At Advanced	4%				
Number of students tested	108984	102496			
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
% At or Above Basic	31%	34%			
% At or Above Proficient	10%	10%			
% At Advanced	1%	2%			
Number of students tested	78740	66855			

LELAND					
GRADE: 9th	TEST: READING				
YEAR: 2002-03--CAT 6	PUBLISHER: CTB MCGRAW-HILL				
YEAR: 1998-02--STANFORD 9	PUBLISHER: HARCOURT-BRACE				
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and who were they assessed?					
Scores are reported here as: NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (NPR)					
LELAND SCORES					
	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	72	62	61	60	64
Number of students tested	459	442	449	467	466
Number of students enrolled	480	446	473	473	467
Percent of total students tested	95.6%	99.1%	94.9%	98.7%	99.8%
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
ASIAN					
National Percentile Rank	81				
Number of students tested	177	178	164	167	194
HISPANIC					
National Percentile Rank	50				
Number of students tested	70	53	72	87	87
WHITE					
National Percentile Rank	74				
Number of students tested	178	184	179	175	158
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
National Percentile Rank	14	19	21	23	26
Number of students tested	22	33	35	33	55
STATE					
	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	42	35	35	36	34
Number of students tested	471688	437965	421064	411866	402399
Number of students enrolled	509467	492115	502184	491762	486258
Percent of total students tested	92.6%	89.0%	83.8%	83.8%	82.8%

LELAND

GRADE: 9th

TEST: MATH

YEAR: 2002-03--CAT 6

PUBLISHER: CTB MCGRAW-HILL

YEAR: 1998-2002--STANFORD 9

PUBLISHER: HARCOURT-BRACE

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and who were they assessec

Scores are reported here as: NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (NPR)

LELAND SCORES

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	84	83	84	81	84
Number of students tested	456	443	457	460	466
Number of students enrolled	480	446	473	473	467
Percent of total students tested	95.0%	99.3%	96.6%	97.3%	99.8%
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
ASIAN					
National Percentile Rank	95				
Number of students tested	178	178	166	167	194
HISPANIC					
National Percentile Rank	52				
Number of students tested	68	53	77	88	88
WHITE					
National Percentile Rank	77				
Number of students tested	178	185	180	171	158
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
National Percentile Rank	40	47	46	53	55
Number of students tested	21	33	39	32	54

STATE

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	45	54	54	54	51
Number of students tested	470372	440646	424751	415958	406217
Number of students enrolled	509467	492115	502184	491762	486258
Percent of total students tested	92.3%	89.5%	84.6%	84.6%	83.5%

LELAND

GRADE: 10th

TEST: READING

YEAR: 2002-03--CAT 6

PUBLISHER: CTB MCGRAW-HILL

YEAR: 1998-2002--STANFORD 9

PUBLISHER: HARCOURT-BRACE

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and who were they assessed

Scores are reported here as: NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (NPR)

LELAND SCORES

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	64	57	62	65	61
Number of students tested	430	445	436	437	411
Number of students enrolled	442	452	467	463	430
Percent of total students tested	97.3%	98.5%	93.4%	94.4%	95.6%
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
ASIAN					
National Percentile Rank	80				
Number of students tested	186	168	174	199	148
HISPANIC					
National Percentile Rank	37				
Number of students tested	43	67	73	70	57
WHITE					
National Percentile Rank	58				
Number of students tested	179	175	166	144	182
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
National Percentile Rank	16	18	23	21	32
Number of students tested	24	31	23	31	32

STATE

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	41	33	33	33	32
Number of students tested	416871	395372	387373	374671	367816
Number of students enrolled	457127	445151	464306	450563	442090
Percent of total students tested	91.2%	88.8%	83.4%	83.2%	83.2%

LELAND

GRADE: 10th

TEST: MATH

YEAR: 2002-03--CAT 6

PUBLISHER: CTB MCGRAW-HILL

YEAR: 1998-2002--STANFORD 9

PUBLISHER: HARCOURT-BRACE

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and who were they assessed

Scores are reported here as: NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (NPR)

LELAND SCORES

2002-2003 2001-2002 2000-2001 1999-2000 1998-1999

National Percentile Rank	76	80	81	85	80
Number of students tested	429	444	435	436	410
Number of students enrolled	442	452	467	463	430
Percent of total students tested	97.1%	98.2%	93.1%	94.2%	95.3%
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
ASIAN					
National Percentile Rank	92				
Number of students tested	185	168	173	199	148
HISPANIC					
National Percentile Rank	43				
Number of students tested	43	66	73	71	56
WHITE					
National Percentile Rank	66				
Number of students tested	179	175	166	143	182
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
National Percentile Rank	37	44	63	62	63
Number of students tested	24	31	23	31	32

STATE

2002-2003 2001-2002 2000-2001 1999-2000 1998-1999

National Percentile Rank	46	48	47	47	45
Number of students tested	415370	396386	389287	377090	369690
Number of students enrolled	457127	445151	464306	450563	442090
Percent of total students tested	90.9%	89.0%	83.8%	83.7%	83.6%

LELAND					
GRADE: 11th	TEST: READING				
YEAR: 2002-03--CAT 6	PUBLISHER: CTB MCGRAW-HILL				
YEAR: 1998-2002--STANFORD 9	PUBLISHER: HARCOURT-BRACE				
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and who were they assessed?					
Scores are reported here as: NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (NPR)					
LELAND SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	64	65	70	67	68
Number of students tested	392	419	391	369	403
Number of students enrolled	424	432	425	391	438
Percent of total students tested	92.5%	97.0%	92.0%	94.4%	92.0%
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
ASIAN					
National Percentile Rank	76				
Number of students tested	161	174	196	142	167
HISPANIC					
National Percentile Rank	38				
Number of students tested	50	62	46	39	67
WHITE					
National Percentile Rank	62				
Number of students tested	150	162	126	161	153
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
National Percentile Rank	13	19	27	33	37
Number of students tested	27	23	20	20	29
STATE					
STATE	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	40	38	37	37	36
Number of students tested	355946	343472	330413	323193	316758
Number of students enrolled	403829	392810	414805	406419	396198
Percent of total students tested	88.1%	87.4%	79.7%	79.5%	79.9%

LELAND					
GRADE: 11th	TEST: MATH				
YEAR: 2002-03--CAT 6	PUBLISHER: CTB MCGRAW-HILL				
YEAR: 1998-2002--STANFORD 9	PUBLISHER: HARCOURT-BRACE				
What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and who were they assess					
Scores are reported here as: NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK (NPR)					
LELAND SCORES	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	80	85	90	85	86
Number of students tested	391	423	390	369	402
Number of students enrolled	424	432	425	391	438
Percent of total students tested	92.2%	97.9%	91.8%	94.4%	91.8%
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
ASIAN					
National Percentile Rank	94				
Number of students tested	161	175	195	146	167
HISPANIC					
National Percentile Rank	48				
Number of students tested	50	63	47	40	67
WHITE					
National Percentile Rank	73				
Number of students tested	149	163	125	160	152
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED					
National Percentile Rank	27	56	73	77	57
Number of students tested	27	23	20	19	29
STATE					
STATE	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
National Percentile Rank	47	50	50	50	48
Number of students tested	354086	343931	331539	324728	317543
Number of students enrolled	403829	392810	414805	406419	396198
Percent of total students tested	87.7%	87.6%	79.9%	79.9%	80.1%