

# OFFICE OF EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDITS



## FINAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

JOHN MARSHALL HIGH SCHOOL

MARSHALL COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

MAY 2006

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

## **INTRODUCTION**

The West Virginia Office of Education Performance Audits conducted an Education Performance Audit of John Marshall High School in Marshall County on March 30, 2005.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of John Marshall High School in Marshall County was conducted March 28, 2006. The purpose of the follow-up was to verify correction of the findings identified during the original Education Performance Audit. The review was in accordance with West Virginia Code §18-2E-5 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320 which specify that a school that meets or exceeds the performance and progress standards but has other deficiencies shall remain on full accreditation status and a county school district shall remain on full approval status for the remainder of the accreditation period and shall have an opportunity to correct those deficiencies. The Code and policy include the provision that a school "... does not have any deficiencies which would endanger student health or safety or other extraordinary circumstances as defined by the West Virginia Board of Education."

## SCHOOL PERFORMANCE 2003-2004

**48 MARSHALL COUNTY**  
Alfred N. Renzella, Superintendent

### 502 JOHN MARSHALL HIGH SCHOOL - Needs Improvement

David Takach, Principal  
Grades 09 – 12  
Enrollment 1413

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on April 20	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
<b>Mathematics</b>								
All	332	340	336	98.82	60.90	Yes	Yes	✓
White	331	338	334	98.82	60.79	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	122	126	123	97.62	48.33	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	53	53	53	100.00	7.54	Yes	No	✗
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>								
All	332	340	335	98.53	69.30	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	331	338	333	98.52	69.20	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	122	126	122	96.83	54.62	Yes	No	✗
Spec. Ed.	53	53	53	100.00	13.20	Yes	No	✗
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

\*\* -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

**Passed  
Graduation Rate = 86.8%**

## SCHOOL PERFORMANCE 2004-2005

This section presents the performance measures and the Follow-up Education Performance Audit Team's findings. The high quality educational standards and performance measures were investigated through the examination of documents; observation of practices; and interviews with personnel, students, and parents.

### 48 MARSHALL COUNTY

Alfred N. Renzella, Superintendent

### 502 JOHN MARSHALL HIGH SCHOOL – Passed

David Takach, Principal

Grades 09 – 12

Enrollment 1413

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
<b>Mathematics</b>								
All	376	384	371	96.61	68.13	Yes	Yes	✓
White	372	380	368	96.84	68.14	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Low SES	146	150	144	96.00	55.71	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	60	62	57	91.93	17.85	By Average	Safe Harbors	✓
LEP	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>								
All	376	384	370	96.35	72.72	Yes	Yes	✓
White	372	380	367	96.57	72.77	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Low SES	146	150	143	95.33	59.71	Yes	Safe Harbors	✓
Spec. Ed.	60	62	57	91.93	32.14	By Average	Safe Harbors	✓
LEP	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

\*\* -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

**Passed**  
**Graduation Rate = 91.2%**

### Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Information by Class

Mathematics											
Class	Tested Enr.	FAY Enr.	Tested	FAY Tested	Part. Rate	Novice	Below Mastery	Mastery	Above Mastery	Distinguished	Proficient
10	384	376	371	364	96.61	7.42	24.45	48.90	13.46	5.77	68.13

Reading											
Class	Tested Enr.	FAY Enr.	Tested	FAY Tested	Part. Rate	Novice	Below Mastery	Mastery	Above Mastery	Distinguished	Proficient
10	384	376	370	363	96.35	5.23	22.04	37.47	22.87	12.40	72.73

Enr. - Enrollment  
FAY - Full Academic Year  
Part. - Participation

### 2004-2005 Writing Assessment Distribution of Performance Across All Performance Levels Grade 10

	Total # Tested	% Novice	% Partial Mastery	% Mastery	% Above Mastery	% Distinguished	% Below # Mastery	% At or # Above Mastery
STATE - WV	18579	2%	12%	51%	27%	9%	14%	86%
MARSHALL COUNTY	420	2%	11%	49%	25%	12%	13%	87%
JOHN MARSHALL HIGH	348	2%	10%	45%	28%	15%	12%	88%

## ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

### **Below Standard.**

#### **5.1.1. Achievement.**

John Marshall High School failed to achieve adequately yearly progress (AYP) in one or more subgroups designated in 5.1.1. Achievement. Two subgroups designated in 5.1.1. Achievement, included: Economically disadvantaged students (SES) in reading/language arts, and special education students (SE) in mathematics and reading/language arts. In accordance with Section 9.5 of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, *A Process for Improving Education: Performance Based Accreditation System*, the West Virginia Board of Education issued the school Temporary Accreditation status at the September 10, 2004 State Board meeting. The school revised its Unified School Improvement Plan (USIP) to improve performance and progress on the standard and the West Virginia Board of Education upgraded John Marshall High School to Conditional Accreditation status with a May 31, 2007 Date Certain to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP).

John Marshall High School achieved AYP in the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics and in the all students (AS) and racial/ethnicity white students (W) subgroups in reading/language arts only by application of the confidence interval. These subgroups may have achievement deficiencies if immediate action is not taken. Marshall County curriculum staff and school staff are urged to vigorously address these issues.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** John Marshall High School achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP) and increased the percent proficient in all subgroups. The increase of the special education (SE) subgroup percent proficient was significant from the previous year: Mathematics 2005 (7.54 percent) and 2006 (32.14 percent). The SE subgroup showed the most impressive increase in achievement in reading/language arts.

**Increase of percent proficient for the all students (AS), racial/ethnicity white (W), and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups was modest. If the school is to show substantial improvement, the Five-Year Strategic Plan must be completely revised with active involvement of teachers, and include goals, objectives, and action steps for the marginal subgroups.**

**The performance data provided compelling evidence for the school improvement team to review the teacher committees' recommendations for systemic changes in the school.**

**The following professional and/or training opportunities were provided by the West Virginia Department of Education, RESA VI, county, and/or school.**

- 1. Technology Training (examples included: Textbook Integration, SAS in School-Science, Numonics Interactive Whiteboards, Creating Webpages, etc.).**
- 2. Principals' Academy.**
- 3. Teachers' Academy.**
- 4. Math Materials.**
- 5. Guided Reading.**
- 6. Video Streaming.**
- 7. Content Area Facilitator Sessions.**
- 8. Strategies to Promote Learning.**
- 9. Content Area Curriculum and Instruction Sessions.**
- 10. Co-Teaching.**
- 11. Kansas Writing.**
- 12. Benchmark Formative Assessments.**
- 13. Mathematics Learning Community.**
- 14. Numerous other professional development and training sessions.**

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

### NONCOMPLIANCES

#### 6.1. Curriculum

**6.1.4. Instruction. Instruction is consistent with the programmatic definitions in Policy 2510. (Policy 2510)**

The Team found little evidence of collaboration among the special education teachers and the general education teachers to effectively deliver the students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Students were making more decisions about their need for assistance than the classroom teachers. The Team determined that the IEP modifications were not being implemented in all classes. When asked during an interview, a special education teacher indicated that special education teachers did not deliver content but rather, served as a resource for special needs students. The Team did not observe an adequate level of accountability of the pupil service teachers in the structure of the schedule for special needs students.

#### FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. The principal indicated and teachers interviewed verified that they had implemented IEP modifications and had discussed how the modifications were being applied.**

**6.1.5. Instructional strategies. Staff demonstrates the use of the various instructional strategies and techniques contained in Policies 2510 and 2520. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)**

The Team did not observe 50 percent inquiry, investigation, and experimentation instruction in Coordinated and Thematic Science (CATS) 9 and 10. Instruction observed in CATS 9 and 10 consisted predominately of lecture and worksheets.

#### FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed lesson plans and interviewed teachers and reported that instruction in the CATS program included the 50 percent inquiry, investigation, and experimentation.**

**6.1.6. Instruction in writing. Instruction in writing shall be a part of every child's weekly educational curriculum in grades K through 12 in every appropriate class. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)**

The Team did not find evidence through classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student interviews that writing instruction was being conducted weekly in all subject areas. Students indicated they seldom wrote in science, mathematics, and social studies classes.



### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** Professional development on the Kansas Writing method had been held on instructional support days. The Team reviewed samples of student writing from numerous classes including science, mathematics, and social studies. Additionally, the Team was shown lesson plans that indicated instruction in writing was included in teaching. The faculty had developed and was using a standard format for lesson plans that included writing as a strategy and as an evaluation tool. Teachers were also providing students feedback on their written work. The Team observed an excellent example of student writing in a science class.

- 6.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.** The application of technology is included throughout all programs of study and students have regular access to library/educational technology centers or classroom libraries. (Policy 2470; Policy 2510)

The Team did not observe the use of technology in all subject areas. When asked during interviews, students indicated that they rarely used technology. Several students had to be given their passwords, which was an indication they rarely used them.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** An impressive quantity of professional development/training sessions on technology had been conducted and will be conducted this school year. Technology was being used to a greater extent than observed during the initial Education Performance Audit.

- 6.1.12. Multicultural activities.** Multicultural activities are included at all programmatic levels, K-4, 5-8, and 9-12 with an emphasis on prevention and zero tolerance for racial, sexual, religious/ethnic harassment or violence. (Policy 2421)

A county multicultural plan had not been implemented.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** The Team reviewed a compilation of multicultural activities that included zero tolerance, multicultural fairs, guest speakers, etc. Videos on character education were shown during students' internal suspension. The principal stated that he recently received a copy of the county's Multicultural Plan.

## **6.2. Student and School Performance**

- 6.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.** Lesson plans that are based on approved content standards and objectives are prepared in advance and the principal reviews, comments on them a minimum of once each quarter, and provides written feedback to the teacher as necessary to improve instruction. (Policy 2510; Policy 5310)

Lesson plans were sketchy and some teachers appeared to have little regard for lesson plans. The Team did not see evidence that the principal had provided constructive

feedback to improve instruction. In consideration of the achievement issues of the economically disadvantaged (SES) and special education (SE) subgroups and the potential achievement issues in the all students (AS) and racial/ethnicity white students (W) subgroups, it is necessary that lessons be prepared to improve student achievement and the administrators review lesson plans and provide feedback to improve instruction in appropriate areas.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** The faculty developed a standardized lesson plan format that included: Strategy, Learner Outcome/Objective, and Evaluation. A section of the plans asked if certain areas had been addressed, i.e., Technology, Laboratories, Writing, etc. A section of the lesson plan format was designated for principal's comments. The Team reviewed numerous lesson plans from various disciplines and found them to be complete and the new assistant principal had provided written feedback to the teachers. Many of the plans reviewed were exceptional.

#### **6.4. Regulatory Agency Reviews**

- 6.4.1. Regulatory agency reviews.** Determine during on-site reviews and include in reports whether required reviews and inspections have been conducted by the appropriate agencies, including, but not limited to, the State Fire Marshal, the Health Department, the School Building Authority, and the responsible divisions within the West Virginia Department of Education, and whether noted deficiencies have been or are in the process of being corrected. The Office of Education Performance Audits may not conduct a duplicate review or inspection nor mandate more stringent compliance measures. (W.Va. Code §§18-9B-9, 10, 11, 18-4-10, and 18-5A-5; Policy 1224.1; Policy 8100; W.Va. Code §18-5-9; Policy 6200; Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973 §104.22 and §104.23; Policy 4334; Policy 4336)

Deficiencies noted in the State Fire Marshal report had not been corrected. The Team observed that fire doors in stairways were propped open with wooden blocks.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** Fire doors were not held open with wooden blocks. The Facilities Department inserted windows in the door that presented a safety problem.

#### **6.7. Safe, Drug Free, Violence Free, and Disciplined Schools**

- 6.7.2. Policy implementation.** The county and schools implement: a policy governing disciplinary procedures; a policy for grading consistent with student confidentiality; policies governing student due process rights and nondiscrimination; the Student Code of Conduct policy; the Racial, Sexual, Religious/Ethnic Harassment, and Violence policy; an approved policy on tobacco use; an approved policy on substance abuse; and an approved policy on AIDS Education. (W.Va. Code §18A-5-1 and §18-8-8; Policy 2421; Policy 2422.4; Policy 2422.5; Policy 2422.5A; Policy 4373; Policy 2515)

Tobacco use by students was evident throughout the building. Heavy smoke and cigarettes were observed in boys' and girls' rest rooms. This violation of the Student Code of Conduct and the policy on tobacco use indicated that administrators and all staff

need to review all relevant policies, including the Employee Code of Conduct, and take appropriate action for any violation of the policies.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** Sensors to detect smoke had been installed in some rest rooms. The county provided additional aides to help monitor hallways and rest rooms were monitored by teachers during lunch. The principal said that the school has a zero tolerance for smoking and the Resource Officer tickets students caught smoking. Students caught using tobacco products were required to attend a smoking cessation program. The fine was waived for the first smoking offense provided the students attended the program. The second time a student is ticketed they appear before Magistrate Court and are fined \$165 or perform community service. The principal indicated these strategies had decreased incidences of students' smoking.

The Team noted a strong odor of tobacco smoke in the hallway around Room 114 and a staff locker room/lavatory. The Team member recommended that the principal follow-up on smoking in the surrounding area and eliminate the source of the problem. The Team urged the county office to continue installation of sensors in all student rest rooms.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**6.1.1. Curriculum based on content standards and objectives.** The Team could not determine that all the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) were taught in Coordinated and Thematic Science 10 (CATS 10). A heavy emphasis was placed on biology rather than chemistry and physics. One teacher had copies of the Instructional Goals and Objectives (IGOs) and indicated that they were the same as the CSOs. The Team recommended that the administrative staff monitor the instruction of the CSOs to ensure that they are taught. Also, the Team recommended that all old IGOs be removed from the school.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.** All teachers interviewed were fully aware of the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) and were able to explain those being addressed. The principal said that the assistant principals monitored the delivery of the CSOs through walkthroughs and by checking lesson plans. The Science Department Chair also worked with science teachers in delivering the CSOs.

**6.1.2. High expectations.** Study halls were a poor use of instructional time. The Team observed students sleeping and very few students doing work or studying. The Team recommended that study halls be eliminated so students can be enrolled in more rigorous instructional activities and teachers are more fully utilized to expand the curricular offerings.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION PARTIALLY FOLLOWED.** Study halls remained in place at the time of the Follow-up Education Performance Audit. The new assistant principal had instituted tutoring programs during this time for students with D and F reports.

**6.1.3. Learning environment.** The Team did not find evidence of student incentive programs. In addition, Team members could not determine what subjects were being taught in some classrooms by looking at the physical environment. The Team recommended that student incentives programs be established to motivate students, which might include a Positive Behavior Support program. The Team also recommended that subject appropriate materials be posted in classrooms.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION NOT FOLLOWED.** Student incentive programs were not in place at the time of the Follow-up Education Performance Audit.

**6.2.1. Unified County and School Improvement Plans.** The Team determined through interviews with teachers that they were not familiar with the Unified School Improvement Plan (USIP). The Team recommended that the administration share the USIP with the staff and have copies available for staff use.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION PARTIALLY FOLLOWED.** Teachers had been given the basic goals and objectives and all staff interviewed had a copy in their lesson plan booklets. The principal said and the teachers verified that the plan had been communicated during Faculty Senate meetings. The principal also presented the plan to the Marshall County Board of Education.

The Team found that teachers were not involved in developing the Five-Year Strategic Plan and only had input when the plan was presented at a Faculty Senate meeting. Furthermore, the Five-Year Strategic Plan was designed to be a long-range plan with annual updates. John Marshall High School's plan was very narrow and only addressed achievement of students with learning disabilities. The Team recommended that:

- 1. At a minimum the Local School Improvement Council (LSIC) actively participate in developing the Five-Year Strategic Plan.**
- 2. Teachers actively participate in developing the plan.**
- 3. Recommendations of faculty committees for systemic changes be reviewed by the Local School Improvement Council (LSIC) and appropriate areas integrated into the plan.**
- 4. The LSIC president present the plan to the county board rather than the principal.**

- 5. The Team strongly emphasized that the Five-Year Strategic Plan be completely redeveloped to comprise a viable long-range plan to guide the school.**

**6.2.4. Data analysis.** The Team determined that not all teachers were familiar with the data analysis of the statewide assessment. The Team recommended that embedded and sustained staff development be provided in the use of data and that special education teachers be provided the item analysis for special needs students.

#### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.** The principal stated that WESTEST data had been analyzed and used to target instruction. Science and social studies teachers had been provided information and were using it to drive instruction. Teacher interviews confirmed the principal's remarks.

**6.5.3. Statewide assessment.** The Team recommended that a formative assessment or benchmark assessment program be developed based on the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) for all students.

#### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.** The principal said that the county team developed benchmarks using IKNOW and Test Ready.

**6.5.4. Physical assessment.** The Team recommended that the Unified School Improvement Plan (USIP) be revised to address the low performance on the Presidential Physical Fitness Test (PPFT). It may be necessary to include skill specific instruction in the physical education classes based upon the PPFT.

#### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION PARTIALLY FOLLOWED.** The Five-Year Strategic Plan did not include goals, objectives, or action steps for skill specific instruction in physical education. However, the Presidential Physical Fitness Test (PPFT) results improved to 44 percent. The principal said that a wellness class, two conditioning classes, and one weight training class will be included in next year's schedule.

**6.8.1. Leadership.** An assistant principal was primarily responsible for curriculum and instruction. The Team recommended that the principal take a more active leadership role in the areas of curriculum and instruction. The principal must be a mentor and coach for the teaching staff and a leader in school improvement.

#### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION PARTIALLY FOLLOWED.** A new assistant principal, who began in November 2005, was responsible for curriculum and instruction. She did a commendable job in this role and in a short time had guided the development of new programs and had assisted teachers. The principal was only partially involved in curriculum and instruction as he stated he oversees the total school operations and developed the Five-Year Strategic Plan.



## INDICATORS OF EFFICIENCY

Indicators of efficiency for student and school system performance and processes were reviewed in the following areas: Curriculum delivery, including but not limited to, the use of distance learning; facilities; administrative practices; personnel; utilization of regional education service agency, or other regional services that may be established by their assigned regional education service agency. This section contains indicators of efficiency that the Education Performance Audit Team assessed as requiring more efficient and effective application.

The indicators of efficiency listed are intended to guide John Marshall High School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Marshall County is obligated to follow the Indicators of Efficiency noted by the Team. Indicators of Efficiency shall not be used to affect the approval status of Marshall County or the accreditation status of the schools.

**7.1.5. Personnel. The school district assesses the assignment of personnel as based on West Virginia Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies to determine the degree to which instructional and support services provided to the schools establish and support high quality curriculum and instructional services.**

The school and the district should reevaluate the use of study halls to determine if it is the most effective use of staff and instructional time. Students were observed sleeping and doing very little work or studying in the study halls throughout the day. Staff assigned to cover study halls may be more effectively utilized to expand the curricular offerings and increase students' active engagement in the instructional program.

### **FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION**

**The principal said that study halls were more structured and greater discipline was being applied. He stated that students were required to bring work to the study halls. Students with D and F reports were taken from study halls for tutoring.**

## **BUILDING CAPACITY TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES**

- 16.1. Capacity building is a process for targeting resources strategically to improve the teaching and learning process. School and county Unified Improvement Plan development is intended, in part, to provide mechanisms to target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process to improve student, school, and school system performance.**

The Team determined that John Marshall High School and Marshall County have the capacity to correct the identified deficiencies.

### **FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION**

**Marshall County and John Marshall High School had undertaken a number of initiatives and programs and corrected the deficiencies cited in the report. The school achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP), but must continue to move forward on the course charted.**



## **EARLY DETECTION AND INTERVENTION**

One of the most important elements in the Education Performance Audit process is monitoring student progress through early detection and intervention programs.

Data indicated that 7.54 percent of the students in the special education subgroup performed at the proficient level in mathematics and 13.20 percent performed at the proficient level in reading/language arts on the WESTEST. With the low percentage of special education students performing at the proficient level the administration and staff should explore other delivery models to ensure that students master the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs). One option that should be considered is an inclusion model. In addition, the teachers of special education and the administrators should monitor the instruction of special education students to ensure that the students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) are being followed and implemented. Particular attention should be given to instructional modifications that are included in the IEPs.

Furthermore, data indicated that potential achievement deficiencies are looming for the all students (AS) and racial/ethnicity white students (W) subgroups in reading/language arts. Marshall County is urged to seek assistance from RESA VI and the West Virginia Department of Education before these subgroups become an achievement issue.

### **TEAM SUMMARY**

**The Team observed classrooms that were using the “co-teaching” model for instruction. Some classes demonstrated an excellent application of this model, while others needed to continue to refine their instructional approaches. The Team was concerned that in the classes observed, a higher number of special education students were in the classes than general education students. Furthermore, these classes were referred to as “low level” classes. The culture of the school needed to move beyond the selecting and sorting of students.**

## SCHOOL SYSTEM APPROVAL AND SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

School	Accreditation Status	Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards	Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement	Date Certain
48-502 John Marshall High	Full Accreditation			

### Education Performance Audit Summary

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education continue the Full Approval status of the Marshall County School System and continue the Full Accreditation status of John Marshall High School.