

OFFICE OF EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDITS



DRAFT EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY CENTER

WOOD COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

APRIL 2006

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|-----------|
| Introduction..... | 2 |
| Education Performance Audit Team | 2 |
| School Performance | 3 |
| Annual Performance Measures For Accountability | 6 |
| Education Performance Audit | 8 |
| Initiatives For Achieving Adequate Yearly Progress | 8 |
| High Quality Standards..... | 9 |
| Indicators Of Efficiency | 11 |
| Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies | 12 |
| Identification Of Resource Needs | 13 |
| Early Detection And Intervention | 14 |
| School Accreditation Status | 15 |

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Jefferson Elementary Center in Wood County was conducted on March 14, 2006. The review was conducted at the specific direction of the West Virginia Board of Education. The purpose of the review was to investigate the reasons for performance and progress that are persistently below standard and to make recommendations to the school and school system, as appropriate, and to the West Virginia Board of Education on such measures as it considers necessary to improve performance and progress to meet the standard.

The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed the Five-Year Strategic Plan, interviewed school personnel and school system administrators, observed classrooms, and examined school records. The review was limited in scope and concentrated on the subgroups that failed to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP).

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Allen Brock, Coordinator

West Virginia Department of Education Team Leader – Sterling Beane, Jr., Coordinator, Office of Technology Instruction

West Virginia Department of Education Team Leader – Bruce Hollis, Coordinator, GEAR UP

West Virginia Department of Education Team Leader – Lisa Youell, Closing the Achievement Gap (CAG) Liaison, Office of School Improvement

TEAM MEMBERS

| Name | Title | School/County |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Don Bower | Elementary School Principal | Beale Elementary Mason County |
| Denver Drake | Middle School Principal | Braxton County Middle Braxton County |
| Tod Faller | Director of Staff Development and School Improvement | Mason County |
| Dr. Mary Harris-John | Assistant Professor | Marshall University |
| Lesa Hines | Director of Instruction | Gilmer County |
| Rhonda Judy | Middle School Assistant Principal | Robert L. Bland Middle Lewis County |
| Dr. Jack Kaufman | Professor of Education | Mercer County |
| Mary Alice Kaufman | Board Member | Mercer County |

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

This section presents the Annual Performance Measures for Accountability and the Education Performance Audit Team's findings.

96 WOOD COUNTY

William A. Niday, Superintendent

211 JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY CENTER – Needs Improvement

Edward J. Alfred, Principal

Grades K - 06

Enrollment 636

WESTEST 2004-2005

| 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 |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | |
| All | 279 | 315 | 314 | 99.68 | 68.10 | Yes | Yes | ✓ |
| White | 267 | 300 | 299 | 99.66 | 67.79 | Yes | Yes | ✓ |
| Black | 11 | 12 | 12 | 100.00 | 72.72 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 202 | 231 | 230 | 99.56 | 65.84 | Yes | Confidence Interval | ✓ |
| Spec. Ed. | 67 | 79 | 79 | 100.00 | 38.80 | Yes | Safe Harbors | ✓ |
| LEP | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |
| Reading/Language Arts | | | | | | | | |
| All | 279 | 315 | 314 | 99.68 | 69.53 | Yes | Confidence Interval | ✓ |
| White | 267 | 300 | 299 | 99.66 | 68.91 | Yes | Confidence Interval | ✓ |
| Black | 11 | 12 | 12 | 100.00 | 81.81 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 202 | 231 | 230 | 99.56 | 65.84 | Yes | Confidence Interval | ✓ |
| Spec. Ed. | 67 | 79 | 79 | 100.00 | 23.88 | Yes | No | ✗ |
| LEP | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | NA | NA | NA |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Attendance Rate = 97.5%

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 |
| 03 | 74 | 62 | 74 | 62 | 100.00 | 11.29 | 16.13 | 50.00 | 20.97 | 1.61 | 72.58 |
| 04 | 82 | 69 | 81 | 69 | 98.78 | 4.35 | 33.33 | 37.68 | 23.19 | 1.45 | 62.32 |
| 05 | 82 | 75 | 82 | 75 | 100.00 | 9.33 | 17.33 | 52.00 | 18.67 | 2.67 | 73.33 |
| 06 | 77 | 73 | 77 | 73 | 100.00 | 12.33 | 23.29 | 42.47 | 20.55 | 1.37 | 64.38 |

| Reading | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Class | Tested Enr. | FAY Enr. | Tested | FAY Tested | Part. Rate | Novice | Below Mastery | Mastery | Above Mastery | Distinguished | Proficient |
| 03 | 74 | 62 | 74 | 62 | 100.00 | 11.29 | 27.42 | 35.48 | 24.19 | 1.61 | 61.29 |
| 04 | 82 | 69 | 81 | 69 | 98.78 | 8.70 | 15.94 | 50.72 | 15.94 | 8.70 | 75.36 |
| 05 | 82 | 75 | 82 | 75 | 100.00 | 8.00 | 17.33 | 41.33 | 32.00 | 1.33 | 74.67 |
| 06 | 77 | 73 | 77 | 73 | 100.00 | 8.22 | 26.03 | 39.73 | 21.92 | 4.11 | 65.75 |

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

Other Relevant Performance Data

2004-2005 Writing Assessment Distribution of Performance Across All Performance Levels Grade 4

| | Total # Tested | % Novice | % Partial Mastery | % Mastery | % Above Mastery | % Distinguished | % Below # Mastery | % At or # Above Mastery |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| STATE – WV | 20498 | 4% | 19% | 49% | 18% | 5% | 24% | 74% |
| WOOD COUNTY | 1035 | 3% | 19% | 56% | 15% | 4% | 22% | 76% |
| JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY | 79 | 2% | 28% | 50% | 12% | 3% | 30% | 66% |

**Physical Assessment – Presidential Physical Fitness Test
Passage Rate**

| Percentage of Students | School Year |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 51.20% | 2003-04 |
| 42.60% | 2002-03 |
| Not Available | 2001-02 |

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Below Standard.

5.1.1. Achievement.

Jefferson Elementary Center failed to achieve adequately yearly progress (AYP) in 5.1.1. Achievement for the special education (SE) subgroup in 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 2005 State Board meeting. The school revised its Five-Year Strategic Plan and was upgraded to Conditional Accreditation status at the February 2006 State Board meeting.

Jefferson Elementary Center achieved AYP in the all students (AS) and the racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups in reading/language arts and the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics and reading/language arts only by application of the confidence interval. It is further noted that Jefferson Elementary Center achieved AYP in the SE subgroup in mathematics only by the safe harbors provision. The county curriculum staff and school staff are urged to address these subgroups in the county and school Five-Year Strategic Plans and apply interventions to improve achievement of all students.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Information By Class data showed the combined percent of students Below Mastery and Novice in mathematics to be very high (over 30 percent) for Grades 4 and 6. The combined percent of students Below Mastery and Novice in reading was above 30 percent for Grades 3 and 6. Additionally, the Grade 4 Statewide Writing Assessment percent At or Above Mastery (66 percent) was below the county and state's scores. These have implications for direct and high-yield instructional strategies to improve achievement of all students.

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

1. Title I Improvement.
2. DIBELS.
3. Individualized Education Plan (IEP).
4. Explicit, Systematic Phonics.
5. Mentor.
6. Pre-School Evaluation.
7. WVEIS.
8. CSR School Reform/Needs Assessment.
9. Book Study/*Classroom Instructional Strategies that Work* -- Marzano.
10. Literacy Stations.

11. Compass training.
12. Mathematics Leadership.
13. West Virginia Reading Conference.
14. Reading Assessment.
15. Sounds Abounds.
16. Mathscape.
17. Alternate Assessment/Special Education.
18. NCLB School of Reform.
19. Reading Techniques with Jan McNeel.
20. Sondag System Curriculum training.
21. Scaffolding/Benchmark Assessments.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

INITIATIVES FOR ACHIEVING ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

The Education Performance Audit Team reported that Jefferson Elementary Center had undertaken initiatives for achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The prominent initiatives and activities included the following.

- 6.1.5. Instructional strategies.** Three Title I teachers developed a Math Cart in which different lessons and remedial programs are housed and may be taken into the classrooms. This was a wonderful resource to supplement general educators' lessons without the necessity of leaving the classroom to gather the resources.

Collaboration and team teaching between the general education and Title I teachers were excellent. It was evident that these teachers were working to provide quality instruction and support for student learning.

The Team commended the grade level teachers for their efforts to provide a high-quality education for all students. Time-on-task, varieties of instructional strategies, and high expectations were evident across a broad range of the classes.

The Title I teachers had begun supporting the special education classes last school year (2004-2005). Data indicated that this support was effective in promoting achievement for these students.

- 6.1.12. Multicultural activities.** The school had developed a comprehensive Multicultural Plan that had been articulated across all grade levels. Evidence indicated that the plan was being fully implemented. The Team believed that the quality of this plan would make a good example for other schools that may benefit from a model plan.

- 6.5.1. Parents and the community are provided information.** One Grade 5 teacher developed a student report that was sent home to each student on a weekly basis. This report provided feedback on the previous weeks lessons. This was an excellent method of communicating to parents and informing them about their child's education.

HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress to Meet the Standard (5.1.1 - SE)

6.1. Curriculum

- 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)**

While the general education teachers were implementing writing in an effective manner through the Kansas Writing program, the Team could not verify that instruction in writing was being conducted in the special education classes on a weekly basis. The school was eight percentage points behind Wood County and 10 percentage points behind the State mastery level on the 2004-2005 Writing Assessment.

6.2. Student and School Performance

- 6.2.1. Unified County and School Improvement Plan. A Unified County Improvement Plan and a Unified School Improvement Plan are established, implemented, and reviewed annually. Each respective plan shall be a five-year plan that includes the mission and goals of the school or school system to improve student or school system performance or progress. The plan shall be revised annually in each area in which the school or system is below the standard on the annual performance measures.**

While most of the teachers interviewed were aware of the various components of the Five-Year Strategic Plan, the special education teachers were not aware of this document. They could not articulate the goals and the action steps of the plan. Given the deficiency of the special education (SE) subgroup, these teachers needed to be involved in developing the plan as well as implementing the action steps specific to special education students' achievement needs.

Title I teachers did not have collaborative planning with the general education teachers during the workday. These teachers meet one evening every other week to meet with the general education teachers. Collaborative planning is a part of the school's Five-Year Strategic Plan.

- 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)**

While most of the lesson plans observed were thorough, concise, and well-developed, the Team reviewed some plans that were not as well developed and lacked evidence of written feedback from the administrators to improve instruction. The administrators must continue to review all lesson plans and provide written feedback to teachers to assure that lesson plans are of a high quality and are designed to improve instruction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1.4. Instruction.** The pre-school special needs teachers were not being provided a planning period in conjunction with the general education teachers. These teachers have had their planning periods bought out by the county and have expressed a desire for the planning period to have time to meet with the other teachers. The Team recommended that the pre-school special needs teachers receive a planning period equal to that of the general education teachers.

The special education teachers did not have a collaborative planning period with the general education teachers. The Team believed that it would be beneficial for these teachers to have a common planning period to facilitate a greater level of communication for special education students to receive the support that they need to be successful.

- 6.1.5. Instructional strategies.** Twenty-six students identified as learning disabled (LD) attended the school with only one LD teacher. The Team believed that this was too high a ratio to achieve the highest levels of student success. The Team recommended that the school and county investigate methods to decrease this case load to assure that the educational needs of students with learning disabilities are given the requisite attention to maximize success.

- 6.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.** An abundance of technology was available throughout the building; however, the music and art teachers indicated that they either did not have computers in their classrooms or the computers that they had were out-dated. An abundance of educational materials for these classes is available through technology, but it would be necessary that a number of computers be dedicated to these classrooms to facilitate this. The Team recommended that the school administrators investigate avenues to procure computers for the art and music classrooms.

- 6.7.2. Policy implementation.** The pre-school teachers indicated that they were not made aware of the West Virginia Department of Education Universal Pre-School Plan and the Wood County initiative to meet the mandate of this plan by 2012. The Team recommended that the county provide staff development on the Universal Pre-School Plan to inform the pre-school staff of the pre-school plan components and Wood County's initiatives to meet the requirements of this 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 Jefferson Elementary Center in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Wood 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 Wood County or the accreditation status of the schools.

7.1.1. Curriculum. The school district and school conduct an annual curriculum audit regarding student curricular requests and overall school curriculum needs, including distance learning in combination with accessible and available resources.

The school had taken a proactive approach to improve student achievement in the special education (SE) subgroup. Collaboration between the general education teachers, special education teachers, and Title I teachers was a major school endeavor. The Team strongly encourages this initiative to continue and be further developed to improve student achievement.

Building Capacity to Correct Deficiencies

West Virginia Code §18-2E-5 establishes that the needed resources are available to assist the school or school system in achieving the standards and alleviating the deficiencies identified in the assessment and accountability process. To assist Jefferson Elementary Center in achieving capacity, the following resources are recommended.

| HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS | RECOMMENDED RESOURCES |
|--|---|
| 6.1.6. Instruction in writing. | West Virginia Department of Education Office of Instructional Services (304) 558-7805 |
| 6.2.1. Unified County and School Improvement Plan. | West Virginia Department of Education Office of Instructional Services (304) 558-7805 |
| 6.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback. | West Virginia Department of Education Office of Instructional Services (304) 558-7805 |

16.3.2. Determining the areas of weakness and of ineffectiveness that appear to have contributed to the substandard performance of students or the deficiencies of the school or school system;

Under the direction of the principal and assistant principal, Jefferson Elementary Center has initiated programs to correct deficiencies in the special education (SE) subgroup. These initiatives, when properly applied, will produce positive achievement results for all subgroups. Wood County central office staff has been providing assistance and programs are being investigated that will help to increase student achievement at all levels.

Identification of Resource Needs

A thorough and efficient system of schools requires the provision of an adequate level of appropriately managed resources. The West Virginia Board of Education adopted resource evaluation as a part of the accreditation and evaluation process. This process is intended to meaningfully evaluate the needs for facilities, personnel, curriculum, equipment and materials in each of the county's schools and how those impact program and student performance.

- 17.1. Facilities, equipment, and materials.** Facilities and equipment specified in Policy 6200, Chapters 1 through 14, are available in all schools, classrooms, and other required areas. A determination will be made by using the Process for Improving Education (W.Va. Code §18-2E-5) whether any identified deficiencies adversely impact and impair the delivery of a high quality educational program if it is below the West Virginia Board of Education standards due to inadequacies or inappropriate management in the areas of facilities, equipment, and materials. The Education Performance Audit Teams shall utilize an assessment instrument for the evaluation of school facilities which generally follows the requirements of Policy 6200. Note: Corrective measures to be taken in response to any identified resource deficiency will of necessity be subject to the feasibility of modifying existing facilities, consideration of alternative methods of instructional delivery, availability of funding, and prioritization of educational needs through Comprehensive Educational Facilities Plans and the West Virginia School Building Authority. This policy does not change the authority, judgment, or priorities of the School Building Authority who is statutorily responsible for prioritizing "Need" for the purpose of funding school improvements or school construction in the State of West Virginia or the prerogative of the Legislature in providing resources. (Policy 6200 and *Tomblin v. Gainer*)

According to the items checked in the School Facilities Evaluation Checklist, the school was below standard in the following areas. The principal checked and the Team confirmed the following school facility resource needs.

- 17.1.7. K classrooms.** The Kindergarten classrooms were not of adequate size.
- 17.1.8. Grades 1-12 classrooms.** The academic learning areas were not of adequate size.
- 17.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The art facility was not of adequate size. The music facility was not of adequate size and lacked adequate storage.
- 17.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.** The science facilities were not of adequate size and were not located with easy access to outdoor activities and isolated to keep odors from the remainder of the building.

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.

Given the achievement levels of students in the special education (SE) subgroup, Jefferson Elementary Center and Wood County must continue to implement high-yield instructional practices and instruction that will improve students' achievement. Furthermore, Jefferson Elementary Center must be diligent in efforts with the all students (AS) and the racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups in reading/language arts and the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics and reading/language arts as the assessed standard was met by application of the confidence interval. Wood County must pursue assistance from RESA V, the West Virginia Department of Education, and the West Virginia Center for Professional Development to assist with school improvement efforts. Curriculum must be data-driven and instruction must be relevant to the curriculum and provide all students the opportunity to learn.

School Accreditation Status

| School | Accreditation Status | Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards | Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement | Date Certain |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--------------|
| 96-211 Jefferson Elementary | Conditional Accreditation | 6.1.6; 6.2.1; 6.2.3 | | |
| | | | 5.1.1 (SE) | May 31, 2007 |

Education Performance Audit Summary

The Team identified three high quality standards – necessary to improve performance and progress to meet 5.1.1 Achievement – for the special education (SE) subgroup. The Team also presented three school initiatives for achieving adequate yearly progress (AYP) and four recommendations. The Team noted an indicator of efficiency, offered capacity building resources, and noted an early detection and intervention concern.

Jefferson Elementary Center’s Education Performance Audit was limited in scope to the performance standards and progress related to student and school performance in the area of deficiency (5.1.1 SE). The Team also conducted a resource evaluation to assess the resource needs of the school. The Team submits this draft report to guide Jefferson Elementary Center in improvement efforts. The school and county have until the next accreditation cycle to correct deficiencies noted in the report and a May 31, 2007 Date Certain to achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).