

CONFIDENTIAL

SCHOOL #157 A3



Accrediting Commission For Schools

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

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: HUNTINGTON PARK HIGH SCHOOL
 Address of School: 6020 MILES AVENUE
 HUNTINGTON PARK, CA 90255
 Name of District: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
 Form Used in Self-Study: FOCUS ON LEARNING - WASC/CDE
 Visit: SIXTH SELF STUDY
 Date of Visit: 4-19-99 THRU 4-21-99
 Accredited Grade Span: 9 - 12
 Enrollment: 4,204

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

	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.
X	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.
	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 critical areas or major recommendations 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

Elinorbeth Goodwin

Sandra Sawyer

Joseph V. Ball

Ann Leonard

Type or print name

Signature

Albert J. ...

Robert ...

Dore A. Cox

WASC 28194

J. Stephen ...

 Committee CHAIRPERSON
 Date 4/21/99

DOCUMENTATION AND JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT

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 result 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.

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 Areas(s) of Strength: 1,2,3,5,6

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

Narrative Rationale:

The Vision and the ESLRs are clearly stated and accepted by the staff. There is a need to establish a process for reviewing these commitments on a periodic basis by the school and its community. The staff has begun work to incorporate the ESLRs into the curriculum as well as to develop rubrics to describe quality.

B. Curricular Paths

Visiting Committee Rating: Effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: 2,3,

Narrative Rationale:

The school's curricular path options are limited and include no formal four year planning process that addresses the student's career interests and that assists them in developing realistic post-secondary goals. Embedding school to career strategies in all curricular areas is vital in helping students to see connections and ensure that they are prepared for the world of work.

C. Powerful teaching and learning

Visiting Committee Rating: Effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: 5

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

Narrative Rationale:

The staff has expressed their commitment to ongoing staff development that will impact student learning. Areas that need to be addressed include involving students in the design of rigorous, challenging learning experiences which include application of knowledge and skills, problem-solving and collaborative learning.

D. Support for Personal and Academic Growth

Visiting Committee Rating: Highly effective

Supporting Area(s) of Strength: 1,2,3,4

Supporting Critical Area(s) for Follow-up: 3,6,7

Narrative Rationale:

A redefined attendance and tardy policy have greatly increased their daily attendance. Other areas that were particularly impressive were the opportunities provided by the Parent Center and the Digital High School action plan. Outstanding college counseling and other student-centered support programs are in abundance.

E. Assessment and Accountability

Visiting Committee Rating: Minimally effective

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

Narrative Rationale: 1,3,4,5

Systematize the gathering of data to impact student learning. Data collection should be orientated toward long-term program planning
Explore ways to improve student achievement in standardized tests,
Develop bench marks of success based on standards and ESLRs.

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

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

Narrative:

The dedication of the staff toward the F.O.L. process, the strong Vision Statement and a doable action plan indicate that the staff has created a willingness for change and has designed a road map to take them where they intend to go.

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

Narrative;

The school addressed the major recommendations made by the WASC visiting committees in 1993 and 1996. The departments and school committees also addressed the various recommendations. Two department recommendations merit continued effort, however: 1, increasing communication and sharing information 2. greater access to the core curriculum for special education students.

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

Narrative

Indications are that there were representative stakeholder groups involved throughout the process of preparing the reports. While several students were involved in all the Focus groups, few parents were involved in these meetings. The voice of parents was collected, however, by way of the many parent groups and meetings that are regularly held at the site.

III. Provide a brief narrative which summarizes the Visiting Committee's rationale for the recommended term.

The visiting team considered the term of accreditation on two occasions. During the first vote, we considered only what had been understood from the self-study report and from our initial interview with the Leadership team, and meetings with two Focus Groups. We determined that a 6R was appropriate at that time. On the final day, we revoted to determine if our initial impressions had been sustained by the subsequent talks and observations that had occurred during the visit. The response was a resounding yes.