



CONFIDENTIAL

SCHOOL # 47 D4

Accrediting Commission For Schools

533 Airport Boulevard, Suite 200
Burlingame, California 94010
(415) 696-1060 • Fax (415) 375-7790

DONALD G HAUGHT, ED.D.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RECOMMENDATION FOR A TERM OF ACCREDITATION

MARILYN S. GEORGE, ED.D.
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Name of School Visited: CRENSHAW HIGH SCHOOL
 Address of School: 5010 ELEVENTH AVENUE
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90043
 Name of District: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED
 Form Used in Self-Study: FOCUS ON LEARNING - WASC/CDE
 Visit: FIFTH SELF STUDY
 Date of Visit: 4-28-97 to 4-30-97
 Accredited Grade Span: 09 - 12
 Enrollment: 2,700
 The Visiting Committee's CONFIDENTIAL recommendation to the Accrediting Commission is:

	A Term Of Accreditation For Six Years: A term of six years with a written Progress Report to the School's governing board on the <u>major</u> recommendations or critical areas listed in the Visiting Committee Report. Upon review and formal acceptance by the board, the report will be filed with the WASC Office.
X	A Term Of Accreditation For Six Years With A Review: A term of six years with a complete Progress Report on <u>major</u> recommendations or critical areas and one day on-site review by a two member committee to be completed not later than the third year of the six year term.
	A Term Of Accreditation For Three Years: A term of three years with a full self-study and a full on-site visit during the third year.
	A Term Of Accreditation For One Or Two Years: A term of one or two years (circle one or two) with a complete Progress Report and revisit to serve as a "warning" that unless prompt attention is given to the major recommendations or critical areas accreditation may be denied.
	Denial Of Accreditation: Denial of accreditation based on conditions detailed in the Visiting Committee Report.

NOTE: The Commission reserves the right to grant terms of accreditation other than those above, including a recommendation for a full self-study at any time. Such action will follow a Commission review of the Visiting Committee Report. In the event of a formal appeal, this document will be provided to the school principal.

VISITING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Kathleen Martin _____ Julian Olague _____

Prentiss Ellis _____ Karen Jones _____

Judith Kissinger _____ Stuart Reeder _____

Jonathan Chapman _____ David K. Hughes _____
Type or print name Signature Committee CHAIRPERSON

Date 4/30/97

ORIGINAL SIGNATURES ON FILE AT THE WASC OFFICE

WASC 26961

DOCUMENTATION AND JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT

I. Complete sections A through E:

- o State the Visiting Committee rating (Highly effective, effective, minimally effective)

highly effective: The results of the self-study and the visit provide evidence of (1) the achievement of a high degree of student learning with respect to the category of criteria and (2) a strong operable school improvement process not requiring external monitoring.

effective: The results of the self-study and the visit provide evidence of (1) the achievement of student learning with respect to the category of criteria; and (2) the need for some minimal outside monitoring to support the school improvement process.

minimally effective: The results of the self-study and the visit provide limited evidence of (1) the achievement of student learning with respect to the category of criteria and (2) the necessity for outside monitoring to support the school's improvement process.

- o Provide a brief narrative rationale that describes the degree to which the school supports student learning through each category of criteria. (Refer to Chapters IV & V of the Visiting Committee Report)

The Committee finds that the school meets the specific WASC/CDE Criteria Categories as follows:

A. Vision, Leadership, Culture

Visiting Committee Rating: Effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: #1,6,7,8,9

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 1,2

Narrative Rationale:

The mission and vision for Crenshaw High School are clearly in place. The WASC process has redirected the change efforts and had a positive effect on the school. The improvement efforts at Crenshaw to date have been uncoordinated; the WASC process has provided focus. Of concern to the visiting committee is that the faculty is split into two groups. One is open to change and willing to move the process forward. The other is apathetic and resistant. The latter group poses a significant challenge to the leadership, which is strong and moving in the right direction. The culture of the school is in transition. The students and the community we met were very proud of their school, unlike previous years when the school was, as the principal described it, "a building where students passed through." This focus area is the strongest in the school.

B. Curricular Paths

Visiting Committee Rating: Effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 2,3,5,9

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 2,3,5

Narrative Rationale:

Students are given clear curricular paths to follow. College preparatory and career oriented opportunities are in place. All students plan their programs upon entering Crenshaw. A high percentage of students complete the University of California a-f requirements. The vocational programs are well developed and utilize some of the best instructional practices at the school. The LEP program needs to be monitored to ensure that these students have full access to the curriculum

Remedial classes have been removed from the curriculum in an effort to raise expectations, and the remaining entry level courses have been restructured to meet the needs of students who have low skills. Efforts must be maintained to ensure that appropriate support and instruction are provided to guard against increased failure and dropout rates.

C. Powerful Teaching and Learning

Visiting Committee Rating: Minimally Effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 1, 2, 3, 9

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Narrative Rationale:

It was difficult for the committee to reach consensus on the overall rating of this focus area. As previously mentioned, the faculty is somewhat polarized in that many offer excellent instruction and many others offer programs that are uninspired and rely on worksheets and require only basic knowledge and recall from students. Efforts to provide active learning opportunities, problem solving, collaborative learning, and integrated instruction are evident and on the increase. Student achievement in these classes is high. However, too many students are performing to the low expectations placed on them by a significant portion of the staff. The committee is optimistic that the instructional program will continue to improve and is impressed with the excellence demonstrated by some, but gave this area a low rating because of the presence of marginal teaching in many classrooms.

D. Support for Personal and Academic Growth

Visiting Committee Rating: Effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 1, 3, 4, 5

Narrative Rationale:

Crenshaw is a caring and nurturing environment for most students. The adults truly care for the students. There is a strong sense of community on the campus. Also, the school provides several counselors and program coordinators to guide students and give them academic and personal support. Students have access to community agencies. Of concern was the high failure rate among 9th and 10th grade students. The Saturday Success Academy addresses this issue, but additional academic support for students with low skills and motivation is needed within the regular instructional program.

E. Assessment and Accountability

Visiting Committee Rating: Minimally Effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 1,

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 1, 2, 3, 4

Narrative Rationale:

Assessment is one of the greatest instructional needs at Crenshaw. The link between the ESLRs and assessment has not been established. Classroom assessment includes some performance based assessment but is typically characterized by traditional tests, quizzes, and worksheets. Programs to help students are developed but without any mechanism for assessing their success. Program evaluation is done solely through observation and anecdotal data. A few departments are developing departmental and course ESLRs that are in line with the schoolwide ESLRs, but the practice is not widespread. Only the math department has ESLRs that are stated in terms of student performance standards. Finally, the schoolwide improvement plans are not well connected to the ESLRs. This area is one requiring significant effort Crenshaw.

II. Summarize the Visiting Committee's findings for these accreditation expectations.

- o The Committee finds that the school meets the accreditation process expectations as follows:

- 1) The school has the capacity to implement a schoolwide action plan resulting in ongoing improvement.

Narrative:

1. The school experienced frustration and confusion in the early stages of the Focus on Learning process but have a clearer understanding at this point. Focus on Learning has provided a way to coordinate and evaluate all of the improvement efforts that have been started in the last few years. The leadership is strong and has led the school from one that was in crisis to one that is attracting enrollment away from neighboring schools. The knowledge base of educational reform, however, is not widespread and the commitment to improvement is far from universal. Nonetheless, the committee is optimistic that the leadership team will move the action plans forward.

- 2) The school has addressed the recommendations of the previous Visiting Committee.

Narrative:

2. The school has addressed the recommendations made by the previous Visiting Committee. The progress was uneven in that one of the recommendations were addressed only in a superficial way, and the recommendation regarding assessment of instruction was set aside. The recommendations made by the previous committee were accurate and appropriate. They did not, however, convey the serious condition of the school at that time. Preliminary improvement efforts focused on making the school safe and restoring the confidence of the community. Only then were improvements in the instructional program attempted. In that light, the progress made by the school since the last visitation has been exceptional

- 3) The school's self-study was appropriately developed with the involvement of individuals as required by WASC.

Narrative:

3. The school went through the process as prescribed by WASC. Few parents, students, and support staff were involved, and many teachers were involved only in a cursory manner. For example, during the visitation, one third to one half of the teachers on each focus group did not attend the meetings with the Visiting Committee. Those who were involved went through the process properly. The Self Study was accurate. The leadership team had difficulty getting the staff started and, therefore, some sections of the Self Study appear to have been rushed. Nonetheless, all the bases were covered.

III. Provide a brief narrative which summarizes the Visiting Committee's rationale for the recommended term: (If there is an unresolved minority opinion please indicate and explain.)

- o term options seriously considered
- o reasons for the *term recommended*

In the comments reflect upon the following:

- the schoolwide degree to which students are learning
- the capacity of the school to implement, monitor, and accomplish the action plan

The committee considered two term options, a three year and six year with review recommendation. The three year term was considered because of the weaknesses that still exist in the instructional program and the need to upgrade the assessment program. After discussion, however, the committee reached consensus on a recommendation for six year with a review.

The reasons for the six year with a review recommendation over the three year recommendation are as follows:

1. The excellent progress the school as made since the last WASC visitation.
2. The fact that the LEARN process is in place.
3. The strength and commitment of the leadership.
4. The action plans identify the critical areas of need.
5. The Focus on Learning process has provided direction and coordination for future improvement efforts.