



INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

H. E. WHITE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CLAY COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

MAY 2014

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Education Performance Audit Team	2
School Performance	3
Annual Performance Measures For Accountability - Analysis	9
Education Performance Audit.....	10
High Quality Standards	10
Indicators Of Efficiency.....	15
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	16
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	17
Early Detection And Intervention	18
Education Performance Audit Summary	19

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of H. E. White Elementary School in Clay County was conducted March 12, 2014. The review was conducted at the specific direction of the West Virginia Board of Education. The purpose of the review was two-fold. The primary purpose was to investigate the reason for performance and progress that are persistently below standard. Secondly, the purpose was to make recommendations to the school, school system, as appropriate, and West Virginia Board of Education on such matters as it considers necessary to improve performance and progress to meet the standard.

The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed the Five-Year Strategic Improvement Plan, interviewed six school personnel and one school system administrator, observed nine classrooms, and examined school records.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Charlene Coburn, Coordinator
Elementary Education

Office of Early Learning West Virginia Department of Education – Lynn Baker,
Coordinator

TEAM MEMBERS

Name	Title	County
Angela Amick	Principal - Panther Creek Elementary	Nicholas County
Eva Marcum	Assistant Principal – Logan Middle School	Logan County
Don Johnson	Retired Elementary Principal	Braxton County

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

16 CLAY COUNTY

Kenneth Tanner, Superintendent

208 H. E. WHITE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – TRANSITION

April Kearns, Principal

Grades PK-5, Enrollment 102

In 2013, West Virginia received waiver approval from certain federal rules and deadlines under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). West Virginia received approval to use its own accountability system which was developed to more effectively identify struggling schools and better direct resources to these schools (2013 ESEA Results). Every public school in the state is designated as a **SUCCESS, TRANSITION, FOCUS, SUPPORT** or **PRIORITY** school.

The West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI) designated H. E. White Elementary School a Transition school. Transition schools are those schools that have either met their target based on their WVAI score or demonstrated that a majority of their subgroups were making academic progress against the annual academic goals in mathematics and reading/language arts, or the school had reached its goals in attendance or graduation rates. Transition schools may have demonstrated some combination of low achievement, achievement gaps, low growth or low attendance/graduation rates. The school must show progress in student achievement each year to maintain or improve this designation. A school's designation is determined once a year based on prior school year data, including WESTEST2 results.

Designation Status for H. E. White Elementary School.

Designation:	TRANSITION	Next Year's Target:	50.7128
Index Score:	34.6599	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	46.7203	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

Supporting Data

Proficiency (60% of the index score)	13.79
Achievement Gaps Closed (0% of the index score)	N/A
Observed Growth (15% of the index score)	7.50
Adequate Growth (20% of the index score)	8.50
<u>Attendance Rate (5% of the index score)</u>	<u>4.87</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	34.66

The West Virginia Accountability Index targets were set for each school to reach progressively higher performance on a defined set of data. Schools have an overall score based on multiple components of student and school performance. All schools were required to meet the same end point, thus defining school-specific trajectories requiring higher rates of improvement for lower performing schools. Targets comprised of the five components listed above were set with a goal of all elementary schools in West Virginia reaching 74.6679 by 2020. Proficiency targets were set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

H. E. White Elementary School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year. When considering the index target of 50.71 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 34.66, H. E. White Elementary School has a steep trajectory to achieve both the short term and long term targets. A significant gap exists between current performance of each subgroup and the target of 75 percent.

- H. E. White Elementary School earned 34.66 of the 100 points possible for the West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI) for the 2012-2013 school year. (The target was 46.72 for 2013 and is 50.71 for 2014.)
- 50 percent of the subgroups at H. E. White Elementary School met the targets in mathematics and reading.
- H. E. White Elementary School acquired 8.50 points of the 20 points possible for adequate growth as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.
- H. E. White Elementary School acquired 4.87 points of the 5 possible points for attendance rate as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.

H. E. WHITE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Grade Level Proficiency Data
School Year 2013

Grade-Level and Subgroup		Mathematics			Reading/Language Arts		
Grade	Group	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient
3	White	93.33%	42.86%	57.14%	93.33%	71.43%	28.57%
3	Special Education	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%
3	Total	93.33%	42.86%	57.14%	93.33%	71.43%	28.57%
4	White	93.75%	80.00%	20.00%	93.75%	53.33%	46.67%
4	Black	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
4	Special Education	66.67%	50.00%	50.00%	66.67%	>95%	< 5%
4	Total	94.12%	81.25%	18.75%	94.12%	56.25%	43.75%
5	White	> 95%	55.56%	44.44%	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%
5	Special Education	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
5	Total	> 95%	55.56%	44.44%	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%

Attendance Rate = 97.40%

The chart, Grade-Level Proficiency Data for School Year 2013, depicts participation, non-proficient, and proficient percentage rates by grade level and subgroup for mathematics and reading/language arts. An analysis of grade level performance follows.

Mathematics

Grade 3 students at 57.14 percent proficient outperformed Grade 4 students (18.75 percent proficient) and Grade 5 students (44.44 percent proficient) in mathematics.

Grades 3, 4, and 5 special education students achieved 50 percent proficient in mathematics.

Less than 5 percent of black students were proficient in mathematics.

Reading/Language Arts

Grade 4 students at 43.75 percent proficient outperformed Grade 3 students (28.57 percent proficient) and Grade 5 students (33.33 percent proficient) in reading/language arts.

Special education students showed the greatest proficiency rate in Grade 3 at 50 percent proficient in reading/language art compared to Grades 4 and 5 (Less than 5 percent proficient).

Less than 5 percent of black students were proficient in reading/language arts.

**H. E. WHITE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Growth Model School Level Summary
Results by Sub-Group**

**Note: Numbers below represent those students who have at least 1 prior consecutive WESTEST 2 score.*

Low	between 1-34th percentile
Typical	between 35th-65th percentile
High	between 66th-99th percentile

Subgroup		Mathematics 2013					Reading/Language Arts 2013				
		Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient	Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient
All Sub-Group	School	11 (44%)	6 (24%)	8 (32%)	38.0	36.6%	7 (29%)	8 (33%)	9 (38%)	55.0	36.6%
	County	336 (33%)	324 (32%)	349 (35%)	51.0	46.2%	300 (30%)	305 (31%)	395 (40%)	55.0	52.0%
	State	51,165 (35%)	45,256 (31%)	50,057 (34%)	50.0	45.1%	50,484 (35%)	45,076 (31%)	50,227 (34%)	50.0	48.8%
White Sub-Group	School	10 (42%)	6 (25%)	8 (33%)	38.0	37.5%	7 (30%)	7 (30%)	9 (39%)	55.0	37.5%
	County	330 (33%)	323 (32%)	349 (35%)	51.0	46.6%	297 (30%)	301 (30%)	395 (40%)	55.0	52.2%
	State	47,034 (35%)	41,704 (31%)	46,085 (34%)	50.0	45.7%	46,584 (35%)	41,462 (31%)	46,170 (34%)	50.0	49.2%
Spec.Ed Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	29.0	42.9%	*	*	*	59.0	28.6%
	County	39 (36%)	35 (32%)	34 (31%)	47.0	26.6%	38 (35%)	28 (26%)	42 (39%)	53.0	19.5%
	State	7,956 (43%)	5,628 (31%)	4,781 (26%)	41.0	18.3%	7,406 (41%)	5,488 (30%)	5,291 (29%)	43.0	16.1%
Non-Spec.Ed Sub-Group	School	9 (43%)	6 (29%)	6 (29%)	38.0	35.3%	6 (30%)	7 (35%)	7 (35%)	52.0	38.2%
	County	297 (33%)	289 (32%)	315 (35%)	52.0	49.1%	262 (29%)	277 (31%)	353 (40%)	56.0	56.7%
	State	43,209 (34%)	39,628 (31%)	45,276 (35%)	51.0	49.6%	43,078 (34%)	39,588 (31%)	44,936 (35%)	51.0	54.2%
LSES Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	23.0	36.6%	*	*	*	70.0	36.6%
	County	206 (35%)	186 (31%)	204 (34%)	50.0	46.2%	171 (29%)	172 (29%)	245 (42%)	58.0	52.0%
	State	26,545 (38%)	21,619 (31%)	22,119 (31%)	47.0	37.5%	25,763 (37%)	21,435 (31%)	22,576 (32%)	47.0	40.8%
Non-LSES Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	45.0	(NA)	*	*	*	40.0	(NA)
	County	130 (31%)	138 (33%)	145 (35%)	53.0	(NA)	129 (31%)	133 (32%)	150 (36%)	52.0	(NA)
	State	24,620 (32%)	23,637 (31%)	27,938 (37%)	52.0	58.1%	24,721 (33%)	23,641 (31%)	27,651 (36%)	52.0	62.5%
Male Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	41.0	37.5%	*	*	*	28.0	29.2%
	County	183 (36%)	157 (31%)	162 (32%)	49.0	43.8%	163 (33%)	155 (31%)	180 (36%)	51.0	43.0%
	State	27,113 (37%)	22,439 (30%)	24,615 (33%)	48.0	44.3%	27,485 (37%)	22,259 (30%)	24,047 (33%)	47.0	41.0%
Female Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	29.0	35.3%	*	*	*	56.0	47.1%
	County	153 (30%)	167 (33%)	187 (37%)	53.0	48.6%	137 (27%)	150 (30%)	215 (43%)	59.0	61.1%
	State	24,052 (33%)	22,817 (32%)	25,442 (35%)	51.0	45.9%	22,999 (32%)	22,817 (32%)	26,180 (36%)	52.0	56.9%

**Note: Schools are those schools that have at least a 4th grade.*

**Denotes cell size <20.*

The Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group chart identifies the percent proficient in each subgroup compared to the county and State averages. In addition, subgroup growth is examined and determined to be low (red cells), typical (yellow cells), or high growth (green cells) based on previous performance. This chart does not include Grade 3; it only includes the scores of students who previously participated in the WESTEST2 assessment.

Mathematics

The all and white subgroups demonstrated typical growth in mathematics while the special education, low socioeconomic, and female subgroups (all comprised of 19 students or less) demonstrated low growth.

36.6 percent of students were proficient in mathematics as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.

42.9 percent of the special education subgroup was proficient in mathematics compared to the non-special education subgroup with 35.3 percent proficient.

The low socioeconomic subgroup performance (36.6 percent proficient) mirrored schoolwide proficiency (36.6 percent proficient) in mathematics.

37.5 percent of males and 35.3 percent of females were proficient in mathematics.

Reading/Language Arts

The low socioeconomic subgroup demonstrated high growth while the male subgroup demonstrated low growth and the other subgroups demonstrated typical growth.

36.6 percent of students were proficient in reading/language arts as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.

28.6 percent of the special education subgroup was proficient in reading/language arts as compared to the non-special education subgroup with 38.2 percent proficient, which indicated a 9.6 percent gap.

29.2 percent of the male subgroup was proficient in reading/language arts and 47.1 percent of the female subgroup was proficient in reading/language arts, which indicated an achievement gap of 17.9 percent.

The low socioeconomic subgroup (36.6 percent proficient) mirrored the schoolwide proficiency (36.6 percent proficient) in reading/language arts.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY - ANALYSIS

Analysis of the data indicated H. E. White Elementary School demonstrated pockets of typical growth. Lack of adequate growth will make it challenging to sustain the gains accomplished by some subgroups. It is evident that the staff has made an impact in reading/language arts instruction for low socioeconomic students. The data indicated a need to provide additional support to the special education subgroup in mathematics and reading/language arts. Overall, the scores for reading/language arts were significantly lower than the mathematics scores, with the exception Grade 4. The data indicated a need to provide support to the staff in reading/language arts instruction.

The following professional development and/or training opportunities were provided as reported by the principal.

Date	Professional Development Session
August 21, 2013	Data Analysis
August 21, 2013	Back to School Policies and Procedures
October 14, 2013	Wellness Policy/Strategic Plan
January 17, 2014	Data/Strategic Plan
February 7, 2014	Formative Assessment/Strategies
February 7, 2014	Diagnostic Evaluation

Prior to the Education Performance Audit, the OEPA staff provided an in-service to H. E. White Elementary School staff December 10, 2013, to review the indicators in Policy 2320 and prepare staff for the audit. An open dialogue took place and issues from the last on-site review were discussed.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.

7.1. CURRICULUM.

7.1.1. 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 could not verify the curriculum in most classrooms was based on the approved content standards and objectives. One Kindergarten teacher was using the math textbook to plan instruction versus using the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. While most teachers had copies of the standards, interviews revealed teachers were struggling with a clear understanding of the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. While one teacher stated s/he had not received training on the West Virginia Next Generation Standards and had to refer to a copy of the standards to recall the name of the standards, another teacher stated s/he had attended two trainings; however, this teacher could not articulate the shifts in mathematics instruction. This teacher was not using the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. Instead, the teacher was utilizing a copy of the Common Core Standards; thereby, omitting the grade level priorities set forth by the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. Three teachers were using the standards as a checklist of skills taught. This indicated the teachers did not understand the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objective are what students should know, understand, and do. When asked how teachers retaught standards, the teachers did not articulate a plan for assisting students if they had not mastered the standards.

7.1.2. 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)

The Team noted that while two teachers had high expectations for students, the remaining teachers used low-level, recall questioning and round robin reading with students. During one observation of round robin reading instruction, only six of 14 students were following along with the text. The Team indicated this was the case in all classrooms where this type of instruction occurred.

The Team noted minimal student work displayed in classrooms. Student writing posted in the hall was below grade level expectations when compared to the West Virginia Next Generation English/Language Arts Content Standards and Objectives. Observations

and reviews of lesson plans revealed a heavy reliance on textbooks and worksheets in all classrooms.

The Team determined the staff did not exhibit a diagnostic approach to teaching and student learning. A system for student intervention was not in place. Teachers talked about small group instruction, but the Team could not verify intensive or targeted instruction was occurring. When asked if data were used to inform instruction, one teacher stated, "I'm tired of looking at data." Comments such as this contributed to a culture of low expectations.

The Team determined teachers were nurturing to the students at H. E. White Elementary School and as a result they were teaching to the level students could be successful versus challenging students with high expectations. While it is important to nurture students, this does not preclude presenting high level curriculum and instruction to improve student learning and achievement.

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

It was evident that the teachers at H. E. White Elementary School were responsive and cared about the physical well-being of the students. Student behavior was positive and the attendance rate for H. E. White Elementary was among the highest in Clay County. The Team reported the learning environment in most classrooms consisted of students sitting in straight rows with limited opportunity for student collaboration. One classroom was extremely cluttered and left little space for instructing students or student learning opportunities. This classroom had numerous stacks of materials, worksheets, and textbooks. Excessive furniture in the classroom prohibited student movement. The overall facility needed a thorough cleaning. The blinds in most rooms were dusty and the walls were dirty and scuffed. Many of the classrooms were decorated with purchased faded posters. The overall appearance of classrooms was not inviting.

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

Teachers did not use various instructional strategies. The Team observed a heavy reliance on worksheets, round robin reading, and teacher lecture in three classrooms. Instruction was delivered in a whole group setting in all classrooms. A Team member observed a classroom in which the teacher lectured for 45 minutes combined with round robin reading. The lesson did not include student conversation or collaborative learning. One student put his head down on the desk, one student played with a marker, and one played with scissors. After 20 minutes of lecturing, 11 students were disengaged. After 40 minutes most all students were disengaged. The teacher did not redirect the students who were off task.

7.1.6. 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 reported writing instruction was occurring weekly, although the instruction was not aligned with West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. Student writing samples were below grade level expectations. Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews indicated a lack of evidence that writing was a routine part of all classes. Team members could not substantiate students were receiving feedback on the writing assignments observed or that writing was occurring across the curriculum. Review of the professional development offerings indicated the school had not provided all teachers technical assistance and professional development in understanding the writing process and in grading students' work. The Team recommended that writing instruction become a schoolwide focus

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

The Team noted the school schedule did not include time for students to access the library. The school library was small and cluttered with storage items. All classrooms lacked books for children to read by choice, pleasure, or for research purposes. The Team determined recreational reading was not encouraged due to the lack of reading materials available to students in classroom libraries and that books were not displayed in classrooms to peak student interest.

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 could not verify through interviews or observations that science was being instructed with 50 percent minimum hands-on investigation and experimentation in all classes. Lesson plans indicated science lessons consisted primarily of textbook activities and worksheets. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2520.3, *21st Century Science K-8 Content Standard and Objectives for West Virginia Schools*, states, "Students will engage in active inquiries, investigations, and hands on activities for a minimum of 50 percent of the instructional time to develop conceptual understanding and research/laboratory skills."

7.2. STUDENT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE.

7.2.2. 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)

The Team determined some staff met prior to the beginning of the year to analyze WESTEST2 data, while two teachers indicated they were not involved in analysis of the student performance data. Interviews with teachers indicated even those who participated in the analysis session were not familiar with the gender differences in reading/language arts performance results, the achievement gap that existed between the special education and non-special education students in reading/language arts, or that special education students outperformed non-special education students in mathematics.

While the principal indicated Dynamic Indicators for Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) was used to group students for small group instruction, the Team did not verify the results were utilized to guide instruction. Interviews revealed H. E. White Elementary School did not have a process, such as data team meetings or professional learning community meetings in place to analyze student data throughout the school year to support personalized learning.

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 concluded that the principal reviewed lesson plans on a regular basis and provided comments such as, “good job”, “good work”, and “small groups.” In consideration of the low achievement results, the principal needs to expand lesson plan reviews to include constructive feedback targeting ineffective or inappropriate strategies being implemented with supportive suggestions on strengthening instruction to better meet students’ needs. Most importantly, it is essential the principal follow up on these suggestions to ensure their implementation.

7.6. PERSONNEL.

7.6.2. Licensure. Professional educators and other professional employees required to be licensed under West Virginia Board of Education policy are licensed for their assignments including employees engaged in extracurricular activities. (W.Va. Code §18A-3-2; Policy 5202)

One Title I teacher did not hold a Multi-subject or Elementary Education Endorsement and did not meet the definition of highly qualified.

7.8. LEADERSHIP.

7.8.1. 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 principal made a strong effort to be available to the staff and provide a positive environment for students and teachers. The principal was supported by staff as evidenced through teacher interviews and the RESA 3 Diagnostic Report.

The principal was compliant and implemented most of the compliance guidelines and recommended programs set forth by the West Virginia Department of Education; however, the principal's focus on compliancy had impacted curriculum and instruction. The principal reported spending 85 percent of her time dealing with managerial issues compared to the time spent dealing with curriculum and instruction. In the absence of a secretary, it was expected that the principal would be responsible for some clerical responsibilities, such as responding to the door buzzer, collecting faxes, and answering the phone. The Team determined the principal needed to develop a balanced leadership structure to address the managerial and curricular demands of the small school. The principal indicated all teachers were on the leadership team for the school. The Team concluded a smaller leadership team would better assist the school with developing a formal process that provides focus for improved student achievement.

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 H. E. White Elementary School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Clay 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 Clay 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 school lacked a sound plan to address the delivery of the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. It is crucial that the school develop a plan for delivering English/language arts standards. Due to exceptionally low achievement in reading/language arts, the principal and staff must assure that quality reading and writing instruction occurs at all grade levels. The Team believed that student achievement will increase in reading/language arts if teachers are provided ongoing, embedded professional development offerings personalized to H. E. White Elementary School. The Team also recommended the principal and staff utilize the Wednesday morning team meeting time to become more familiar with the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives, review student work, and analyze data to plan differentiated reading and writing instruction to meet the needs of all students. The principal is in the classrooms routinely; however, the school lacked a structured system of classroom walkthroughs to gauge progress on instructional priorities.

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 H. E. White Elementary School in achieving capacity, the following resources are recommended.

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.

Building Capacity - Transition School

The school and students will receive additional support by request. The majority of services will be led by the local school district, with support from the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) and the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE). The school will complete a targeted strategic plan and will be monitored occasionally for progress. The local school systems may partner with the local RESA and others to provide professional development, technical assistance, and interventions.

Due to low achievement in reading/language arts and the teachers' need for a better understanding of the current math standards, the Team recommended both areas become a prioritized focus for professional development offerings personalized to H. E. White Elementary School. While the West Virginia Next Generation Mathematics Content Standards and Objectives were being utilized, the Team recommended the school leadership team, with support of central office personnel, develop an ongoing, embedded professional development plan to provide support to all teachers in the delivery of the West Virginia Next Generation Math and English/Language Arts Content Standards and Objectives.

The Team recommended the school leadership team, with central office staff, plan ongoing, embedded professional development at the school which includes opportunities for teachers to analyze examples of exemplary writing at each grade level. Meanwhile, the Team recommended the staff utilize the website, corestandards.org, in which Appendix C provides student writing samples that have been annotated to illustrate the criteria required to meet the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives for writing Grades K-12.

The Team further recommended the school follow through with the recommendations provided in the RESA 3 Diagnostic Report which was the result of a diagnostic visit conducted February 5, 2014.

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.

19.1. 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 of West Virginia 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.

19.1.2. Administrative and service facilities. The administrative office area did not include reception/waiting area. (Did not adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.5. Library/media and technology center. The library did not have an electronic card catalog, automated circulation capacity, or on-line periodical indexes. (Did not adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas. Art and music classes were conducted in the multi-purpose room. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.14. Food service. A teachers' dining area of adequate size was not available. A locker/dressing room was not provided. (Did not adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.15. Health service units. The health services unit was not of adequate size and did not contain small rooms, curtains, cots, scales or a refrigerator with locked storage. (May adversely impact student health and safety.)

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.

The 2013-2014 “5-17 Percent Needy Report” indicated 64 percent of the students at H. E. White Elementary School were economically disadvantaged. This coupled with low student achievement expedites the need to assure a process is in place to assist school staff in providing quality core instruction and intervention to students needing targeted or intensive support. In order to increase achievement and close subgroup gaps, it is crucial that the school strengthen core instruction to provide support for personalized learning. It is vital that time is provided for classroom, special education, and Title I teachers to plan for differentiated instruction. The Wednesday morning meetings could be transformed to a professional learning community constructed to provide time for vertical teaming, analyzing Instructional Practices Inventory data, formative assessments, and student work. This could provide an opportunity for teachers to set goals around specific areas of instruction they want to strengthen while also establishing short term goals for student achievement.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

H. E. White Elementary School's Education Performance Audit examined performance and progress standards related to student and school performance. The Team also conducted a resource evaluation to assess the resource needs of the school. The Team submits this initial report to guide H. E. White Elementary School in improvement efforts.

The Team identified 11 high quality standards necessary to improve performance and progress.

7.1.1 Curriculum based on content standards and objectives.

7.1.2 High expectations.

7.1.3 Learning environment.

7.1.5 Instructional strategies.

7.1.6 Instruction in writing.

7.1.7 Library/educational technology access and technology application.

7.1.9 Programs of study.

7.2.2 Data analysis

7.2.3 Lesson plans and principal feedback

7.6.2 Licensure

7.8.1 Leadership.

The Team noted one indicator of efficiency, offered capacity building resources, and noted an early detection and intervention concern.

Section 17.10. of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320 states:

If during an on-site review, a school or county board is found to be in noncompliance with one or more standards, the school and county electronic strategic improvement plans must be revised and shall be submitted to the West Virginia Board of Education within 30 days of receipt of the draft written report. The plans shall include objectives, a time line, a plan for evaluation of the success of the improvements, a cost estimate and a date certain for achieving full accreditation and/or full approval status as applicable.

Based upon the results of the Education Performance Audit, the Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education direct H. E. White Elementary School and Clay County to revise the school's Five-Year Strategic Plan within 30 days and correct the findings noted in the report by the next accreditation cycle.