



Accrediting Commission For Schools

533 Airport Boulevard, Suite 200
Burlingame, California 94010
(650) 696-1060 • Fax (650) 696-1867

WILL RUGBY, ED.D.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Recommendation for a Term of Accreditation

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

Name of School Visited: FREMONT, JOHN C., HIGH SCHOOL
Address of School: 4610 FOOTHILL BOULEVARD
OAKLAND, CA 94601
Name of District: OAKLAND UNIFIED SD
Form Used in Self-Study: FOCUS ON LEARNING - WASC/CDE
Visit: SEVENTH SELF-STUDY
Date of Visit: 4-19-99 to 4-21-99
Accredited Grade Span: 9 - 12
Enrollment: 2,290

The Visiting Committee's CONFIDENTIAL recommendation to the Accrediting Commission:

<input type="checkbox"/>	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 critical areas or major recommendations listed in the Visiting Committee Report. Upon review and formal acceptance by the board, the report will be filed with the WASC Office
<input type="checkbox"/>	A Term Of Accreditation For Six Years With A Review: A term of six years with a complete Progress Report on critical areas or major recommendations and a one day on-site review by a two member committee to be completed not later than the third year of the six year term.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 critical areas or major recommendations accreditation may be denied.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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

Rita Donahue Rita Donahue

Felton Owens Felton Owens

Gail Donovan Gail M. Donovan

Sylvia Segal Sylvia Segal

Penny Burney Penny L. Burney
Type or print name Signature

Maria Bañuelos 4/21/99
Committee CHAIRPERSON Date

DOCUMENTATION AND JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT

For proper processing, please complete the information in box:

Marie V. Bañuelos Chair Name	John C. Fremont High School, Oakland Name and City of School Visited	
(909) 387-4925 Chair's Work Phone	(909) 923-4520 Chair's Home Phone	 Alternative Phone

I. Complete sections A through E:

- 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 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.
- Provide a brief narrative rationale that describes the degree to which the school supports learning through each category 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, 2, 4, 10, 13, and 14

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: 1, 2, 5, 10, 11,

Narrative Rationale:

The staff has worked hard at restructuring Fremont to provide greater interaction between students and teachers and to provide a meaningful curriculum. They are working toward these goals by redesigning the school into academies and by providing for and attending to a wide range of staff development programs, many of which address the school's ESLRs. Staff is continuing to work on safety issues at Fremont in order to provide a safe learning environment.

Fremont High School's commitment to enroll all students into academies supports the notion that students who belong to a group are more successful. The school is challenged by the large number of ELD and Special Education students who are not part of the academy system. However, it is felt that the biggest obstacle will be for the leadership team to work with all stakeholders to ensure that these students are included. Presently there is a resistance by administration to accept that these students are not included.

One Visiting Team member assessed the school as highly effective in Vision, Leadership, and Culture. The member's comments are included in the narrative and, though the rest of the team disagree with the member's rating, the team agrees with the narrative as a whole.

B. Curricular Paths

Visiting Committee Rating: **EFFECTIVE**
Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 1, 3, 4, 5,
Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 3, 7, 22, 23, 24,
Narrative Rationale:

Out of the six academies, only three are aligned with academy model. While many students have access to the academy system, some students still do not. 90% of the students who choose academies get their first choice. However, some students do not choose and are placed in academies by lottery.

One minority opinion stated that students are offered the opportunity to participate in an increasingly relevant and coherent curriculum designed around career pathways. The school has been highly effective in developing the pathways as a vehicle to begin the implementation of its school-to-career model.

C. Powerful Teaching & Learning

Visiting Committee Rating: **EFFECTIVE**
Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 4, 6, and 11
Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, and
18
Narrative Rationale:

Fremont's six academies serve as the primary reason why the committee was able to reach a consensus on a rating in this area. While the committee agreed that there are classes where teaching is unsatisfactory, there are other classes where the teaching can be considered outstanding. Through staff development, the school should be able to close the gap between good teaching and bad. Fremont is part of the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative who has provided Fremont with its Rubrics as a guide to use for improvement.

Two Visiting Committee members' minority rating of Minimally Effective was stated this way: Teaching of the highest caliber was observed in multiple classes within the science and English departments especially. Deficient teaching and classrooms where students were totally engaged in other pursuits were also observed in multiple instances over the three-day visit.

D. Support for Student Personal & Academic Growth

Visiting Committee Rating: **EFFECTIVE**

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 22, 23, and 23

Narrative Rationale:

The committee discussed all the areas of support for student personal and academic growth that is available to students at Fremont. We see the need for these services to be brought into focus so all students are not only aware of these programs but are taking advantage and using services. As Fremont builds a coherent program of support services, the students will be able to achieve a higher level of academic success.

E. Assessment & Accountability

Visiting Committee Rating: **MINIMALLY EFFECTIVE**

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: # 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: # 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21

Narrative Rationale:

This component of the school's assessment system is only at the "birthing" stage. Section E of the Visiting Committee's Report points out the many areas that the staff might consider in order to build a coherent assessment and accountability system for the school. The school, at present, is unable to assess the effectiveness of its new programs and the effects on student achievement.

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

- **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: The school began to develop a more viable action plan during the last day of the Visiting Committee's work. With regular consultant help and coaching, the school

should be able to execute their action plans. Hopefully, a plan will focus on improving teacher performance in the classroom.

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

Narrative: The school addresses the previous committee's Key Issues for Follow Up; however, involving stakeholders, especially parents, is still a critical area requiring much improvement.

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

Narrative: This was a highly inadequate self-study report. It lacked evidence and data, organization, responsiveness to study prompts, and lack of the requirements of the task. Much more attention needs to be focused on the business of making the school intelligible to the outside community, in this case the Visiting Committee. The inability to present a coherent picture of the school may account for the observable disconnects between teachers and students and between teachers and parents. It was clear in Focus Group Meetings that all members did not have a clear understanding of the process or the information contained in the report.

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.)

- Term options seriously considered
- Reasons for the term recommendation

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 Visiting Committee reviewed all of the possible term recommendations. The team was in immediate consensus that the school's study and visit did not warrant recommendations of a six-year nor a six-year with a mid-visit. The team also reached consensus immediately eliminating a recommendation of a zero and one year term.

The team expressed concern that the school did not appear to understand the accreditation process. The school had not examined student achievement data and could not adequately talk about how students were doing. The school had not looked at the problems with Focused Reading and the high failure rate. Though the staff had been

engaging in major staff development activities, the teaching staff did not exhibit an understanding of how the staff development could improve student achievement.

The Visiting Team made keen observations about assessment and accountability and was specific to bring to the school's attention key issues that need to be addressed, which could support the school to connect new programs and staff development to the effect on student results.

The team did discuss a two-year recommendation but felt that the school had made major strides and needed time to complete implementation and evaluate their programs effectively. The team came to consensus on a recommendation of a three-year term with a full visit easily.