**Final Education Performance Audit Report**

 **For**

 **SOUTH MIDDLE SCHOOL**

**MONONGALIA COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**september 2008**

**West Virginia Board of Education**

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of South Middle School in Monongalia County was conducted on December 7, 2005.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of South Middle School in Monongalia County was conducted May 7, 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.

**56 MONONGALIA COUNTY**

Frank Devono, Superintendent

**401 SOUTH MIDDLE SCHOOL – Needs Improvement**

Dennis Gallon, Principal

Grades 06 - 08

Enrollment 757 (2004-05 2nd month enrollment report)

**WESTEST 2004-2005**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Enrolled for FAY** | **Number Enrolled on Test Week** | **Number Tested** | **ParticipationRate** | **Percent Proficient** | **Met Part. Rate Standard** | **Met Assessment Standard** | **Met Subgroup Standard** |
| **Mathematics** |
|   All | 716 | 750 | 739 | 98.53 | 76.62 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   White | 665 | 695 | 686 | 98.70 | 77.01 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   Black | 43 | 47 | 46 | 97.87 | 66.66 | NA | NA | NA |
|   Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Indian | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  |
|   Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Low SES | 281 | 307 | 297 | 96.74 | 58.08 | Yes | Confidence Interval |  |
|   Spec. Ed. | 153 | 166 | 162 | 97.59 | 38.00 | Yes | No |  |
|   LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| **Reading/Language Arts** |
|   All | 716 | 750 | 738 | 98.40 | 78.43 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   White | 665 | 695 | 683 | 98.27 | 79.35 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   Black | 43 | 47 | 47 | 100.00 | 62.79 | NA | NA | NA |
|   Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Indian | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  |
|   Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Low SES | 281 | 307 | 298 | 97.06 | 60.43 | Yes | No |  |
|   Spec. Ed. | 153 | 166 | 162 | 97.59 | 42.00 | Yes | No |  |
|   LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed**

**Attendance Rate = 97.2%56 MONONGALIA COUNTY**

Frank Devono, Superintendent

**401 SOUTH MIDDLE SCHOOL – Needs Improvement**

Dennis Gallon, Principal

Grades 06 - 08

Enrollment 696 (2005-06 2nd month enrollment report)

**WESTEST 2005-2006**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Enrolled for FAY** | **Number Enrolled on Test Week** | **Number Tested** | **ParticipationRate** | **Percent Proficient** | **Met Part. Rate Standard** | **Met Assessment Standard** | **Met Subgroup Standard** |
| **Mathematics** |
|   All | 659 | 703 | 690 | 98.15 | 76.19 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   White | 609 | 648 | 636 | 98.14 | 76.75 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   Black | 41 | 45 | 44 | 97.77 | 65.00 | NA | NA | NA |
|   Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Low SES | 282 | 306 | 296 | 96.73 | 61.90 | Yes | Confidence Interval |  |
|   Spec. Ed. | 137 | 145 | 137 | 94.48 | 35.38 | By Average | No |  |
|   LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| **Reading/Language Arts** |
|   All | 659 | 703 | 690 | 98.15 | 78.51 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   White | 609 | 648 | 636 | 98.14 | 79.09 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   Black | 41 | 45 | 44 | 97.77 | 67.50 | NA | NA | NA |
|   Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Indian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Low SES | 282 | 306 | 298 | 97.38 | 66.05 | Yes | Safe Harbors |  |
|   Spec. Ed. | 137 | 145 | 138 | 95.17 | 38.46 | Yes | No |  |
|   LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed
Attendance Rate = 97.2%**

**56 MONONGALIA COUNTY**

Frank Devono, Superintendent

**401 SOUTH MIDDLE SCHOOL – Needs Improvement**

Dennis Gallon, Principal

Grades 06 - 08

Enrollment 699 (2006-07 2nd month enrollment report)

**WESTEST 2006-2007**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Enrolled for FAY** | **Number Enrolled on Test Week** | **Number Tested** | **ParticipationRate** | **Percent Proficient** | **Met Part. Rate Standard** | **Met Assessment Standard** | **Met Subgroup Standard** |
| **Mathematics** |
|   All | 654 | 688 | 679 | 98.69 | 75.96 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   White | 602 | 634 | 626 | 98.73 | 75.75 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   Black | 41 | 42 | 41 | 97.61 | 75.00 | NA | NA | NA |
|   Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Indian | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  |
|   Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Low SES | 264 | 286 | 278 | 97.20 | 60.93 | Yes | No |  |
|   Spec. Ed. | 124 | 135 | 130 | 96.29 | 27.73 | Yes | No |  |
|   LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| **Reading/Language Arts** |
|   All | 654 | 688 | 679 | 98.69 | 80.80 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   White | 602 | 634 | 626 | 98.73 | 80.84 | Yes | Yes |  |
|   Black | 41 | 42 | 41 | 97.61 | 77.50 | NA | NA | NA |
|   Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Indian | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  | \*  |
|   Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
|   Low SES | 264 | 286 | 279 | 97.55 | 67.82 | Yes | No |  |
|   Spec. Ed. | 124 | 135 | 130 | 96.29 | 35.83 | Yes | No |  |
|   LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed
Attendance Rate = 96.4%**

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

**Below Standard.**

**5.1.1. Achievement.**

 South Middle School failed to achieve adequately yearly progress (AYP) in 5.1.1. Achievement for the economically disadvantaged students (SES) subgroup in reading/language arts and the special education (SE) subgroup in mathematics and 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 continued the school’s Conditional Accreditation status at the September 2005 State Board meeting.

It was further noted that a substantial achievement gap existed for students in the racial/ethnicity black (B), economically disadvantaged (SES), and special education (SE) subgroups and that of the students in the all students (AS) and racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups. An achievement disparity was also prevalent among the subgroups below the percent proficient. For example, racial/ethnicity (B) students achieved higher than economically disadvantaged (SES) students, most notably in mathematics**.**

South Middle School achieved AYP in the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics by application of the confidence interval and may have an achievement deficiency if remediation and interventions have not been emphasized. Additionally, students in the racial/ethnicity black (B) subgroup were not considered in AYP because of the number (N) less than 50 students. Achievement of students in the racial/ethnicity (B) subgroup in reading/language arts was substantially below the State’s proficiency level. Monongalia County curriculum staff and school staff must monitor the achievement of these students and promote instructional strategies and activities that are designed to close the achievement gap.

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

1. CADRE I Reading Initiative.
2. Infusing Literacy into Content Instruction.
3. Overview of Standards Based Mathematics Materials.
4. Reading in Content Areas.
5. WESTEST (How to Prepare Students for the WESTEST).
6. Improving Student Achievement with OnLine Resources.
7. Integrating Understanding by Design into Your Lesson Planning.
8. Marco Polo.
9. Math Around the World.
10. Standards Based Mathematics Activities.
11. Using Rubrics for Evaluation and Learning.
12. Strategic Reading.
13. Teaching with Technology.
14. Generational Poverty.
15. The Differentiated Classroom: Different Strategies for Different Learners.
16. ACT EXPLORE and PLAN Update.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**MET STANDARD. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, *A Process for Improving Education*-*Performance Based Accreditation System* in Section §126-13-6 provides:**

**6.1. A system of points on an index will be used to assess and weigh annual performance measures for state accreditation of schools and approval of school systems that gives credit or points on an index to prevent any one measure alone from causing a school to achieve less than full accreditation status or a school system from achieving less than full approval status: Provided, That a school or school system that achieves AYP is eligible for no less than full accreditation or full approval status, as applicable, and the system established pursuant to this subsection shall only apply to schools and school systems that do not achieve AYP.**

**The index showed that South Middle School performed within the point range (841-724) for full accreditation status.**

**On the 2007 WESTEST South Middle School failed to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the economically disadvantaged (SES) and the special education (SE) subgroups in mathematics and reading/language arts. The school showed modest achievement gains in mathematics and reading/language arts in the SES subgroup.**

**The school staff continued to improve through professional development in areas such as Writing Across the Curriculum, Co-Teaching Training, book study of Debbie Silver’s “Drumming to the Beat of Different Marchers”, Differentiated Instruction, Marzano’s Effective Instructional Strategies, etc. The staff continued to use WESTEST results and the county Educational Testing Service (ETS) benchmarking results to identify student academic weaknesses and target instruction to address student needs.**

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

**Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.**

**6.1. Curriculum**

* + 1. **Curriculum based on content standards and objectives. The curriculum is based on the content standards and objectives approved by the West Virginia Board of Education. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)**

The Team interviewed teachers and observed classrooms and determined that some teachers were not utilizing the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) to direct their curriculum. Some teachers referred to the West Virginia Board of Education Instructional Goals and Objectives (IGOs) instead of the CSOs.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. All teachers had copies of the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) in their plan books and used the CSOs to prepare the weekly lesson plans.**

**6.1.2. High expectations. Through curricular offerings, instructional practices, and administrative practices, staff demonstrates high expectations for the learning and achieving of all students and all students have equal education opportunities including reteaching, enrichment, and acceleration. (Policy 2510)**

When the Team interviewed the grade level teachers during their planning period, several teachers in one grade level team responded, “It is a problem of genetics,” when referring to the rationale explaining the low tests scores. Most teachers were not able to articulate how high expectations are conveyed to students.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. Interviews with teachers produced discussions of several ways teachers demonstrated high expectations for students, such as not accepting incomplete work or exempting students from completing assigned work. Special education students had been included into the core classes and teachers were pleased with the achievement of these students. Team observations of activities in several classrooms verified that all students were actively engaged in the learning process.**

**6.1.3. Learning environment. School staff provides a safe and nurturing environment that is conducive to learning. (Policy 2510)**

Special education classrooms had more than two core subjects and grade levels scheduled per period throughout the day. This practice made it difficult, if not impossible, to deliver a high level of effective instruction. Given the achievement scores of the special education (SE) subgroup, this practice impeded student learning and achievement.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. The special education program had been revamped and most special education students were scheduled into core classrooms with support provided by special education co-teachers. The remaining special education classrooms did not have more than one subject per period.**

**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 varied instructional strategies and best practices for instruction. Instruction in many of the classes observed relied upon direct instruction with worksheets, reading, and whole group instruction. When the administration was asked how instructional strategies are implemented or demonstrated, the response was that they monitor through lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs. However, classroom observations and lesson plan reviews failed to validate this. Additionally, students were not engaged in activities that promoted higher order thinking skills.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. The faculty received training in using varied, effective instructional strategies. Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews provided evidence the staff development programs on varied instruction and effective instructional techniques were being implemented. Students in classrooms observed were actively involved in learning activities and were using higher order thinking skills such as observation, analyzing, and evaluating.**

**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 some teachers were fully implementing instruction in writing (as demonstrated in student portfolios), but other teachers were not providing instruction in writing to all students on a weekly basis. The Team also found that numerous teachers did not collect and correct student writing for spelling, punctuation, content, and grammar after giving students writing assignments.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed student writing samples from a variety of subjects. The school academic coach provided extensive training to the staff on teaching writing in all curriculum areas. This has been effective and all teachers provide instruction in writing and students were writing in all 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)**

The Team was not presented a multicultural plan. When the principal was asked to present the plan, he provided an agenda for an upcoming meeting at the school level to discuss this plan December 6, 2006. The audit date was December 7, 2005. No formal plan was in place on the date of the audit, although the county is addressing a countywide plan. Additionally, the Team observed minimal multicultural activities in place throughout the building.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. A school committee designed the Multicultural Plan for the school. Teachers implemented the schoolwide plan and added additional programs for individual classes.**

**6.2. Student and School Performance**

* + 1. **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 reported that some lesson plans had not been checked by the administration. A lesson plan review schedule was in place; however, some plans were vague and could not be followed by substitute teachers. Given the deficiencies in the special education (SE) subgroup and the performance of the economically disadvantaged (SES) and the racial/ethnicity black (B) subgroups, it is important that the administrators review plans and assure that lessons are coherent, relevant, sequential, and address students’ learning needs. The Team did not see a direct relationship of the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) in the lessons. One teacher did not have lesson plans for the date of the audit or for the remaining two days of the week.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. The Follow-up Education Performance Audit Team reviewed lesson plans filed in the school office and reviewed lesson plan books in classrooms. This review verified that the school administrators reviewed lesson plans quarterly. The Team verified that the plans were complete enough to be effectively used by a substitute teacher. Teacher lesson plans showed the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) being taught in each lesson.**

**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)**

The Team observed that the principal had worked closely with the faculty to develop a strong family culture at the school; however, the school had not advanced to the next step of improvement concerning WESTEST data analysis, varied instructional strategies, differentiated instruction, and the West Virginia Writing Assessment. The administrative team needed to develop an overall plan that brings the Curriculum Team and administration together to address economically disadvantaged (SES), special education (SE), and racial/ethnicity black (B) low assessment results. These meetings need minutes and records and results shared with the Faculty Senate.

The administration could not provide the Team members specific indications of staff meetings. When interviewed, the principal explained that faculty meetings were held on the first Tuesday of each month; however, the Team visited on the first Wednesday and nothing supported any such meeting on the Tuesday preceding the audit. The Team believed strengthened communication between the administration and the staff would improve student achievement issues and assure a schoolwide achievement goal.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE. The principal developed a school leadership team to provide advice and direction on the school’s operation. This team was instrumental in developing the school’s Five-Year Strategic Plan and other schoolwide initiatives. The overall school plan was driven by student achievement. Actions to implement the plan included implementation of a schedule change to provide time during the school day (ninth period) for reteaching activities for all students, implementation of an effective In School Suspension (ISS) room as part of the Positive Behavior Support program, and a system of analyzing WESTEST results and county ETS benchmarking results to identify student academic needs and design instructional strategies to address these needs.**

**The Follow-up Team reviewed faculty meeting agendas which were held monthly. Discussions were held on items such as test data analysis and classroom data uses, writing across the curriculum, and staff development opportunities. The school faculty was organized into grade level teams that had common planning periods. The principal met with each team monthly to discuss efforts to improve student achievement and additional support needed.**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**6.2.1. Unified County and School Improvement Plan.** The Team observed that while the school had a Five-Year Strategic Plan in place, the staff did not follow some of the items in the plan. Specifically, the activity stated in the plan, “Teachers will begin each class with a sample WESTEST question,” was not observed or shown in lesson plans. The Team recommended that the administration review the Five-Year Strategic Plan with staff members and ensure that the plan is implemented fully to enhance student achievement.

**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED. Each member of the faculty had a bound copy of the school’s Five-Year Strategic Plan. The principal led faculty discussions on the school’s goals and objectives, high yield practices, work plans, etc. The Team interviewed members and verified they were knowledgeable of the school’s goals and strategies to meet the goals.**

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 South Middle School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Monongalia 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 Monongalia 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.**

Given the seriousness of the deficiencies found, it is imperative that a concerted effort be made by the staff of South Middle School and Monongalia County to eliminate these issues. Each of the deficiencies reported has a detrimental impact on student achievement; when all are combined, the results can be less than acceptable.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

**The principal provided leadership and professional developmental to the faculty to improve their teaching skills and methods to vary instructional strategies to keep students on task during instruction. Additional staff development on effective instructional strategies was also provided. The faculty worked cooperatively to analyze student academic needs as shown on the WESTEST and county benchmarking tests and designed classroom activities to target specific needs. The school was provided an academic coach who was instrumental in providing teachers’ support in targeting instruction to the identified student needs. The faculty appeared to be working hard to address the learning of all students at South Middle School and was anxiously awaiting the measure of their efforts on the 2008 WESTEST.**

**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 South Middle School and Monongalia County have the capacity to correct the identified deficiencies. However, given the high number and diversity of the issues found assistance from RESA VII and the West Virginia Department of Education must be received. The administration at the school has only been in place less than four years and has made great changes at the school. The Team believed that they have the ability to correct the deficiencies, but assistance from the two groups mentioned above will help expedite this process.

**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;**

Monongalia County has provided an abundance of staff development in programs and practices to improve student performance. It would be beneficial if staff development programs were continuous and sustained to lead to the results of improved student performance. Student specific levels of achievement need to have weaknesses addressed with learning sequences applied to students’ prior knowledge. Assessment must be ongoing with identified criteria linked to students’ mastery of the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs).

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

**Monongalia County provided an achievement benchmarking program through ETS which was used three or four times during the year to measure student achievement on criteria in the Content Standards and Objectives (CSO). Teachers used student achievement information gained from the benchmarking tests to identify skill weaknesses and target instruction.**

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 site was not 11 acres plus one acre for each 100 students over 600. The site was not large enough for future expansion.

**17.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The art facility was not of adequate size, did not have adequate storage, and did not have two deep sinks.

**17.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.** The science facilities were not of adequate size and did not have a sink, hot and cold water, gas, and adequate storage.

**FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION**

**The facility resource needs remained the same as identified in the Draft Education Performance Audit Report.**

**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 students (SES), special education (SE), and racial/ethnicity black (B) subgroups, South Middle School and Monongalia County must implement high yield instructional practices that will improve students’ achievement. Monongalia 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. Instructional activities must be data-driven and instruction must be relevant to the curriculum and provide all students the opportunity to learn.

**FOLLOW-UP TEAM SUMMARY**

**Staff development programs continued to be provided by the county, RESA VII, the West Virginia Department of Education, and the West Virginia Center for Professional Development that were designed to improve instructional strategies teachers use in the classrooms. Teachers continued to implement these strategies. Data from WESTEST and county benchmarking were analyzed to identify weaknesses in student achievement and these weaknesses were targeted for more attention in classrooms. South Middle School has designated a time period in each instructional day to specifically target instruction to the identified student weaknesses. The staff was awaiting the 2008 WESTEST results to see the effects of their efforts on student achievement.**

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education continue South Middle School’s previous accreditation status until the 2008 performance data are analyzed and the 2008 Report of Ratings is approved by the West Virginia Board of Education.