



**Office of Education  
Performance Audits**

**FINAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT  
FOR  
POINT PLEASANT INTERMEDIATE  
MASON COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM  
JUNE 2008**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

## **INTRODUCTION**

An announced Education Performance Audit of Point Pleasant Intermediate School in Mason County was conducted on January 23, 2007.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Point Pleasant Intermediate School was conducted March 6, 2008. 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.

### 49 MASON COUNTY

Dr. Larry E. Parsons, Superintendent

### 218 POINT PLEASANT INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL – Needs Improvement

Paul E. Ashby, Principal

Grades 03 - 06

Enrollment 376 (2005-2006 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>Mathematics</b>								
All	350	375	375	100.00	67.71	Yes	Yes	✓
White	334	359	359	100.00	67.66	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	14	14	14	100.00	64.28	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Low SES	179	200	200	100.00	55.86	Yes	No	✗
Spec. Ed.	66	71	71	100.00	36.36	Yes	No	✗
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>								
All	350	375	375	100.00	76.28	Yes	Yes	✓
White	334	359	359	100.00	75.74	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	14	14	14	100.00	85.71	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Low SES	179	200	200	100.00	66.48	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	66	71	71	100.00	43.93	Yes	No	✗
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed**  
**Attendance Rate = 97.4%**

**49 MASON COUNTY**  
Dr. Larry E. Parsons, Superintendent  
**218 POINT PLEASANT INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL – Passed**  
Paul E. Ashby, Principal  
Grades 03 - 06  
Enrollment 382 (2006-2007 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>Mathematics</b>								
All	347	368	365	99.18	70.34	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	337	358	355	99.16	69.76	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	10	10	10	100.00	90.00	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	201	218	215	98.62	61.61	Yes	Safe Harbors	✓
Spec. Ed.	71	73	71	97.26	44.92	Yes	Safe Harbors	✓
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>								
All	347	368	366	99.45	76.52	Yes	Yes	✓
White	337	358	356	99.44	76.11	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	10	10	10	100.00	90.00	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	201	218	216	99.08	69.34	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	71	73	72	98.63	50.00	Yes	Safe Harbors	✓
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year  
\* -- 0 students in subgroup  
\*\* -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

**Passed**  
**Attendance Rate = 96.5%**

## **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **Below Standard.**

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

**Point Pleasant Intermediate School failed to achieve adequately yearly progress (AYP) in Achievement for the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics and the special education (SE) subgroup 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 October 2006 State Board meeting.**

**Point Pleasant Intermediate School achieved AYP in the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in reading/language arts subgroup only by application of the confidence interval. The county curriculum staff and school staff are urged to address this subgroup in the county and school Five-Year Strategic Plans and apply interventions to close the achievement gap for the SES students. Furthermore, the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Information by Class Data showed that 42.71 percent of Grade 4 students and 33.34 percent of Grade 5 students were below mastery in mathematics. Grades 3 and 6 students fared somewhat better, but a high percentage of students in both grades were below mastery (Grade 3 – 26.92 percent; Grade 6 – 24.41 percent). Class data for reading showed: Grade 3 – 21.80 percent below mastery; Grade 4 – 25.00 percent below mastery; Grade 5 – 31.11 percent below mastery; and Grade 6 – 16.28 percent below mastery.**

**The Grade 4 Statewide Writing Assessment performance was less than the county and State level with Point Pleasant Intermediate School's students at 68 percent at or Above Mastery compared to 70 percent for Mason County and 75 percent for West Virginia.**

The following professional development and/or training opportunities were provided.

1. WESTEST Analysis.
2. Food Allergy Training.
3. Title I School Improvement.
4. CSR Grant Training.
5. Shurley Method Training.
6. Wellness Policy.
7. School Choice Parent Meeting.
8. DIBELS Training.
9. Writing Strategies.
10. Point Pleasant Intermediate Summer Academy.

## **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**MET STANDARD.** Point Pleasant Intermediate School met adequate yearly progress (AYP) in all subgroups in 2007; however, this was enabled by application of the confidence interval for the all students (AS) and racial ethnicity/white (W) subgroups in mathematics and the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in reading/language arts, and the safe harbors provision for the SES and special education (SE) subgroups in mathematics and the SE subgroup in reading/language arts.

## **EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT**

### **HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS**

**Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress to Meet the Standard (5.1.1. – SES/SE)**

#### **7.1. Curriculum**

**7.1.9. Programs of study.** Programs of study are provided in grades K-12 as listed in Policy 2510 for elementary, middle, and high school levels, including career clusters and majors and an opportunity to examine a system of career clusters in grades 5-8 and to select a career cluster to explore in grades 9 and 10. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)

The Team interviewed faculty, students, staff, and administration and found that art was not being taught as a separate subject.

Chart IV Middle Level (5-8) of Policy 2510 states, "These required courses are considered part of the encore curriculum and shall be taught at each grade level each year as separate subjects with adequate time to achieve mastery of the West Virginia Content Standards and Objectives." The chart specifies Visual Art.

## **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** The master schedule and teachers' lesson plans showed that art was being taught as a separate subject in Grades 3, 4, 5, and 6.

#### **7.2. Student and School Performance**

**7.2.2. Counseling services.** Counselors shall spend at least 75 percent of the work day in a direct counseling relationship with students, and shall devote no more than 25 percent of the work day to counseling-related administrative activities as stated in W.Va. Code §18-5-18b. (W.Va. Code §18-5-18b; Policy 2315)

The delivery of developmental guidance was not apparent at all grade levels. Additionally, Grade 3 students and teachers reported that this grade level had very little guidance service as of the date of the Education Performance Audit. One counselor was available two days a week. The Team recommended that a developmental guidance schedule be constructed and distributed at the beginning of the year. The Team furthered recommended that students in all grade levels receive counseling services.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** The Team reviewed the counselor's schedule which had been distributed to the school staff. The schedule showed all classes at all grade levels receiving developmental guidance and time provided for individual student guidance counseling. The school still had guidance counselor services only two days a week.

**7.2.3. 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)

The Team observed classrooms, interviewed teachers, and reviewed lessons and found that several teachers did not have written lesson plans or could not explain that the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) were being covered. Lesson plans needed to be developed by all teachers in advance and ensure that the CSOs are delivered. West Virginia Board of Education policies and sound educational practices require planning that provides teachers direction for delivering the CSOs and ensuring curriculum sequencing and continuity. Given the performance of the economically disadvantaged (SES) and special education (SE) subgroups, it is particularly important that lesson plans be prepared in advance and the principal review and comment on them for instructional relevance.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** All teachers were being required to prepare lesson plans. Core teachers' lesson plans were due on Thursday afternoon. The appropriate core teachers' lesson plans were being provided to special education and Title I teachers on Friday so these support teachers could coordinate their plans with the core teachers' lesson plans. All lesson plans were due to the principal on Monday. The lesson plans are reviewed by the principal and comments made as necessary, and the plans are returned to the teachers. The Team reviewed lesson plans and found this system to be working well.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**7.1.4. Instruction.** Collaboration opportunities did not exist between general education, special education, Title I, and the technology teachers so that instructional objectives could be synchronized. The Team recommended that administration and faculty explore ways that provide teacher opportunities to develop instructional strategies in the master schedule or through an alternate format.

A common planning opportunity did not exist for grade level teachers. The Team recommended that a master schedule be developed to provide grade level teachers a common planning period.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.** The school master schedule allowed two core teachers at each grade level to plan together two days a week. During a week all core teachers were able to plan together with other grade level teachers for some of the days.

**Time was being provided once a month for grade level teachers to meet and plan together after the school day with teachers being paid a stipend for their time. The principal hoped to expand this schedule next year to allow all grade level teachers to plan together daily.**

**7.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.** The Team found that teachers were not utilizing technology to effectively supplement instruction due to lack of staff development opportunities and input regarding schoolwide technology purchases. While teachers were utilizing technology in the curricular areas, they did not employ technology in the non-curricular supportive areas. The Team recommended that teachers better utilize computers through consistent scheduling, provide input on schoolwide technology purchases, and incorporate technology related staff development into the Five-Year Strategic Plan. Teachers were spending an inordinate amount of time completing the grading process each grading period. The Team recommended that teachers utilize a technology-based program to assist teachers with this process.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.** Teachers had been involved in determining the schoolwide technology purchases. The school purchased interactive electronic Whiteboards for most classrooms and had plans to purchase interactive electronic Whiteboards for all the classrooms. The GradeQuick electronic grading program had been provided and teachers were being trained to use the program.



## **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 Point Pleasant Intermediate School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Mason 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 Mason County or the accreditation status of the schools.

**8.1.1. 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 Five-Year Strategic Plan needed to be effectively implemented and applied to result in improved student, school, and school system performance. The curriculum was missing art, developmental guidance, and a counseling curriculum.

### **FOLLOW- UP CONCLUSION**

**The Five-Year Strategic Plan was being implemented to improve student and school performance. The curriculum included art as a separate subject in all classes. The guidance counselor was implementing the developmental guidance curriculum through the developmental guidance program. The appropriate portions of the curriculum were being taught to all students in all grade levels.**

## **BUILDING CAPACITY TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES**

- 18.1. Capacity building is a process for targeting resources strategically to improve the teaching and learning process. School and county electronic strategic 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.**

Capacity building needs to be developed for educators at the school in strategically targeting resources to the teaching and learning process as indicated in the Five-Year Strategic Plan to improve student and school achievement.

### **FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION**

**The school staff was involved in analyzing student achievement data and this data were being used to target instruction to students who showed weaknesses on skill development on the testing programs (WESTEST and DIBELS). The staff spent four days in September 2007 analyzing data to identify all students who scored five points below or five points above mastery on WESTEST and individual students' specific skill deficiencies. Teachers planned instruction that targeted the deficiencies in student skill achievement from this analysis. This information was being used during this school year and student progress was being monitored with DIBELS.**

## **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 economically disadvantaged (SES) and special education (SE) subgroups, Point Pleasant Intermediate School and Mason County must implement high yield instructional practices and 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning skills that will improve students' achievement. Mason County must actively pursue assistance from RESA II, the West Virginia Department of Education, and the West Virginia Center for Professional Development to assist with school improvement efforts. Instruction must be relevant to the curriculum and provide all students the opportunity to learn.

### **FOLLOW-UP TEAM SUMMARY**

**Technical assistance had been provided by Mason County Schools, RESA II, the West Virginia Department of Education, and the West Virginia Center for Professional Development to improve student achievement. Some of the activities provided include:**

- 1. Staff Development on effective instructional strategies.**
- 2. Strategies for teaching reading.**
- 3. Training in special education teaching techniques.**
- 4. County Teacher Academy.**
- 5. Technology leadership.**
- 6. External facilitators to train teachers.**
- 7. Reading First.**

### SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

<b>School</b>	<b>Accreditation Status</b>	<b>Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards</b>	<b>Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement</b>	<b>Date Certain</b>
49-218 Point Pleasant Intermediate	Full Accreditation			

### Education Performance Audit Summary

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education continue the Full Accreditation status of Point Pleasant Intermediate School.