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INTRODUCTION

The West Virginia Office of Education Performance Audits conducted an Education Performance Audit of Philippi Middle School in Barbour County on March 30, 2006.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Philippi Middle School in Barbour County was conducted September 25-26, 2007. 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

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

**02 BARBOUR COUNTY**

R. Matthew Kittle, Superintendent

**303 PHILIPPI MIDDLE SCHOOL – Needs Improvement**

James D. Sprouse, Principal

Grades 06 - 08

Enrollment 340

**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 | 326 | 343 | 340 | 99.12 | 72.22 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| White | 312 | 327 | 324 | 99.08 | 72.90 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 231 | 247 | 244 | 98.78 | 68.12 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 77 | 83 | 81 | 97.59 | 30.26 | Yes | Safe Harbors | Made AYP |
| LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Reading/Language Arts** | | | | | | | | |
| All | 326 | 343 | 341 | 99.41 | 70.98 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| White | 312 | 327 | 325 | 99.38 | 71.61 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 231 | 247 | 245 | 99.19 | 65.06 | Yes | Confidence Interval - Averaging | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 77 | 83 | 82 | 98.79 | 23.68 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed**

**Attendance Rate = 97.5%**

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

**02 BARBOUR COUNTY**

R. Matthew Kittle, Superintendent

**303 PHILIPPI MIDDLE SCHOOL – Needs Improvement**

James D. Sprouse, Principal

Grades 06 - 08

Enrollment 313 (2nd month enrollment report)

**WESTEST 2005-2006**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | 293 | 310 | 309 | 99.67 | 64.72 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| White | 281 | 295 | 294 | 99.66 | 66.07 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Low SES | 206 | 220 | 219 | 99.54 | 58.53 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 73 | 79 | 79 | 100.00 | 27.39 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| LEP | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| **Reading/Language Arts** | | | | | | | | |
| All | 293 | 310 | 310 | 100.00 | 69.62 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| White | 281 | 295 | 295 | 100.00 | 71.17 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Low SES | 206 | 220 | 220 | 100.00 | 61.65 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 73 | 79 | 79 | 100.00 | 28.76 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| LEP | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed  
Attendance Rate = 97.4%**

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

**02 BARBOUR COUNTY**

Dr. DeEdra Lundeen, Superintendent

**303 PHILIPPI MIDDLE SCHOOL – Needs Improvement**

James D. Sprouse, Principal

Grades 06 - 08

Enrollment 295 (2nd month enrollment report)

**WESTEST 2006-2007**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | 280 | 294 | 292 | 99.31 | 64.38 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| White | 265 | 278 | 276 | 99.28 | 66.53 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Low SES | 188 | 201 | 199 | 99.00 | 57.52 | Yes | Confidence Interval - Averaging | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 66 | 68 | 66 | 97.05 | 29.68 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| LEP | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| **Reading/Language Arts** | | | | | | | | |
| All | 280 | 294 | 290 | 98.63 | 64.98 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| White | 265 | 278 | 274 | 98.56 | 66.41 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Asian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Low SES | 188 | 201 | 197 | 98.00 | 58.37 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 66 | 68 | 65 | 95.58 | 25.39 | Yes | No | Made AYP |
| LEP | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed  
Attendance Rate = 97.3%**

**The following are staff development programs that had been received by the staff at Philippi Middle School in an effort to increase student achievement.**

1. **GLOBE Science.**
2. **Governor’s Summer Institute.**
3. **NASA Space Camp.**
4. WV Science/Music/Art Conferences.
5. **Writing Roadmap.**
6. **Kaplan Reading.**
7. **Safe and Drug Free Schools.**
8. **Mentor Training.**
9. **School Law.**
10. **Administrator’s Leadership Conference.**
11. **Language Arts/Writing Curriculum and Benchmark Assessments.**
12. **Co-teaching.**
13. **Reading Advantage Intervention.**
14. **WESTEST Data Analysis.**
15. **Mathematics Curriculum Mapping and Benchmark Assessments.**
16. **Internet Safety.**
17. **Marco Polo.**
18. **Macmillan Textbook and Technology Training.**
19. **Informal Reading Screenings and Spelling Inventories.**
20. **DIBELS Reading Screening.**
21. **Scheduling for Tier 1 and Tier 2 Interventions.**
22. **Reading Diagnostic Assessments.**
23. **Classroom Performance System.**

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

**Below Standard.**

**5.1.1. Achievement.**

**Philippi Middle School** **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 9.4 of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, *A Process for Improving Education: Performance Based Accreditation System*, the West Virginia Board of Education upgraded the school’s rating to Conditional Accreditation status at the February 2006 State Board meeting with a May 31, 2008 Date Certain to achieve AYP.**

**Philippi Middle School achieved AYP in the all students (AS), racial/ethnicity white (W), and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups in reading/language arts only by application of the confidence interval and in the special education (SE) subgroup in mathematics 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 close the achievement gap for these students.**

**The Grade 7 Statewide Writing Assessment percent At or Above Mastery (66 percent) was below the county and state’s scores.**

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**NONCOMPLIANCE. Philippi Middle School failed to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the special education (SE) subgroup in mathematics and reading/language arts for the 2006-2007 school year. Additionally, the school failed to achieve AYP for the all students (AS), racial/ethnicity white (W), and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups in reading/language arts. Philippi Middle School achieved AYP in the AS and W subgroups in mathematics only by application of the confidence interval and in the SES subgroup in mathematics by the confidence interval and averaging. Philippi Middle School and Barbour County must aggressively pursue high quality programs and practices to increase student achievement and achieve Full Accreditation status by the May 31, 2008 Date Certain.**

**The Team noted that the staff development and training were specific to the students’ and school’s needs.**

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

**Noncompliances**

**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)**

The Team interviewed teachers and students and found that all teachers were not providing instruction in writing to all students on a weekly basis. While some teachers were teaching writing on a regular basis, many stated that they conducted writing activities only on a sporadic basis. The Team also found that student writing was not consistently collected and corrected for spelling, punctuation, content, and grammar. Writing Assessment percent At or Above Mastery (66 percent) indicated that the school staff needed to emphasize instruction in writing.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. All teachers interviewed indicated that writing assignments were given at least weekly. Journal writing was being conducted in all classes. These writing assignments were corrected for spelling, punctuation, grammar, and content. The Team reviewed samples of student writing.**

**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)**

Teacher interviews, student interviews, and Team observations indicated that technology integration throughout the school was nearly nonexistent in the classrooms. The Team further noted that computer laboratories were minimally utilized throughout the day of the Education Performance Audit and students interviewed confirmed this. Classroom computers were not observed to be used. The Team recommended that the administration move computers from the classrooms into another space to create more computer availability and usage and that the technology be utilized to enhance instruction.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. The school’s two computer laboratories were utilized more than 90 percent of the time. The Team observed high quality lessons during the follow-up education performance audit. Teachers and students stressed the importance of technology and it was one of the major school initiatives. Most teachers were on a two-week rotation into the computer laboratories. All students had weekly exposure to the computer laboratory and more frequent time on classroom computers.**

**6.1.8. Instructional materials. Sufficient numbers of approved up‑to‑date textbooks, instructional materials, and other resources are available to deliver curricular content for the full instructional term. (Policy 2510)**

Team members found that one health textbook series (Glencoe Course 3) was being used for Grades 6, 7, and 8. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to meet the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) for each of these classes using the same textbook each of the three years.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. Grade level textbooks were provided for health classes.**

**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 schoolwide Multicultural Plan had been developed; however, the teachers and students were not able to articulate this plan or the various parts of it. Multicultural activities were described as “Martin Luther King Day, lessons from social studies textbooks, and two speakers.” This did not satisfy the requirements of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2421.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. Teachers and students could discuss at least four major building-wide multicultural activities that had taken place during the 2006-2007 school year. These activities were to be continued through the 2007-2008 school year.**

**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 the school had developed a Five-Year Strategic Plan, the teachers could not articulate the various components of this plan. It was not evident that all teachers were using this document to help drive the curriculum. It was indicated that the principal developed the plan with limited involvement from the staff and had the goals approved by the Local School Improvement Council (LSIC).

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. Although the deadline for submitting the electronic Five-Year Strategic Plan had not yet arrived, the principal and teachers were developing and implementing the initiatives for the plan. These initiatives included increased technology use, increased student attendance, a major reading initiative, comprehensive test mastery/student data analysis and use, and continuing to implement the co-teaching model.**

**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)**

**NEW ISSUE Over half the teachers kept multiple sessions of the same class on the same pace in lesson planning. For example, one Language Arts Grade 8 teacher kept three different classes on the same pace. This practice did not allow for differentiation among the classes.**

**6.2.4. Data analysis. Prior to the beginning of and through the school term the county, school, and teacher have a system for analyzing, interpreting, and using student performance data to identify and assist students who are not at grade level in achieving approved state and local content standards and objectives. The county, principal, counselors, and teachers assess student scores on the American College Test and the Scholastic Aptitude Test and develop curriculum, programs, and/or practices to improve student and school performance. (Policy 2510)**

Teachers reported and the Team observed that the mathematics and reading/language arts teachers were using theWESTEST data;however, there was little or no evidence that the other subject area teachers were using the data.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. Teachers had a complete item analysis set of the WESTEST deficient areas. A packet of modifications for special education students was given to each teacher. Each teacher explained how the data analysis guided curriculum and discussed the continuing process to monitor student progress.**

**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 of West Virginia, 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)**

One item on the latest Fire Marshal Report (2/8/05) had not been corrected. This was stated as “door shall swing toward the means of egress travel in the band room near the band room storage room”.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. All items on the most recent Fire Marshal report had been corrected.**

**6.5. Administrative Practices and School-Community Relations**

**6.5.2. Codes of conduct. The county and schools implement, investigate, and monitor the code of conduct for students and the code of conduct for employees. (W.Va. Code §18‑2E‑5; Policy 4373; Policy 5902)**

Some teachers and students indicated that they did not feel safe at the school. Incidences of student fights had increased this year as well as intimidation by a select group of students. The measures being taken to address this issue appeared to be reactive rather than proactive. Teachers stated that discipline was applied on an inconsistent basis. Teachers reported that, “There is a tolerance for low level incidence of infractions”. Enabling, tolerance and entitlement for disruptive behavior were also evident through Team observations and were supported in teacher interviews.

The Team observed students pushing and shoving throughout the day in the hallways during class changes. Student anger was reported to be an increasing problem at the school. The principal reported that over 100 students had been suspended this school year. Prevention programs as outlined in West Virginia Board Policy 4373, Peer Mediation/Conflict Resolution, Character Education, Student Assistance Teams and programs that address bullying and harassment were not evident.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. Teachers and students stated that they felt safe at the school and that bullying and harassment occurrences were not an issue. The staff had implemented a Character Education program that is conducted each Monday and a Respect and Protect program which provides a proactive approach to prevent bullying and harassment incidents.**

**6.8. Leadership**

**6.8.1. Leadership. Leadership at the school district, school, and classroom levels is demonstrated by vision, school culture and instruction, management and environment, community, and professionalism. (Policy 5500.03)**

Due to the number of deficiencies found at Philippi Middle School, the Team determined that assistance from the central office administration, the West Virginia Department of Education, and RESA VII be sought to assist the building administrator in the operation of the school.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE. The school administrator works closely with the Barbour County Central Office staff and the superintendent concerning student achievement and school climate. The school and county also utilize resources from the West Virginia Department of Education and RESA VII. The Team believes these initiatives will increase student achievement.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**6.1.3. Learning environment.** The ventilation system in the classrooms was set to the automatic position. This did not allow ventilation/circulation to occur during occupancy of the building. The Team recommended that the ventilation system be set to the on position for proper ventilation.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED. Fans in the classrooms were set to the on position.**

**6.1.5. Instructional strategies.** The special education delivery model consisted of a heavy reliance on self-contained classrooms and mainstreaming the higher achieving special education students with no support from the special education department. The Team recommended that collaboration/consultation be conducted to a greater extent and allow special education students exposure to content area specialists.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED. The special education delivery model involved less than five pull-out classes. The remaining classes were mainstream with co-teaching in many classes. The special education teacher was active in delivering the curriculum in each co-teaching class the Team observed.**

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 Philippi Middle School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Barbour 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 Barbour 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.**

It is imperative that the administration, staff, and central office immediately investigate and implement programs that will be proactive in dealing with the increasing instances of bullying and harassment at the school. Teachers and students must feel safe in order for the educational process to be effective, and this was not evident through teacher and student interviews. This issue must be a priority of Philippi Middle School and Barbour County.

The computer laboratories were not being utilized effectively or efficiently. In view of the achievement of the special education (SE) subgroup, the Team determined that this technology should be used consistently for a more efficient and effective application to enhance student learning.

The Five-Year Strategic Plan needed to be effectively implemented and applied to result in improved student, school, and school system performance.

An effective method of analyzing WESTEST data was needed. The information found in these test results must be a driving force behind the planning and implementation of the schoolwide curriculum.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Character Education programs to deal with bullying and harassment were conducted weekly. The Character Education programs and the Respect and Protect program had created the feeling of a safer environment as reported by teachers and students.

Computer usage at the school had greatly increased. Teachers were scheduled to take classes to the computer laboratory two times a week and students used the individual classroom computers more frequently. Students had exposure to technology several times per week.

The school’s Five-Year Strategic Plan included initiatives to address student needs. Technology integration, a comprehensive reading initiative, increased data analysis, and a more aggressive attendance program were components of the plan.

All teachers interviewed discussed how they used the individual item analysis to identify the student weaknesses on the WESTEST and how the data guide their curriculum to increase student achievement. Teachers related the skills individual classes and individual students needed.

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 Philippi Middle School in achieving capacity, the following resources are recommended.

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 Five-Year Strategic Plan was not being utilized to improve the teaching and learning process in the special education (SE) subgroup in reading/language arts. The plan was not used for building capacity of the school for improved performance as it was not developed collaboratively, known by teachers, and implemented schoolwide. Capacity needs to be developed to improve student and school performance through a strong Five-Year Strategic Plan that is comprehensive, targets low performing subgroups, contains specific research-based activities, is implemented schoolwide, and is monitored periodically to assess effectiveness.

Teacher and student safety concerns must be addressed immediately and programs and procedures much be put into place that will assure that the facility is warm, inviting, safe, and conducive to the learning process.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Teachers were aware of the major initiatives of the school and how they will be implementing the school’s Five-Year Strategic Plan. All teachers had the student data and a notebook with the modifications for all special education students.

Teacher and student safety concerns had been addressed since the original Education Performance Audit. Teachers were utilizing the weekly Character Education and the Respect and Protect programs to ensure staff and student safety. Administration, staff, or students had not reported any safety violations.

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.

**17.1.1. School location.** The school site did not have 11 acres + one acre for each 100 students over 600. The site was not suitable for special instructional needs, e.g., outdoor learning.

**17.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** The library did not have newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets for student use.

**17.1.8. Grades 1-12 classrooms.** Rooms 25 and 28 did not have a teacher’s desk and computer station.

**17.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The art area did not have access to natural and artificial light. The music facility was not of adequate size, was not located away from quiet areas of the building, did not have adequate storage, and did not have acoustical treatment. The physical education facility did not have a display case.

**17.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.** All science rooms 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. The following equipment was not available in all science classrooms: AC and DC current, air vacuum, ventilation fume hood, demo table, sufficient laboratory workspace, fire extinguisher, blanket, emergency showers, balance cases, darkening provisions, main gas shut-off, and adequate storage.

**17.1.14. Food service.** The food service area did not have a locker/dressing room.

**17.1.15. Health service units.** The health service unit did not have curtained or small rooms with cots or a work counter.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

**All facility resource needs remained the same as identified in the original Education Performance Audit report with the exception of the following.**

17.1.5. Library/media and technology center. Newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets were available.

17.1.10. Specialized instructional areas. The physical education facility had a display case.

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, Philippi Middle School and Barbour County must implement high yield instructional practices that will improve students’ achievement. Barbour County must actively pursue assistance from RESA VII, 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.

**FOLLOW-UP TEAM SUMMARY**

**Although student performance declined in all but one reporting cell from the 2004-2005 school year to the 2006-2007 school year, programs had been put into place to address student achievement. A strong emphasis had been placed on the reading initiative and technology use and high quality programs had been instituted. An increased effort to address the low attendance, especially that of the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup, will be instrumental in increased achievement. The Team believed that student achievement will increase if these programs are continued and staff development is conducted regularly.**

School Accreditation Status

| **School** | **Accreditation Status** | **Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards** | **Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement** | **Date Certain** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-303 Philippi Middle | Conditional  Accreditation |  | 5.1.1 (AS, W, SES, SE) | May 31, 2008 |

**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 Barbour County School System and continue the Conditional Accreditation status of Philippi Middle School with a May 31, 2008 Date Certain to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP).