



**Office of Education  
Performance Audits**

**DRAFT EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**GRANT COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**NOVEMBER 2009**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

# Table of Contents

Page

**Introduction .....2**

**Education Performance Audit Team.....3**

**Initiatives For Achieving Adequate Yearly Progress .....4**

**Annual Performance Measures For Accountability.....5**

**High Quality Standards .....16**

**Capacity Building.....62**

**Recommendation .....63**

## INTRODUCTION

An announced (five days in advance) Education Performance Audit of the Grant County School District was conducted on October 6-8, 2009 and October 15-16, 2009. The review was conducted at the specific direction of the West Virginia Board of Education. The purpose of the review was to investigate reasons the county had not achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP) during the past five years and other existing circumstances that warranted an on-site review. The Team also reviewed district level high-quality standards in accordance with appropriate procedures to make recommendations to the West Virginia Board of Education on such measures as it considers necessary to improve performance and progress to meet the high-quality standards as required by W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies.

The Education Performance Audit Team interviewed the Grant County Board of Education President and board members, school district personnel including the interim superintendent, the Finance official, Director of Elementary Education, and other county office personnel, and teachers. The Team also interviewed the former superintendent, parents, community members, and business leaders. The Team examined documents including the Grant County Five-Year Strategic Improvement Plan; agendas and minutes of meetings of the Grant County Board of Education; personnel documents; personnel evaluations; the school system policy manual; regulatory agency reviews, i.e., financial audit, the Comprehensive Educational Facilities Plan (CEFP), etc.; and letters, faxes, and materials of interest to the Education Performance Audit.

This report presents the Education Performance Audit Team's findings regarding the Grant County School District.

**GRANT COUNTY  
EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM  
October 6-8, 2009**

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Dr. Donna Davis, Deputy Director.

<b>NAME</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
Denise White	Coordinator, Instruction & Prof. Development	Office of Instruction, WVDE	AYP/ /High Quality Standards
David Price	Coordinator	Office of, Organizational Effectiveness & Leadership, WVDE	AYP/Five-Year Strategic Plan
Delores Ranson	Retired Assistant Superintendent, Personnel	Jackson County Schools	Personnel - Hiring/Licensure/ Internship
Shawn Hawkins	Coordinator, Teacher Quality	Office of Professional Preparation, WVDE	Certification
Jody Lucas	Chief School Business Official	Cabell County Schools	Finance
Dr. Joe Super	Superintendent	Pleasants County Schools	Policy Implementation/ Administration
Bill Elswick & staff	Executive Director	Office of School Facilities, WVDE	Facilities
Carroll Staats	Member, County Board of Education	Jackson County Schools	Evaluation/Leadership
Bernard Hott	Member, County Board of Education	Hampshire County Schools	Leadership

## **EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT**

### **INITIATIVES FOR ACHIEVING ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS**

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

Two literacy coaches were located at Petersburg Elementary and assigned primarily (80 percent of their time) to that school and the remaining time at Petersburg High School, the two schools in Grant County that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the past five years. Their primary duties are to conduct model lessons, provide professional development for county teachers, and analyze data. A central office staff member indicated that the literacy coaches conducted professional development on Acuity, Writing RoadMap and techSteps. Teachers from across the county can request services from a literacy coach through a form on the Grant County website.

## COUNTY PERFORMANCE

### ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

This section presents the Annual Performance Measures for Accountability and related student performance data. It also presents the Education Performance Audit Team's findings.

#### 5.1. ACCOUNTABILITY.

##### 5.1.1. Achievement.

##### Adequate Yearly Progress

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) data for the 2008-2009 school year identified that Grant County did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP). Grant County failed to achieve AYP for the last five consecutive years. Chart 1 shows the grade span/assessment and subgroup(s) that did not make AYP for 2008-2009. It also shows the percent proficient for each grade span/assessment and subgroup.

The Team noted that when the performance of these subgroups listed in Chart 1 compared with the 2007-2008 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) data, all special education (SE) subgroups identified above were less proficient in academic performance in mathematics and reading at both the elementary and secondary programmatic levels.

Chart 1

<b>WESTEST</b>		
<b>GRADE SPAN/ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>2008-2009 PERCENT PROFICIENT</b>	<b>2007-2008 PERCENT PROFICIENT</b>
Mathematics – Elementary (SE)	29.6%	47.2%
Mathematics – Secondary (SE)	19.4%	30.1%
Reading – Elementary (SE)	27.6%	49.1%
Reading – Secondary (SE)	16.1%	32.4%

\* SE – Special Education

Chart 2 showed that in the last five years, the same two Grant County's schools were identified for not achieving AYP – Petersburg Elementary and Petersburg High School.

Chart 2

<b>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS NOT ACHIEVING AYP</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
2005	2
2006	2
2007	2
2008	2
2009	2

An examination of the achievement gap between subgroups for the 2008-2009 assessment school year revealed a measurable achievement gap between the special education (SE) subgroup when compared to the academic performance of the all students (AS) and racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups (Charts 3-8).

Charts three and five indicated that the 2008-2009 Grant County School District student percent proficient in mathematics was consistently below the State percent proficient, except for the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup at the high school level. Student assessment performance in reading/language arts (Charts 6 and 8) was below the 2008-2009 State percent proficient at the elementary level in all subgroups. Performance in reading/language arts at the high school level was above the State percent proficient in all subgroups. Middle school mathematics and reading data were included with the high school data, since both high schools contained Grades 7-12.

Chart 3

<b>ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS 2008-2009</b>		
<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>State Percent Proficient</b>
All Students (AS)	57.3%	65.2%
White (W)	57.4%	65.7%
Black (B)	NA	54.6%
Special Education (SE)	29.6%	40.9%
Economically Disadvantaged (SES)	51.9%	56.0%

Chart 4

<b>MIDDLE MATHEMATICS 2008-2009</b>		
<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>State Percent Proficient</b>
All Students (AS)	*	56.9%
White (W)	*	57.6%
Black (B)	*	42.3%
Special Education (SE)	*	23.1%
Economically Disadvantaged (SES)	*	46.4%

\* Not Applicable – Middle level students attend the high schools (Grades 7-12).

Chart 5

<b>HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS 2008-2009</b>		
<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>State Percent Proficient</b>
All Students (AS)	56.2%	56.9%
White (W)	56.6%	57.5%
Black (B)	NA	44.3%
Special Education (SE)	19.4%	21.6%
Economically Disadvantaged (SES)	52.5%	46.0%

Chart 6

<b>ELEMENTARY READING/LANGUAGE ARTS 2008-2009</b>		
<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>State Percent Proficient</b>
All Students (AS)	62.9%	65.5%
White (W)	63.0%	65.9%
Black (B)	NA	57.8%
Special Education (SE)	27.6%	32.8%
Economically Disadvantaged (SES)	55.0%	56.1%

Chart 7

<b>MIDDLE READING/LANGUAGE ARTS 2008-2009</b>		
<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>State Percent Proficient</b>
All Students (AS)	*	63.2%
White (W)	*	63.5%
Black (B)	*	54.9%
Special Education (SE)	*	22.6%
Economically Disadvantaged (SES)	*	52.8%

\* Not Applicable – Middle level students attend the high schools (Grades 7-12).

Chart 8

<b>HIGH SCHOOL READING/LANGUAGE ARTS 2008-2009</b>		
<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>State Percent Proficient</b>
All Students (AS)	55.6%	52.7%
White (W)	55.8%	53.2%
Black (B)	NA	41.4%
Special Education (SE)	16.1%	14.3%
Economically Disadvantaged (SES)	49.3%	41.8%

### **SAT/ACT Assessment Results**

Chart 9 shows the Grant School District's Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and American College Testing (ACT) results. The SAT math mean score showed a pattern of growth from 2004-05 to 2006-07, then declined in 2007-08. The SAT verbal mean score increased from 2006-07 to 2007-08. The SAT writing score declined from 2006-07 to 2007-08. The percent of test takers declined dramatically from 2004-05 to the following years when test takers remained stable.

ACT trend data showed an increased composite from 2004-05 to 2007-08. The ACT Composite decreased by .3 percent in 2008-09. This represents a significant decrease in the ACT examination. The percentage of students taking the ACT decreased from 2004-05 to 2005-06, then increased and remained stable in 2006-07.

Chart 9

<b>SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST (SAT) – Grant County School District</b>					
<b>County</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
SAT Takers (%)	21.6%	10.4%	9.4%	9.4%	*
SAT Math Mean Score	423	498	520	494	*
SAT Reading Score			477	509	*
SAT Writing Score			481	467	*
<b>AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING (ACT) Grant County School District</b>					
ACT Takers (%)	74.5%	49.2%	60.6%	60.1%	79 students
ACT Composite	19.3	19.8	20.2	20.2	19.9

2008-2009 college entrance examination results were not available from the State.

Source: State, County and School Data, 2008-2009 West Virginia Report Cards, West Virginia Department of Education.

### **ACT EXPLORE Assessment Results**

According to the 2008-09 Grade 8 ACT EXPLORE results in Chart 10, Grant County students showed a decrease in the composite score as compared to the 2004-05 results. Five years of trend data showed an increase then a decrease in English, Mathematics, Science, and then the Composite score. Reading scores peaked in 2005-06 and have declined steadily since then.

County personnel indicated that they did not have 2008-09 ACT EXPLORE data at the central office. They said it was kept at the school level, which indicated that the county did not use this data in developing the county strategic plan. The Team contacted the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Assessment and Accountability, to obtain the 2008-09 scores.

Chart 10

<b>ACT EXPLORE RESULTS</b>					
<b>Grade 8</b>					
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
English WV	14.2	14.3	14.2	14.3	13.9
English Grant	13.3	14.8	14.9	13.6	12.7
Mathematics WV	14.2	14.5	14.5	14.7	14.3
Mathematics Grant	13.7	15.1	14.9	14.5	13.9
Reading WV	13.8	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.6
Reading Grant	13.3	13.9	13.7	12.9	12.7
Science WV	15.8	15.9	15.9	16.0	15.6
Science Grant	15.4	16.2	16.2	15.6	14.8
Composite WV	14.6	14.8	14.8	14.9	14.5
Composite Grant	14.0	15.1	15.0	14.3	13.6

## ACT PLAN Assessment Results

Based on the 2008-09 Grade 10 ACT PLAN results in Chart 11, Grant County test takers showed an increase in the recording years 2004-05 to 2007-08, then a decrease in the 2007-08 and 2008-09 composite score. Three years of trend data showed a decline in English and a significant decline in reading and a slight decline in mathematics and science.

County personnel indicated that they did not have 2008-09 PLAN data. They said it was kept at the school level, which indicates that the county did not use this data in the development of the county strategic plan. The Team contacted the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Assessment and Accountability, to get the 2008-09 scores.

Chart 11

<b>ACT PLAN RESULTS</b>					
<b>Grade 10</b>					
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
English WV	16.7	16.8	16.7	16.3	16.3
English Grant	15.8	16.6	16.2	16.2	16.0
Mathematics WV	16.4	16.5	16.6	16.3	16.3
Mathematics Grant	16.2	15.9	16.6	16.8	16.6
Reading WV	16.5	16.6	16.5	16.5	15.7
Reading Grant	16.3	16.4	16.4	16.4	15.4
Science WV	17.7	17.8	17.7	17.5	17.1
Science Grant	17.6	17.5	17.9	17.7	17.1
Composite WV	17.0	17.1	17.0	16.8	16.5
Composite Grant	16.6	16.7	16.9	16.9	16.4

**5.1.2. Participation rate. A minimum of 95 percent in the current or a two or three year average of all students enrolled in a public school/county school district/state at the time of testing, including students in each subgroup as required by *NCLB* must participate in the statewide assessment WESTEST or the West Virginia Alternate Performance Task Assessment (APTA) in reading/language arts or mathematics. Students with a significant medical emergency may be exempt by appeal from the calculation of participation rate for AYP provided that the county superintendent has proper documentation. (Policy 2340; Policy 2419; Policy 2510)**

All five schools in the Grant County School District had participation rates of 98.75 percent or above for reading and mathematics on the WESTEST 2 during the 2008-09 school year.

**5.1.3. Attendance rate (Elementary/Middle).** The student attendance rate for elementary and middle schools is at or above 90 percent or the percentage of students meeting the attendance rate show improvement from the preceding year. The student attendance rate will be adjusted for students excluded as a result of the Productive and Safe Schools Act (W.Va. Code §18A-5-1a) and school bus transportation interruptions (W.Va. 126CSR81), West Virginia Board of Education Policy 4110, *Attendance Policy*, (hereinafter Policy 4110). Additional exclusions include excused student absences, students not in attendance due to disciplinary measures, and absent students for whom the attendance director has pursued judicial remedies to compel attendance to the extent of his or her authority. For the AYP determination, the attendance rate calculation will be used for accountability at the public school/LEA/SEA levels, but will not be calculated for each subgroup. However, for schools/LEAs that use the safe harbor provision to meet AYP for the achievement indicators, the attendance rate standard must be met by the subgroup/s not meeting AYP.

Chart 12 indicated the Grant County School District attendance rate remained above the State requirement of 90 percent for the last five reporting years.

Chart 12

<b>ATTENDANCE RATE</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Attendance Rate</b>
2004-2005	97.7%
2005-2006	98.3%
2006-2007	98.2%
2007-2008	97.5%
2008-2009	97.7%

Chart 12A lists each school's attendance rate. The attendance rate for all five schools in Grant County was above the required 90 percent.

Chart 12A

<b>ATTENDANCE RATE BY SCHOOL</b>					
<b>School</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>
Dorcas Elementary	99%	99.11%	99.04%	99.03%	99.03%
Maysville Elementary	98%	98.99%	98.68%	98.84%	99.13%
Union Educational Complex				97.13%	97.27%
Petersburg Elementary	97%	97.99%	97.88%	98.13%	98.16%
Petersburg High				96.51%	96.81%

**5.1.4. Graduation rate.** The student graduation rate is 80 percent or the percentage of students meeting the student graduation rate shows improvement. The graduation rate is calculated according to the high school completer formula recommended by the NCES with the additional condition that graduates include only those students who receive a regular diploma in the standard number of years and does not include students receiving the GED. For the AYP determination, the graduation rate calculation will be used for accountability at the public school/LEA/SEA levels, but will not be calculated for each subgroup. However, for schools/LEAs that use the safe harbor provision to meet AYP for the achievement indicators, the graduation rate standard must be met by the subgroup/s not meeting AYP.

Grant County School District's graduation rate met the State requirement of 80 percent for the last five reporting years (Chart 13). Graduation rates for the Grant County secondary schools are listed in Chart 13A.

Chart 13

<b>GRADUATION RATE</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
2004-2005	81.6%
2005-2006	83.3%
2006-2007	89.4%
2007-2008	85.2%
2008-2009	87.4%

Chart 13A

<b>GRADUATION RATE BY SCHOOL</b>					
<b>School</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>
Union Educational Complex	96%	94.74%	95.45%	96.15%	95.2%
Petersburg High	79%	81.51%	88.33%	83.09%	86.2%

**SECTION II**  
**DATA ANALYSIS**

Chart 14 demonstrated the number of advanced placement (AP), honors, and college credit courses offered in Grant County’s high schools.

Chart 14

<b>NUMBER OF ADVANCED PLACEMENT (AP), HONORS, AND COLLEGE COURSES OFFERED 2009-2010</b>			
High School	Number of AP Courses Offered	Number of Honors Courses Offered	Number of College Credit Courses Offered
Petersburg High	0	0	8/6 taken
Union Educational Complex	0	0	0

**Petersburg High School**

In 2008 Advanced Human Anatomy and Physiology with 44 seats was offered. In 2008 Advanced Environmental Earth Science with 9 seats was offered. However, no students enrolled in these courses.

A minimum of four advanced placement (AP) classes are to be offered as prescribed in West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510. Petersburg High School did not offer or teach these courses. Eight college credit courses were offered for the 2009-10 school year and six were being taught on-site at Petersburg High School through Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College and Potomac State College. The Team noted that students do not receive dual credit for these courses, although teachers refer to these classes as “dual credit”. This misunderstanding must be clarified so educators, parents, and the community have a clear understanding of advanced level courses.

College courses taught included:

1. College English
2. College History
3. College Algebra
4. Psychology
5. Special Topics Biology
6. Chemistry II

Virtual courses or distance learning courses were not available.

### Union Educational Complex School

No advanced placement (AP), honors, or college credit courses had been taken since the 2003-04 school year. Personnel at the central office said they did not know what courses (if any) had been offered at the high schools this year. They said there might be virtual course offerings, but it was not known how many students (if any) take these courses.

Virtual courses or distance learning offerings were not available.

Chart 15 provided college entrance testing information for the American College Test (ACT) and the advanced placement test (AP). Data are listed for each Grant County high school, the county, and the State. The Grant County ACT composite score was .4 percent lower than the State, which is significant. With no AP courses taught at the high schools, AP test takers data reflected 0.0 percent.

Chart 15

<b>COLLEGE-ENTRANCE TESTING INFORMATION – ACT &amp; APT 2007-2008</b>					
<b>ACT(American College Test)</b>			<b>APT (Advanced Placement Test) Test Takers</b>		
<b>Schools</b>	<b>Test Takers</b>	<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>Tenth Grade</b>	<b>Eleventh Grade</b>	<b>Twelfth Grade</b>
Petersburg High	63.7%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Union Educational Complex	44.0%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Grant County Schools	60.1%	20.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
STATE	66.0%	20.6%	1.0%	7.5%	9.1%

Chart 16 showed the percentage of advanced placement (AP) test takers decreased from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008 in both grades 11 and 12. The percent of Grades 11 and 12 test takers with a score of three or higher has been 0.0 in all of the five recording years.

Chart 16

<b>AP TEST TAKERS</b>					
<b>Grant County</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The high school graduate overall college going rate for Grant County reported in fall 2007 was 50.4 percent compared to the State's overall college going rate of 57.5 percent as presented in Chart 17. County staff reported that fewer students in Grant County indicated they were college bound.

Chart 17

<b>ESTIMATED COLLEGE GOING RATE FALL 2007</b>		
	Number of High School Graduates 2006-07	Overall College Going Rate Percentage
State	17,914	57.5%
Grant	129	50.4%

Source: West Virginia College Going Rates By County and High School Fall 2007, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission.

Grant County's percent of students enrolled in developmental courses (Fall 2008) was measurably higher than the State's percentage of students taking both English and mathematics developmental courses (Chart 18). The percentage of students taking developmental mathematics courses was 10 percent higher than the State's average.

Thirteen of Grant County's 74 first-time freshmen or 17.57 percent were enrolled in Developmental English during fall 2008 compared to the State total (15.79 percent). Twenty-eight graduates or 37.84 percent were enrolled in Developmental Mathematics compared to the State (27.55 percent).

Chart 18

<b>HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENROLLED IN DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES FALL 2008</b>					
	1 <sup>st</sup> Time WV Freshmen Total #	English Total #	% in Developmental English	Mathematics Total #	% in Developmental Mathematics
State	8,073	1,275	15.79%	2,224	27.55%
Petersburg High	66	11	16.67%	25	37.88%
Union Educational Complex	8	2	25%	3	37.5%
Grant	74	13	17.57%	28	37.84%

Source: First-Time Freshmen, Previous Year WV High School Graduates in Developmental Courses by Type of Course Fall 2008 (census).

### SECTION III

#### HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

##### 7.1. CURRICULUM.

**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)**

High expectations for student performance were lacking in the Grant County School District evidenced by the examples that demonstrated a priority was not being placed on students.

1. Neither high school offered advanced placement (AP), honors, or virtual credit courses. The lack of these courses negatively affected students' preparation for college level courses as supported by the chart depicting the high percentage of Grant County students taking developmental level college courses.
2. Reviewers who conducted observations in the schools indicated that many teachers at some schools did not expect much from the students and the students thought the work was "easy".
3. Principals of two newly determined Title I schools failed to attend the mandatory statewide Title I training held at Stonewall Jackson.
4. The lack of an individual in personnel at the county office impeded the hiring process for teachers and other necessary staff. Curriculum directors assumed some of these duties which took time away from their curricular responsibilities.
5. Counseling services at one high school was limited and a counselor had not visited one elementary school this year (2009-10).
6. The Grant County Board of Education minutes of meetings indicated that the majority of the board's time involved employing a position for personnel/secondary education.

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

The learning environment in Grant County stemming from the board of education and central office levels failed to encourage school environments conducive to learning. A lack of a personnel director and secondary curriculum director and a pervasive climate of mistrust and internal issues at the central office have resulted in the county's lack of attention to providing schools' environments conducive to learning.

**7.1.4. Instruction. Instruction is consistent with the programmatic definitions in West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510, *Assuring the Quality of Education: Regulations for Education Programs* (hereinafter Policy 2510). (Policy 2510)**

1. Petersburg High School. Grades 7 and 8 students received instruction in social studies first semester and science second semester. Policy 2510 clearly indicates that science and social studies must be taught daily during the 180-minute core block.
2. Petersburg High School. Teachers indicated to the Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA) Team that they had not received any professional development on implementing the block schedule prior to its inception.
3. The OEPA school Team indicated that special education staff at Petersburg High School were not used to support student achievement. They did not collaborate with general education teachers. The Team found one class of 11 students, all had been retained the previous year, and five of these students had Individualized Education Plans (IEPs).
4. The OEPA school Team indicated that a credit recovery option was not available to students attending Grant County Schools. Currently, one student at Union Educational Complex will not be able graduate at the end of this year (2009-10) because options are not available to recover credit.

**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)**

The school reviewers on the OEPA Team indicated a lack of quality instructional strategies throughout the county's schools. Individual school reports state specific findings regarding instructional strategies. A secondary curriculum specialist was not in place to guide secondary curriculum and instruction.

**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)**

1. The OEPA school Teams noted that no students were using educational technology during the school visits and classrooms observations.
2. Union Educational Complex High School students only had access to the library during their lunch period.

**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 Programs Studies for Grant County Schools, posted on their website at <http://www.grantcountyschools.com/> under “Programs of Study” was not up-to-date with the requirements of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510. The section describing the K-2 subject requirements only mentioned an uninterrupted 90 minute reading block instead of the Policy 2510 language which requires “a daily uninterrupted 90 minute reading/English language arts block.” The section that listed the other content areas in the Grant County Program of Study at K-2 just contained the information that “specific content area instruction in the following content areas **may or may not be offered daily.**” It did not reflect the language of Policy 2510, “Sufficient emphasis must be placed on the given content areas to ensure that students master content knowledge and skills as specified in the 21<sup>st</sup> century content standards and objectives for each subject.”

The Grant County Program of Study for Grades 3-4 contained the language requiring 60 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction. This is no longer in Policy 2510. The physical education requirement has also changed.

The Grant County Program of Study for Grades 5-8 specified a 90-minute reading and English/language arts block within a 225 minute day, while Policy 2510 requires a core block of courses (Reading and English/Language Arts, Mathematics/Algebra I, Science and Social Studies) for no less than 180 minutes. The semester requirement for physical education was also missing in the Grant County Program of Study.

Graduation requirements for Grades 9-12 were not according to Policy 2510. This entire section of the Grant County Program of Study needed to be updated and reflect requirements of Policy 2510.

This document should be removed from the Grant County Schools website until such time as it is updated to reflect the requirements of Policy 2510. A direct link to the State policy could be used until the updated copy is available.

**7.1.11. Guidance and advisement. Students are provided specific guidance and advisement opportunities to allow them to choose a career major prior to completion of grade 10. (Policy 2510)**

1. Counseling services had not been provided during the 2009-10 school year at Maysville Elementary School.
2. The counselor at Union Educational Complex School was unofficially filling the role of assistant principal because the principal was also the county attendance director. This limited students' guidance and advisement services.

**7.1.12. 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)**

1. Teachers at Maysville Elementary were not aware of a Multicultural Plan or its contents.
2. A Multicultural Plan was not in place at Petersburg High School.

## **7.2. STUDENT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE.**

**7.2.1. County and School electronic strategic improvement plans. An electronic county strategic improvement plan and an electronic school strategic 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.**

### **Grant County Five-Year Strategic Plan**

**Interviews indicated that the County Five-Year Strategic Plan was prepared in isolation. Most often one or two people were involved in developing the plan. A collaborative process was not used for writing, reviewing and/or revising the strategic plan in place in Grant County.**

1. Through an interview with central office staff, the Team found that the county Five-Year Strategic Plan had been prepared and updated by one central office staff member. A team had been established, but had never met. Another member of the central office staff updated the plan on the day before the OEPA Team arrived. The objectives under the goals for the county were the same for both goals. The objectives did not specifically target the goal for improvement.

2. The Team reviewed the professional development opportunities offered at the various schools and reported that many schools had not planned professional development that would support the goals of the school and/or county.

Plan Committee. Staff indicated that a new plan committee had been selected and meetings had been scheduled to rewrite the plan. It was also stated that in July the superintendent had scheduled several meetings to work on the strategic plan with the committee but had canceled all of the meetings for various reasons not given.

Core Beliefs and Mission. The core beliefs of the county had been reviewed and revised. They could be internalized and easily remembered by staff and reflected qualities of highly effective schools and school systems. The mission statement should be reviewed and written in future oriented language that conveys what the school system is striving to accomplish to prepare students for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The county plan did not do an adequate job of analyzing data and identifying areas of need.

Data Analysis. Student achievement data analysis was limited to WESTEST 2 data and very limited at that. Charts had been copied and pasted with limited analysis cited. No analysis of external trends, culture, conditions, and practices, or other student outcomes, such as, attendance, discipline, dropout rates, etc., was included in the strategic plan. Prioritized strategic issues listed were not related to the data analysis.

Goals and Objectives. The goals were not derived from the data analysis or the prioritized strategic issues. The goals were related to improving student achievement but the objectives could not be measured by quantifiable evidence.

Action Steps and Professional Development. Action steps were limited in detail and high yield strategies were limited. Professional development was not targeted at goal achievement. Only three of 17 professional development opportunities were goal oriented.

Special education achievement was cited as the reason for not making AYP but no collaborative action had taken place at the county level to address this need. Special education professional development listed in the plan was not focused on improving student achievement through improving instructional practices for all teachers. The plan did not include objectives/action steps that supported guiding principles for parental involvement as stated in Policy 2200.

## **Schools' Five-Year Strategic Plans**

### **UNION EDUCATIONAL COMPLEX SCHOOL**

Plan Committee. The Five-Year Strategic Planning committee met bi-weekly to create and modify the Five-Year Strategic Plan for Union Educational Complex School. The committee was made up of the principal, each school's learning community chair, Title I teacher, special education teacher, general education teachers, technology coordinator, and a parent. Information was updated and analyzed to ensure progress. All teachers and several parents were invited to each meeting to keep them up-to-date on the progress.

Core Beliefs and Mission. Core beliefs were few in number and could be internalized and easily remembered. Core beliefs were written in a language that conveyed the school's values. The beliefs reflected qualities of highly effective schools.

Data Analysis. The narrative describing data analysis was very limited. However, the school indicated they had conducted data analysis for student achievement and other student outcomes, including attendance, graduation rate, and external trend data. An analysis of culture conditions and practices was not included in the data analysis. The data analysis did not include a summary of the overall implication for the strategic plan.

Core Beliefs. Core beliefs were written in language that strongly conveyed the schools values. The beliefs reflected qualities of highly effective schools.

Mission Statement. The mission was the same as the county's mission. It was not written in a future oriented language and did not describe what the school is striving to accomplish to prepare students for the future.

Prioritized Strategic Issues. The prioritized strategic issues were not directly related to the data analysis.

Goals and Objectives. The goals focused the school on improved student achievement. The goals were not derived from data analysis and prioritized strategic issues. The goal statements were measured by quantifiable evidence at the objective level.

Action Steps and Professional Development. These were limited in detail and sequential steps were not described to implement high yield strategies. No discussion was included of the purpose for taking a particular action step. Professional development opportunities listed did not occur over time. Professional development activities were limited to trainer led sessions. Professional development sessions listed did not relate directly to goal achievement.

Parental Involvement. The plan did not include objectives or action steps that supported the implementation of the guiding principles for parental involvement as stated in Policy 2200. Actions were not included to encourage embedded parental

involvement. Actions were not included for celebrating student success to encourage success. Actions were not included for utilizing the community to provide resources to strengthen school programs, families, and community members in improving student achievement. Current school parent involvement initiatives were not listed in the plan.

## **DORCAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

**Plan Committee.** The school identified a sufficient number of participants to efficiently complete the Five-Year Strategic Plan. The stakeholders included on the membership team provided a broad and knowledgeable perspective regarding the preparation of students for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Dorcas Elementary School staff worked together through dialogue reviewing the plan and updating it accordingly. Local school improvement council (LSIC) meetings were also scheduled and stakeholders were invited to review the plan. The strategic plan was also discussed at a faculty senate meeting for review and revisions.

**Core Beliefs.** Core beliefs were written in language that strongly conveyed the school's values. The core beliefs listed were numerous (13) and hard to internalize and remember. The beliefs reflected qualities of highly effective schools.

**Mission Statement.** The mission was the same as the county's mission. It was not written in a future oriented language and did not describe what the school is striving to accomplish to prepare students for the future.

**Data Analysis.** Test data were provided to principals at the beginning of the school year and then provided to teachers. The depth of the analysis that occurred was not evident. Data analysis for student achievement and other student outcomes including attendance, graduation rate, and external trend data were included. An analysis of culture conditions and practices was not included in the data analysis. The data analysis did not include a summary of the overall implication for the strategic plan.

**Goals and Objectives.** The goals focused the school on improving student achievement. The goals were not derived from data analysis and prioritized strategic issues. The goal statements were measured by quantifiable evidence at the objective level.

**Action Steps and Professional Development.** Action steps were limited in detail and sequential steps were not described to implement high yield strategies. Professional development opportunities listed did not occur over time. Professional development activities were limited to trainer led sessions. Professional development sessions listed did not relate directly to goal achievement. Action steps for math had not been updated since September of 2008. Action steps for reading described the school's purpose for taking a particular action step. Reading actions had been updated and implemented high yield strategies. Parental involvement was embedded in the actions for improved student achievement.

### **MAYSVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

Plan Committee. The plan committee had a sufficient number of participants to efficiently complete the Five-Year Strategic Plan. The stakeholders represented various school and community groups to assist in aligning improvement efforts toward common goals. The narrative described how the plan was written, but did not identify how it will be reviewed or revised during the upcoming year.

Core Beliefs. Core beliefs were written in language that strongly conveyed the school's values. The core beliefs listed were numerous (13) and hard to internalize and remember. The beliefs reflected qualities of highly effective schools.

Mission Statement. The mission was the same as the county's mission. It was not written in a future oriented language and did not describe what the school is striving to accomplish to prepare students for the future.

Data Analysis. Data analysis had been completed and interpretations added to the plan when appropriate. Student achievement data was reviewed from several data sources and were cited in the plan.

Prioritized Strategic Issues. The list was not from the data sources examined.

Goals and Objectives. The goals focused the school on improving student achievement. The goals were not derived from data analysis and prioritized strategic issues. The goal statements were measured by quantifiable evidence at the objective level.

Action Steps and Professional Development. Action steps and professional development activities had not been updated since September 2008.

Parental Involvement. The plan did not include objectives or action steps that supported the implementation of the guiding principles for parental involvement as stated in Policy 2200. Actions were not included that encouraged or embedded parental involvement. Actions were not included for celebrating student success to encourage further success. Actions were not included for utilizing parents and community members to provide resources to strengthen school programs for improving student achievement. Current school parent involvement initiatives were not listed in the plan.

### **PETERSBURG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

Plan Committee. A review of the Five-Year Strategic Plan committee did not show parents involved on the committee, although the narrative described how parent advisory groups will be involved in the committee's review. The narrative provided a description of how parents, community, and other appropriated stakeholder member were involved in the plan's development and/or revisions.

**Core Beliefs.** Core beliefs were written in language that strongly conveyed the school's values. The core beliefs listed were numerous (13) and hard to internalize and remember. The beliefs reflected qualities of highly effective schools.

**Mission Statement.** The mission was the same as the county's mission. It was not written in a future oriented language and did not describe what the school is striving to accomplish to prepare students for the future.

**Data Analysis.** A comprehensive data analysis was completed by Petersburg Elementary School and a variety of sources was identified. The vital survey was mentioned in the narrative as related to the culture, conditions, and practices of the school. Other student outcomes, such as, student attendance and other important student outcome data were mentioned.

**Prioritized Strategic Issues.** The list of strategic issues was included from the data sources examined.

**Goals/Objectives.** Goal statements could be measured by quantifiable evidence at the objective level and the goals focused the school on improving student achievement. The achievement goals were derived from data analysis.

**Action Steps and Professional Development.** Professional development indicated a plan for activities to occur over time to build knowledge and skill of the participants. The activities reflected a variety of delivery methods. Although professional development had been updated, there was no indication that the action steps had been updated or modified since September 2008.

**Parental Involvement.** The plan did not include objectives or action steps that supported the implementation of the guiding principles for parental involvement stated in Policy 2200. Actions were not included that encouraged or embedded parental involvement. Actions were not included for celebrating student success to encourage success. Actions were not included for utilizing the community to provide resources to strengthen school programs, families, and community members in improving student achievement. Current school parent involvement initiatives were not identified in the plan.

## **PETERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL**

**Plan Committee.** The narrative provided a brief summary of how the plan was developed but lacked information of how it will be monitored, reviewed, and/or revised. The committee had a sufficient number of participants to efficiently complete the plan.

**Core Beliefs.** Core beliefs were written in language that strongly conveyed the school's values. The core beliefs listed were numerous (13) and hard to internalize and remember. The beliefs reflected qualities of highly effective schools.

**Mission Statement.** The mission was the same as the county's mission. It was not written in a future oriented language and did not describe what the school is striving to accomplish to prepare students for the future.

**Data Analysis.** The data analysis was limited to WESTEST 2 results. No other achievement data, such as, ACT PLAN and ACT EXPLORE were analyzed according to the narrative. External trend data or other important student outcome data such as dropout rates, attendance rates, discipline, and college attendance rate were not mentioned. Other data not mentioned in the narrative included results of classroom walkthroughs, monitoring reports, or data completed by the staff or external evaluators that described the overall culture, conditions, and practices that existed.

**Prioritized Strategic Issues.** The list of prioritized issues was data analysis from WESTEST 2. The special education (SE) subgroup was cited for improvement as well as the low economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in reading and math.

**Goals/Objectives.** Goals focused the school on improving student achievement. The goal statements were not written in a bold and challenging language. The goals were not derived from data analysis or the prioritized strategic issues.

**Action Steps/Professional Development.** A professional development plan for the goals was not provided in the plan. Action steps had not been updated since September 2008.

**Parental Involvement.** The plan did not include objectives or action steps that supported the implementation of the guiding principles for parental involvement stated in Policy 2200. Actions were not included to encourage or embed parental involvement. Actions were not included for celebrating student success to encourage success. Actions were not included for utilizing the community to provide resources to strengthen school programs, families, and community members in improving student achievement. Current school parent involvement initiatives were not listed in the plan.

**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)**

1. The OEPA school Team reported that counseling services had not been provided at Maysville Elementary.
2. The OEPA school Team reported that the counselor at Union Educational Complex School was unofficially filling the role of assistant principal because the principal was also the county attendance director. This impeded the 75 percent direct counseling relationship with students.

**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)**

1. The OEPA school Team reported that one of 17 teachers at Maysville Elementary did not have lesson plans and that the existing plans of the remaining teachers were so vague they could not be followed by a substitute.
2. The OEPA school Team noted that the lesson plans of teachers at Petersburg Elementary were too vague to be followed by a substitute.
3. The OEPA school Team reported that the lesson plans of the special educators at Union Educational Complex were not adequate.

**7.2.4. 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)**

1. The Team interviewed staff and found that principals usually received the WESTEST data for their school and then held a meeting at the beginning of the school year at which time teachers looked at the test data for their grade level.
2. The OEPA school Team reported that several teachers at Petersburg High School expressed concern that the data analysis was not done until the school year was well under way.
3. The Team's review of the Data Analysis section of the Grant County Five-Year Strategic Plan noted that student achievement data analysis was limited to WESTEST 2 data and very limited. The Team further stated that charts had been copied and pasted with limited analysis cited. Other student outcomes, such as, attendance, discipline, dropout rates were not included in the strategic plan.

### **7.3. ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION.**

#### **7.3.1. Alternative education. Alternative education programs meet the requirements of Policy 2418. (W.Va. Code §18-2-6 and §18-5-19; Policy 2418)**

The Team interviewed county office staff and determined an alternative school was located at Petersburg High School last school year (2008-09) that met for four hours each evening. One teacher and one administrator operated the program. RESA VIII provided NOVA Net and trained the teacher and administrator. Students were referred to the alternative school based on their behavior. The alternative school was not in operation this school year (2009-10) because the teacher left the county.

### **7.4. REGULATORY AGENCY REVIEWS.**

#### **7.4.1. 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)**

##### **1. Finance**

The Team reviewed the annual financial audit of Grant County Schools and found the auditors noted the following conditions.

##### **Central Office**

Fiscal Year 2008 Audit report reviewed

No findings or deficiencies in internal control were reported. The general fund balance decreased by \$93,500 from Fiscal Year 2007. Grant County spent 64.5 percent of total expenditures in the general fund toward direct instruction.

The Team reviewed unaudited financial statements for Fiscal Year 2009.

Grant County recorded \$136,826.63 for other post employment benefits, OPEB, for the year. In spite of this additional liability, the county's general fund balance remained a positive number of \$64,116.77, although the general fund undesignated amount is a

negative of \$3,376.06. Expenditures in the general fund for direct instruction were 66.1 percent of total expenditures, an increase of 1.6 percent over Fiscal Year 2008.

The Team reviewed the Treasurer's Report to the Board along with the September 2009 bank reconciliation and reported the following findings.

1. The treasurer provides a detailed listing of expenditures each month to the board. The report did not contain information required by West Virginia Board of Education Policy 8100, *Handbook for School Finance in West Virginia*. Requirements are shown in detail on page 53 of the handbook.
2. A "schedule of checks already written" was provided to the board each month. Payments were being made prior to board approval. The board must be given a list of invoices to approve before payment is actually made as required by (West Virginia Codes §12-3-18 and §18-9-3).

### Food Service

The Team examined the annual financial report prepared by the food service director for the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Child Nutrition. This report revealed that the cost to prepare a breakfast during Fiscal Year 2009 was \$2.60 and the cost for lunch was \$3.46. Grant County charged adults \$2.50 for breakfast and \$3.25 for lunch during the year.

3. The county was subsidizing adult meals. The food service director said the board would be asked to increase the price charged to adults for breakfast and lunch to at least the cost to prepare the meals in the near future. The Team recommended that the board take action at their next meeting to increase the amount charged for adult meals to at least the cost to prepare and serve the meals.

### Individual Schools

An audit of Grant County's schools was conducted by The Fyffe Jones Group for the year ended June 30, 2008.

#### **Dorcas Elementary School**

A corrective action plan was prepared by school officials showing action taken to cure findings in the 2008 audit report.

Faculty Senate. The budget was recorded in the minutes. The Team recommended that the faculty senate budget show more detail.

## Parent Teacher Associations; Booster Groups

Finding 1. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 1224.1, section 5.1 and 5-7, requires the board to approve a list of all groups collecting funds in the name of the school. No record of such board action was available.

## Union Educational Complex School

Finding 1. A corrective action plan was not available regarding findings from the 2008 audit.

Faculty Senate Budget. The budget was recorded in the minutes. The Team recommend that the faculty senate budget show more detail

Expenditures. Check 3947 dated October 6, 2009, was issued and the purchase requisition was signed by the principal, but the actual purchase order was not.

Finding 2. Purchase orders were not approved prior to the order being placed.

Finding 3. Parent Teacher Associations, Booster Groups. The athletic booster annual report did not show a beginning or an ending balance.

Finding 4. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 1224.1, section 5.1 and 5-7, requires the board to approve a list of all groups collecting funds in the name of the school. No record of such board action was available.

Interview with principal. The principal asked that the county business office invoice transportation cost due the county office by the school in a timely manner. The principal did not have an accurate unencumbered balance without knowing that liability. He said the invoice of all last year had not been received until the end of the school year. The Team recommended the county business office take action to invoice the schools at least monthly.

## Maysville Elementary School

Parent Teacher Associations; Booster Groups. The PTO annual financial statement to the principal did not show the beginning balance for their savings account. The Team recommend that the PTO modify their reporting format to show beginning balances for their checking and savings accounts.

Finding 1. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 1224.1, section 5.1 and 5-7, requires the board to approve a list of all groups collecting funds in the name of the school. No record of such board action was available.

### **Petersburg Elementary School**

Faculty Senate. The faculty senate budget was recorded in their minutes, but did not show categories of planned expenditures. The Team recommended that the faculty senate budget show more detail.

Parent Teacher Associations; Booster Groups. The PTO annual statement to the principal did not show beginning or ending balances. The Team recommends that the PTO annual financial statement show beginning and ending balances.

Finding 1. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 1224.1, section 5.1 and 5-7, requires the board to approve a list of all groups collecting funds in the name of the school. No record of such board action was available.

### **Petersburg High School**

Finding 1. A corrective action plan was either not prepared or not available that addressed the six audit findings reported in the 2008 audit.

Finding 2. Expenditures. Check 9101 was issued to a game official September 9, 2009 for services and travel. Boards of Education have the statutory authority to reimburse travel only to employees, not independent contractors or vendors. In this case the school reimbursed travel expense to a non-employee.

Check 9112 was issued to Image Express. Neither invoice nor other document indicated the product had been received by the purchaser. The secretary was comfortable that products were received. The Team recommended the invoice or packing slip be signed by the purchaser acknowledging receipt of goods or services before payment is made.

Finding 3. Parent Teacher Associations; Booster Groups. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 1224.1, section 5.1 and 5-7, requires the board to approve a list of all groups collecting funds in the name of the school. No record of such board action was available.

## **2. Facilities**

The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed the Grant County Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEFP), interviewed the Director of School Facilities, the county superintendent, and visited schools. A narrative of the Team's observations follows.

School administrators were able to locate the most recent Fire Marshal reports and the Asbestos Management Plan; however, they were only able to locate the old

Pest Inspection Log. The Pest Inspection contract has been handled by a new company for the past couple of years and the log book was located in the kitchen area of each school. Through conversation, Grant County Maintenance Director, stated that the schools had all been made aware of the change in companies and location of the log book.

### **Dorcas Elementary School**

Dorcas Elementary was constructed in 1950 with additions in 1971, 1975, and 1985. The teachers had access to the thermostats and fan control for their spaces. The Team found multiple rooms with fans in the "Auto" position. Fans must remain in the "On" position during occupied times to allow adequate ventilation to the classrooms. The site did not have five usable acres. The media center did not have electronic card catalogs, automated circulation capacity, or online periodical indexes. The art room did not have counter space, mechanical ventilation, a ceramic kiln or blackout areas. The music room did not have music chairs with folding arms, a podium or acoustical treatment. The physical education facility did not have a data projector, network connections or Internet access. There was no teachers' dining area of adequate space. The food service area did not have locker/dressing rooms. There was no dedicated space designated for a health services area and the furnishings and equipment were not adequate. The furnace room door was not kept locked. The door had warped due to age and was difficult to open. The playground equipment needed proper ground cover in fall protection areas. Most rest room exhaust fans were inoperable. An electrical panel in a storage room located off the gymnasium was blocked at the time of the visit.

### **Maysville Elementary School**

Maysville Elementary was constructed in 1950 with additions in 1971, 1976, and 1986. The building was not mechanically ventilated and did not meet ventilation code requirements. The thermostats throughout the facility contained mercury and should be updated. The site did not have five usable acres. The media center did not have electronic card catalogs, automated circulation capacity, online periodicals, or newspapers. The art room was not adequate in size and did not have two deep sinks, hot and cold water, counter space, mechanical ventilation, a ceramic kiln, or blackout areas. The music facility did not have adequate storage space, music chairs with folding arms, a podium, recording devices, or acoustical treatment. The physical education facility did not have provisions for two or more teaching stations, a data projector, network connections, Internet access, or audio equipment. The food service area did not have lockers/dressing rooms. The health service area was not adequate in size and did not have adequate equipment and furnishings. The radiators throughout the hall had damaged and missing grilles that allowed access to the units.

### **Petersburg Elementary School**

Petersburg Elementary School was constructed in 1974 as an open concept school with partition walls added at a later date. An addition was constructed in 2004. The playground equipment needed proper ground cover in fall protection areas. The art room did not have blackout areas. The physical education facility did not have a data projector, network connections, or Internet access. The health service area was not adequate in size and did not have adequate equipment and furnishings. The health service door was unlocked during the Team's visit, at a time when the nurse was not scheduled to be in the facility. Kindergarten classrooms were inadequate in size. Teachers had access to the thermostats and fan control in the original building for their spaces. Multiple rooms were found with fans in the "Auto" position. Fans must remain in the "On" position during occupied times to allow adequate ventilation to classrooms.

### **Petersburg High School**

Petersburg High was originally constructed in 1949 with additions in 1952, 1957, 1968, 1971, and 2001. The media center did not have electronic card catalogs or automated circulation capacity. The primary gymnasium did not have a data projector and the secondary/practice gymnasium did not have a drinking fountain, provisions for two or more teaching stations, a display case, a data projector, network connections, or Internet access. The music facilities did not have acoustical treatment. There was no auditorium/stage facility at this site. The food service area did not have a teachers' dining area. The health services area did not have a toilet.

### **Union Educational Complex School**

Union Educational Complex School was originally constructed in 1968 with additions in 1975, 1979, 1980, and 1985. The building was not mechanically ventilated and did not meet ventilation code requirements. This site was not handicap accessible. Evidence of multiple roof leaks existed and the site was not well drained. The Team observed signs of efflorescence throughout the facility from the roof leaks and problems with the gutters. The media center did not have electronic card catalogs or automated circulation capacity. The first/second grade split classroom was excessively cluttered with materials that reduced the free area of the classroom. The art room did not have mechanical ventilation or blackout areas. The music room did not have music chairs with folding arms or acoustical treatment and did not have adequate storage. The elementary physical education facility was not adequate in size and did not have adequate materials and equipment. The food services area did not have adequate storage space, a teachers' dining area, lockers, and dressing rooms or chairs. There was no dedicated space designated for a health services area and the furnishings and equipment available were not adequate. The high school science facilities were not isolated to keep odors from the remainder of the building and did not have AC and DC current, compressed air, or ventilation fume hoods. The high school gymnasium served as the auditorium for this facility. Most rest room exhaust fans were inoperable. There

was water infiltration in the boiler room. Electrical panel P2 was missing a blank cover, which was reported to the county and a blank was installed during the visit. Teachers throughout the facility were storing items in direct contact with baseboard heater cabinets. The area directly around these units is to be kept clear for adequate air flow and to prevent flammable materials from becoming overheated and igniting. The elementary rooms had the original carpeting. This carpet should be replaced with tile or other appropriate floor covering. The floor in the sprinkler valve room was gravel over dirt. A vapor barrier needed to be put in place in this room.

## **Countywide**

The county did not use a preventive maintenance program or an automated work order system. The Team recommended that a preventive maintenance program be implemented and used to improve maintenance efforts and reduce equipment failures. The School Building Authority (SBA) requires all SBA funded equipment projects to have a documented preventive maintenance program. The Petersburg Elementary and Petersburg High School Gymnasium and addition were SBA funded projects in Grant County. The current work order system used by the county was cumbersome and difficult to track progress and completion of projects. The Team recommended a computerized work order system to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the work order system.

Stained ceiling tiles remained in place longer than 24-48 hours. This allowed possible mold growth. Tiles should be replaced after each occurrence of wetting and roofs needed to be repaired/replaced to prevent future instances of water infiltration.

## **7.5. ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AND SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS.**

**7.5.1. Parents and the community are provided information. Staff members provide parents and the community with understandable information and techniques for helping students learn.**

The Grant County Schools' website contained links to all five schools. The website space was furnished by Hardy.net. Each school maintained its own site. Some sites were up-to-date with individual teachers posting announcements and weekly homework assignments. Other sites contained little or no information for parents. This would only be useful to parents with Internet access.

## 7.6. PERSONNEL.

### 7.6.1. Hiring. County boards follow hiring practices set forth in W.Va. Code. (W.Va. Code §§18A-4-7a, 18A-4-8, and 18-2E-3a)

Interviews with board of education members, central office staff, and school personnel throughout the county revealed a high degree of conflict surrounding the hiring of a personnel director for the county. This position was still vacant as of October 7, 2009.

There was no director of personnel in Grant County Schools or a secretary assigned the responsibility for specific personnel office tasks, such as postings, certification, filing personnel documents (contracts, board correspondence), etc., that are the tasks of a personnel secretary. The superintendent's secretary did receive and stamp-in job applications.

Prior to July 1, 2009, the county had a director of personnel as one of his titles. This individual resigned and to date (October 7, 2009) the position had not been filled. Board minutes indicated the board approved posting the position at its August 11, 2009 meeting. It was rescinded at the board's October 1, 2009 meeting so that the interim superintendent would have more time to review applications. The vacant office of the former personnel director contained the personnel files, records of postings, applicant files, etc. However, documents had not been maintained in a manner that allowed someone from the office staff to pull a requested document. (No office staff member knew where specific documents were located.) Additionally, no one had the authority to look for documents. This made monitoring of personnel practices difficult. Stacks and boxes of applicant files, etc., were on the personnel desk that the Team reviewed. The documents contained information which occurred after July 2009. Documents prior to that date were not reviewed.

It appeared that the superintendent employed from July 1 through September 30, 2009 handled all personnel. The interim superintendent's employment was effective October 1, 2009. Coming from the position of a classroom teacher, the interim superintendent did not have administrative experience and had limited knowledge of school personnel requirements. She appeared to be highly motivated and determined; however, at this time she stated that she will be the only individual handling personnel including preparing postings, filing documents in personnel files, etc. No other staff member, including the superintendent's secretary, was permitted to see or handle personnel files. Prior to the resignation of the personnel director, the superintendent's secretary filed contracts and correspondence in employee personnel files.

The interim superintendent expressed a lack of trust of county office staff members, and therefore, did not feel comfortable with those individuals working with personnel matters. Unfortunately, handling all personnel procedures, as required by school law, will most likely become an impossible task for one individual who has other responsibilities such as those of a superintendent. The interim superintendent also taught a high school class each morning at Petersburg High School. It would appear

that this method of leadership will not make for a positive and productive working environment and the development of relationships needed for success.

The Team observed the following discrepancies in postings.

- **Hiring.** Jobs posted for the 2009-10 school year. The Team randomly reviewed more than 30 job postings and their respective applicant pool for teachers, student support personnel, extracurricular personnel, and service personnel. Postings were not numbered. While this is not a requirement, numbering would organize and manage the posting files.

Hiring practices were being followed only in part. A separate file was being retained for all postings. The file was identified only by the name of the vacancy, location, and posting date. The file included the posting and applications. A few files included a partially completed matrix. Interview questions were found in four files.

- **Postings.** As per the interim superintendent, all postings and reposting of positions not filled are approved by the board prior to the actual posting of a vacant position. Positions are posted on the West Virginia K-12 Jobs Bank for a period of five days. Individuals may go the county website to review vacancies. When individuals click on the county website it will automatically link them to the State website. Vacancies were also posted in schools and at the county board office (inside and outside). Vacancies posted within schools included relevant information with the exception of the job description. No professional posting reviewed had specialized training listed. Prior to July 1, 2009, vacancies were posted by the director of personnel or the superintendent of schools. Subsequent to that date and prior to October 1, 2009, postings were done by the superintendent or an individual from outside the county who was contracted to assist the county with personnel. The new interim superintendent stated that she will be responsible for future postings, but has not yet been trained to put postings on the State website.

There was no evidence that vacant positions were being continuously posted. Three vacancies identified as long term (more than 30 instructional days) were identified as being filled with individuals who were not certified for their respective assignments. According to West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5202, the county can request a waiver to keep the substitutes in their respective assignments for more than 30 days. The superintendent stated that she will request a waiver from the State Superintendent of Schools.

- **Job descriptions.** Job descriptions were not attached or included with the postings. On two extracurricular postings, cheerleader coach and team coaching assistant (formerly known as volunteer coach), a short narrative of the job description, including some duties or responsibilities, was given. However, other

postings under job description, stated, “detailed description available upon request.” In reviewing job descriptions that could have been made available, the Team found that they were outdated or needed to be revised. For example, the classroom teacher job description was dated August 25, 1992. Job descriptions for service personnel did not list the State competency test as a required qualification, yet this qualification was listed on the posting.

- **Application.** The professional application (bid sheets) needed to be revised, as they did not include all information needed to evaluate the applicants per W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a. The county had two bid sheets. One was for transfers (regular employees) the other was for substitutes and non-employees. It appeared that the transfer bid sheet would be used when considering qualifications under the second set of factors of W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a. The other applications would be utilized if using the first set of factors to evaluate the qualifications of individuals. Therefore, if the county has two bid sheets the one for substitutes and non-employees should also be for regular employees who do not meet the standards of the posting as the second set of factors are only used when the applicant is a regular employee and meets the standards of the posting.

The transfer bid sheet currently asks for “documented satisfactory evaluations over the previous two years.” The document should read, “Received an overall rating of satisfactory in the previous two evaluations conducted as per W.Va. Code §18A-2-12.” The document also asks for total years of experience in Grant County Schools. It should ask for “seniority” in Grant County Schools.

The bid sheet for substitute and non-employees needed to be revised to include the applicant’s grade point average (GPA), relevant specialized training (not just that on the job posting), and past performance evaluations conducted as per W.Va. Code §18A-2-12. Also, components of the transfer bid sheet, such as, seniority must be included on the application in the event a regular employee applied for the posted position and all applicants are evaluated using the second set of factors in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a. Substitute teachers can gain seniority as a substitute which can be used when applying for a job.

The Team recommended that one application be used by all applicants for a posted position and that all information shown in both sets of factors listed in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a be provided.

### **Specific postings showing irregularities.**

1. The Title I Reading Specialist/Reading Interventionist was posted as a regular position part-time, effective for the 2009-10 school year. A retired teacher was hired in the position. The intent of the posting was for the job to be part-time (1/2 day) for 115 days at a daily pay rate of \$100. However, this was not reflected on the posting or in the board minutes (dated October 1, 2009). Although, it would not

apply here, since the individual was not employed as a retired substitute teacher, the superintendent was not knowledgeable if the county had a board policy approved by the State Board concerning hiring retired substitute teachers into critical needs areas (W.Va. Code §18A-2-3). As per the superintendent, this position was posted in the absence of the superintendent by a central office director. The employment was currently in place. Neither the posting of the position as a regular position or the hiring of the individual as a regular employee complied with school law.

The above position was posted requiring a reading specialist. As per W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a, postings should also be written to ensure that the largest possible pool of qualified applicants may apply. For example, reading certification can be met with a masters degree in reading specialist, completion of a graduate level reading specialist program, a reading authorization, remedial reading, or completion of a reading endorsement program (Policy 5202).

2. As per the revised agenda dated September 8, 2009, an individual was hired under employment as a “temporary part-time itinerant school based health nurse” for the 2009-10 school year at \$20 per hour for up to two days per week; eight hours a day.” It appears that this should have been “Contracted Services”, such as the employment of speech/language services.
3. The posting of a Medicaid Billing Specialist Itinerant – up to eight hours weekly, was posted as an “Extra-duty Professional Contract” at a salary of \$7,500 stipend paid by Medicaid funds. The position should have been posted as “extracurricular” and since the posting was up to eight hours weekly, the salary should have been listed as “up to \$7,500.” As written and approved, the individual could work very few hours per week and still receive a total of \$7,500. Additionally, the position was posted September 18-25, 2009 with three applicants. Applications were received September 14 and 16. The application for the position received September 16 was marked, “too late.” As per the superintendent’s secretary, applications are often received prior to a position being posted. Applications received outside the posting period are accepted and considered. Applications considered should be only those received during the posting period. If there are no applications, then applications can be received following the closing date.
4. The Team reviewed several professional job postings and application files such as (English, social studies/ESL, music Petersburg High School; itinerant agriculture teacher, itinerant counselor; itinerant special education and elementary teacher (1/2 time) Petersburg Elementary School and noted that the county was not consistent with using the factors in W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a to determine the most qualified candidates. When a matrix was used, it was not completed (all criteria were not evaluated) and the most qualified applicant, with the exception of one posting, was not identified.

5. A matrix using the second set of factors, as one regular employee applied, for a music teacher position (PES) indicated that the applicant who was determined the most qualified and hired was from out-of-state. She was deemed most qualified because she received a “yes” for evaluation of past experiences and had the highest seniority. In reviewing the file, the Team determined that this applicant was given credit for evaluations not performed per W.Va. Code §18A-2-12 and that she was given credit for seniority with the out-of-state school district. Of the seven factors, the matrix showed that this candidate won in two areas (degree level and seniority) and tied in all other areas with the regular employee. Due to this error, the “new” out-of-state applicant was considered the most qualified and recommended for the position. The senior applicant was not selected for the position. There was no documentation that the senior applicant had requested a written statement of reasons as to why she was not selected.
6. For an itinerant guidance position (as per the job title) posted August 13, 2009, at Union Educational Complex School, the second set of factors was used; however, it was not clear who the most qualified applicant was. It was necessary to review board minutes to determine who received the position. The most qualified candidate could not be identified by reviewing the application pool file.
7. The Team did not find a matrix for a posted itinerant gifted position, which took place after five days prior to the beginning of the instructional term. (However, the position was most likely posted.) A 4<sup>th</sup> grade teacher who was not certified in gifted was transferred into the position effective for the 2010-11 school term. He was not certified in gifted education. No applicant was certified. The job had been filled for the remainder of this year with a long-term substitute teacher who was not certified in gifted. She has worked beyond 30 days and a waiver had not been requested. The Team recommended that the county refrain from transferring individuals who are not certified into a position when the transfer will not take effect until the subsequent school year. The position should be filled with a substitute and continued to be posted.
8. In postings reviewed where the first set of factors was used (new applicants or regular employees not meeting the standards of the posting), a matrix was partially completed. It appeared that the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh factors were not being considered. This was most likely because the majority of this information was not requested on the job application form. (English Teacher, PHS; Itinerant Counselor). However, no matrix was found with the majority of the postings observed. (Social Studies, July 12-22; Itinerant Special Education, August 12–19; Social Studies/ESL, August 9-2, 2009). The interim superintendent provided the team member documents that showed how the county is to use the two matrices to evaluate the qualifications of classroom teachers and other personnel per W.Va. Code §18A-4-7a (using factors one and two). However, it was evident that these procedures **were not** followed. **Note: A matrix is not required when using the first set of factors, but the county must show that all qualification criteria, per §18A-4-7a, were considered. There was no such evidence.**

9. Interviews. Four of the files reviewed for posted positions had interview questions with interviewers' notes; however, the files did not contain evidence of ratings of the interviews. The superintendent stated that principals interview applicants and make a recommendation to the superintendent. Faculty senate members may also interview applicants. The new superintendent plans to interview all individuals recommended by the principals prior to making the recommendation to the board.
10. Attendance Director. W.Va. Code §18-8-3 requires counties to employ at least a half-time director of school attendance if such county has a net enrollment equal to or less than four thousand pupils. Grant County Schools has hired a school principal on an extra-duty contract. He stated that he is paid a stipend. This was not in accordance with school law. It also did not meet the definition of "extra-duty" found in W.Va. Code §18A-4-8b for service personnel or W.Va. Code §18-8-3.
11. Extra-Duty Assignments vs. Extracurricular Assignments. Grant County was confused in understanding extra-duty assignments vs. extracurricular assignments. Extra-duty is defined in W.Va. Code §18A-4-8b (f) for service personnel, while extracurricular assignments is defined in W.Va. Code §18A-4-16 (for service and professional). The county hired its coaches under extracurricular assignments (example: October 13, 2009 Board agenda); band and chorus assignments were hired under curricular assignments (see August 11, 2009 board agenda) and all others, such as, county attendance director, transportation supervisor, network technician specialist, co-county technology coordinator, substitute aide caller, senior sponsor, etc., were hired under "extra-duty" assignments. There was some confusion regarding the use of contracted services. For example, mentors of beginning teachers were hired under contract services instead of extracurricular assignments. It appeared that all of the above should have been hired with extracurricular assignment contracts per W.Va. Code §18A-4-16.
12. Recruitment. The Interim superintendent was not knowledgeable of recruitment efforts.

### **Service Professional.**

1. Hiring. Only one service personnel postings was available for the Team to review, (Instructional aide, PHS S09-402-41). Applications were in the file; but, in no order. The service personnel application did not provide a seniority date or information regarding past performance evaluation. There was no identification in the file as to the most qualified candidate. As per school law, a letter was not being sent to each applicant not selected for employment concerning the status of his/her application.
2. Postings. As required by school law, all postings were posted in conspicuous places for all school service personnel to observe. Positions were posted on the West Virginia Jobs Bank, but required information, such as the length of

employment, salary, classification, and job descriptions was only posted on the school or board office postings. Under job description for the aide posting, it was stated, "Assist teacher in the instructional program and accept reasonable assignments necessary to a successful program. More information may be obtained from the personnel office or school principal." Job descriptions needed to be revised or updated.

3. **Substitute Service Personnel Postings.** Once substitute personnel are hired for a specific category, the county begins accepting applications for the next employment of substitutes for that classification. The time period could be several months. These applications are included with the applications received during the actual posting period. This procedure could result in requiring the personnel office to administer many individuals the state competency test for the classification area. At the time this area was being reviewed, no one was available to speak with the Team concerning this procedure or how competency tests were administered. Applications should be received during the posting period. The posting period can be greater than five days, if needed.
4. **Substitute Bus Operators.** As per the supervisor of transportation, he holds multi-classification of supervisor of transportation and bus operator. The Team did not review his personnel file; however, the April 21, 2009 Board agenda listed under "**Extra-duty Assignments,**" Transportation Supervisor returning to position from 2008-2009 school year. The county employs 25 bus operators. There were only four substitute bus operators. A bus mechanic substitutes as a bus operator, when needed. It was not determined if he holds multi-classification of mechanic/bus operator.
5. **Calling Substitute Service Personnel.** Substitute service personnel are called to work by different individuals. The aides are called by an aide at Petersburg High School, who holds an "extra-duty" contract. When an aide is to be absent, he/she calls this individual who in turn calls for the substitute aide. She carries her "Calling Book" with her at all times and calls aides on a rotating basis. This individual has a phone in her classroom that she can use for this purpose, if needed. Note: The employment contract should be "extracurricular, not extra-duty."

Custodians are called by principals or their designee (school secretary). A secretary interviewed from Petersburg High School stated that she had a list of all substitute custodians and calls from the list. However, she stated that she does not know who has been called by other schools and does not know if calls by different individuals result in custodians being called in a rotating manner. If she calls the fourth custodian on the list, for example, she has no idea if that custodian actually worked the previous day and it was the fifth custodian on the list that should have been called. Another secretary, perhaps from Union Educational Complex School or Dorcus Elementary School, stated that she had her own list of custodians that she called on a rotating basis. She does not call from the county

list. The calling of substitute custodians did not appear to be on a rotating basis which does not comply with school law.

Substitute bus operators are called by the transportation supervisor and cooks are called by an individual from the central office. It was not determined who called substitute secretaries.

6. Positions filled with substitutes per W.Va. Code §18A-4-15. The finance personnel indicated that the county posts and fills all vacancies which result from an approved leave of absence or on the job injuries (workers compensation). The document listing seniority of service personnel, dated September 1, 2009, stated that "Substitutes utilized as temporary long-term substitutes for regular employees on leave of absence may be entitled to an adjusted seniority date once they have obtained regular employee status within the same classification. Employees are encouraged to review their records and bring such involvements to the personnel department's attention when appointed to a regular position." Note: Effective July 1, 2007, W.Va. Code §18A-4-15 the temporary long-term substitute no longer accrues regular seniority.
7. Application. The service personnel application (bid sheet) needed to be revised to list seniority. It should also show if the individual has passed the State competency test or if he/she holds or previously held the classification. It should request information concerning past performance evaluations. The form asked for information that the application would not be able to address. It stated, "If awarded this requested position, would you be required to supervise a spouse; parent; sibling; the spouse of a parent, sibling or child; or an individual with whom you have a relationship that would be regarded as a common law relationship? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_ (If yes, provide identities of individual on a separate sheet.)"

If an individual takes a supervisory position, how will he/she know if someone who falls into one of the categories listed above will transfer or be hired into an area in which he/she supervises?

The application also asks, "Do you have a spouse; parent; sibling or child; or an individual with whom you have a relationship that would be regarded as a common law relationship, who serves in a position at or above the rank of principal or equivalent supervisory position? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_. (If yes, provide identities of individuals on a separate sheet.)" Does this mean, if the answer is yes, the individual would not be eligible for employment or transfer?

The above requirement did not seem to be a part of the county policy on the Employment of Service Personnel, Policy 4120.

8. Other. According to the interim superintendent, the personnel section of the board agenda is not posted prior to the board meeting. Information concerning personnel to be acted on at the board meeting is given only to the board members in advance. Other individuals only become aware of action to be taken at the actual meeting. This may be in violation of the Open Meeting Laws (W. Va. School Law, Chapter 6) or interpretations from the Ethics Commission. In training sessions provided for superintendents and board members, it has been stated that agenda items (including the name of the person to be employed, transferred, etc.,) are to be posted prior to a board meeting. If the name of the person is not available at the time the agenda is prepared, the board agenda item has to be listed, without a name (which will be provided at the meeting). This process provides interested individuals an opportunity to know it will be an agenda item if they wish to attend the meeting. If the specific position is not on the agenda it cannot be added the night of the meeting.
  
9. Employment of Interim Superintendent. Board minutes showed that an interim superintendent was appointed September 25, 2009 and effective October 1, 2009. The new superintendent was a classroom teacher and still teaches one period a day. The interim superintendent did not resign her teaching position.

**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)**

The Team found several violations of W.Va. Code §18A-3-2 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5202. The following chart explains the certification issues the Team observed through a detailed review of the certified list, WVEIS Master Course Schedule, and the West Virginia Department of Education Certification Database. A majority of the errors were related to WVEIS coding in the Master Schedule. Several waivers and applications were requested to assist in helping the teachers assigned to positions be eligible to continue teaching in the positions. The Coaches' Database was not up to date and reflected several individuals in positions who in reality were no longer assigned to athletics.

County-School	Educator Name	Courses/Content Teaching	Certification/Status	Findings	Recommendations
Petersburg High School (PHS)	Educator	63013I Tech Chem 30223I- App Math	Multi-Cat K-Adult Autism K-Adult Restricted Eng. 5-Adult (T/U)	3022 <b>AND</b> 3023 are no longer valid courses/codes	Rename and label math course with a valid course/title for 3022 and 3023
(PHS)	Educator	411604 Autism Inst.	Severe Disabilities PK-Adult	4116 is an endorsement code, correct to reflect course being taught and requires a U in the sixth position	Please correct name or code for actual course being taught.
(PHS)	Educator	305030 College Alg. 30473X Statistics	Math 5-12	3050 course/code is indicated as College Alg., is no longer valid	Correct course/code to reflect a valid course offering, such as 30210X
(PHS)	Educator	6009 Sci. 9	No certification currently held	Not certified	Make application on Form 20T or Form 1-1A
(PHS)	Educator	400930 English 9	Theatre PK-AD Elem K-6 Oral Communications 5-AD	4009 requires English End.	Apply for Out-of-field or permit on Form 1-1A. (Waiver requested and pending in OPP Oct. 20, but no application received).

(PHS)	Educator	163500 Manual/Auto 163700 Suspension	Application denied 20081208	Not certified	Apply for certification or correct position to accurately reflect name of person holding position
Petersburg Elementary School (PES)	Educator	801300	Elem. K-6	8013 requires a G	Apply for Out-of- field or permit on Form 1-1A. (Waiver requested and pending in OPP Oct. 20, but no application received).
(PES)	Educator	80170R	Multi-Cat 5-Adult	Teaching below 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	Apply for Out-of- field or permit on Form 1-1A. (Waiver requested and pending in OPP Oct. 20, but no application received)
Maysville Elementary School (202)	Educator	801300	Elem. K-6	8013 requires a G	Apply for Out-of- field or permit on Form 1-1A. (Waiver requested and pending in OPP Oct. 20, but no application received) and Correct course code
(202)	Educator	80170R	Multi-Cat 5-Adult	Teaching below 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	Apply for Out-of- field or permit on Form 1-1A. (Waiver requested and pending in OPP Oct. 20, but no application received)
Dorcas Elementary School (201)	Educator	2605 Head Start	Community Programs Authorization expired June 30,	Renew	Make application Form 50 for Community Programs or

			2008		identify person in position
(201)	Educator	Speech Lang Path	Unknown	Cannot locate certification	Verify legal name and certification
Union Educational Complex School (101)	Educator	Alg. I	General Substitute	In position since September 8, 2009	To hold position for longer than 30 days requires a long-term substitute permit. Request Waiver or complete Form 2
(101)	Educator	703100 Civic/Gov't	OK	No longer at school, transferred before school	Verify person in the teaching assignment
(101)	Educator	801700	Permit for Multi-Cat	8017 must have a 6 <sup>th</sup> position exceptionality in place	Correct course code
(101)	Educator	6302 Adv. Chem	Bio 9-Adult Gen. Sci. 5-Adult	6302course/code is no longer valid and Chemistry requires Chemistry Endorsement	Please correct course/code to reflect a valid course offering and Apply for Out-of-field or permit on Form 1-1A. (Waiver requested and pending in OPP Oct. 20, but no application received)
(101)	Educator	681100 Driver's Ed 029070 Ag Explor	Ag. Education	6811 requires Drivers Ed Endorsement and 0290 is not a valid course code	Apply for First-Class/Full-Time Permit using Form 1-1A and correct course code
(101)	Educator	801700	SLD MI	8017 must have a 6 <sup>th</sup> position exceptionality in place	Correct course code

(101)	Educator	801700	Elem K-6 Early Ed. PK-K	8017 must have a 6 <sup>th</sup> position exceptionality in place and requires specific endorsement	Correct course code and apply for Out-of-field or permit on Form 1-1A. (Waiver requested and pending in OPP Oct. 20, but no application received)
(101)	Educator	801700	Multi-Cat K-Adult	8017 must have a 6 <sup>th</sup> position exceptionality in place	Correct course code

The following chart indicates the percent of highly qualified teachers by school, content area and percent.

**HQT- Highly Qualified by Name, Content Area & Percent 2008-2009**

County-School	Educator Name- Not Highly Qualified (where applicable)	Courses/Content Teaching	% Highly Qualified
<b>Dorcas Elem.</b>		Self-Contained	100
		Reading/ Language Arts	100
		<b>Overall</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Maysville</b>	Educator	Self-Contained	96.0
	Educator	Mathematics	50.0
		English	100
		Science	100
		Reading/Language Arts	100
		History	100
		Arts	100
	Educator	Collaborative	N/A
		<b>Overall</b>	<b>96.2</b>
	<b>Petersburg Elementary</b>	Educator	Self-Contained
		Mathematics	100
		English	100
		Science	100
Educator		Reading/Language Arts	96.8
		History	100
		Arts	100
Educator		Collaborative	N/A
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>97.0</b>	
<b>Petersburg High</b>	Educator	Mathematics	73.7
	Educator	English	91.4
	Educator	Science	85.0
	Educator	Reading/Language Arts	76.2
		Geography	100
		Economics	100
	Educator	History	85.7
	Educator	Civics/Government	57.1
		Arts	100
	Educator	Foreign Languages	63.6
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>83.5</b>	
<b>Union Educational Complex</b>		Self-Contained	100
		Mathematics	100

	Educator	English	55.6
		Science	100
	Educator	Reading/Language Arts	62.5
		Geography	100
		History	100
	Educator	Civics/Government	0.0
	Educator	Arts	94.1
		Foreign Languages	100
	Educator	Collaborative	
		<b>Overall</b>	<b>90.4</b>
<b>Grant County</b>		Self-Contained	96.4
		Mathematics	83.5
		English	89.8
		Science	90.9
		Reading/Language Arts	89.4
		Economics	100
		Geography	100
		History	92.6
		Civics/Government	44.4
		Arts	99
		Foreign Languages	69.2
		<b>Overall</b>	<b>91.6</b>

**Coaches Database**

<b>Coach Name not listed in Coaches Database</b>	<b>Date application made to Office of Professional Preparation (Approved)</b>
Coach	7-31-2009
Coach	6-12-2009

<b>Coach Name listed in Coaches Database without Coaching Authorization</b>	<b>Coaching Authorization</b>
Coach	Expired 6-30-2008
Coach	Expired 6-30-2008
Coach	Expired 6-30-2009

**Out-of-Field & First-Class/Full-Time Permits Issued to Grant County 2009-10**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Teacher Name</b>	<b>Endorsement</b>	<b>Programmatic Level</b>
Out-of-Field- Initial	Educator	Autism	5-Adult
Out-of-Field- Initial	Educator	Multi-Categorical	5-Adult
Out-of-Field- Renewal	Educator	Reading Specialist	PK-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Initial	Educator	English	5-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Initial	Educator	Family and Consumer Science	5-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Initial	Educator	Autism	K-6
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Initial	Educator	Autism	5-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Initial	Educator	School/Library Media	PK-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Renewal	Educator	School Nurse	PK-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Renewal	Educator	Multi-Categorical	5-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Renewal	Educator	Spanish	5-Adult
First-Class/Full-Time Permit- Renewal	Educator	Math	5-Adult

**\*\*Waivers requested for the 2009-2010 School-Year (First-Class/Full-Time Permits)**

<b>Teacher Name</b>	<b>Endorsement</b>	<b>Programmatic Level</b>
Educator	Gifted	1-12
Educator	Multi-categorical	K-6
Educator	English	5-Adult
Educator	Chemistry	9-Adult
Educator	PK Special Needs	PK-K

**7.6.3. Evaluation. The county board adopts and implements an evaluation policy for professional and service personnel that is in accordance with W.Va. Code, West Virginia Board of Education policy, and county policy. (W.Va. Code §18A-2-12; Policy 5310; Policy 5314)**

The Team reviewed personnel files of a random sampling of 15 teachers, containing teachers from all five schools with 0-5 years of teaching experience.

The Team found the following problems.

Teacher Evaluations.

1. 2008-2009 school year. The personnel files of seven teachers contained only one evaluation. Principals interviewed reported they had submitted the second evaluation at the end of the year, but apparently the evaluations did not get filed and no one in the central office knew where they were.
2. 2008-2009 school year. The personnel files for three teachers contained no evaluations.
3. 2007-2008 school year. The personnel file of one teacher contained no evaluation.
4. 2007-2008 school year. The personnel file of one teacher contained only one evaluation (Two are required for a third year teacher).
5. 2006-2007 school year. The personnel file of one teacher had no evaluation.

Support Personnel Evaluations.

The random review of files contained five personnel files for professional support personnel (counselors, librarians, speech therapist, etc.,) with the following findings.

1. One counselor, who according to West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5310 and Grant County Board of Education personal evaluation policy, should have been evaluated twice each year had only one evaluation for the 2007-08 year and only one evaluation for the 2008-09 year.
2. Two librarians and one speech-language therapist, each had more than five years of experience and should have been evaluated every three (3) years, had not been evaluated for at least seven years.
3. One counselor should have had two evaluations in the 2008-09 year and only had one evaluation.

### Coach Evaluations.

The Team reviewed evaluation files for eight extracurricular coaches/sponsors and interviewed some principals which produced the following findings.

1. No evaluations were found for the 2008-09 year for five (5) extracurricular coaches/sponsors.
2. Evaluations for two coaches did not meet the West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5310 requirement of being completed “within a four (4) week period at the conclusion of each sport’s season”.
3. The required observation forms were not completed for extracurricular coaches/sponsors at Petersburg High School.

### Service Personnel.

The Team randomly reviewed a sampling of service personal evaluations for the service personnel classifications of custodian, bus operator, cook, mechanic, secretary and secretary/accountant/coordinator. Nineteen (19) evaluations were reviewed for the 2008-09 year, all except one were completed in accordance with State Board Policy 5310 and the service personnel evaluation policy of the Grant County Board of Education. One mechanic did not have an evaluation for the 2008-09 year.

### School Administrators.

Most personnel files for school administrators that the Team reviewed contained a narrative evaluation by the superintendent, but the narrative did not address progress toward meeting a set of agreed upon goals for the 2008-09 year. Interviews with administrators did not produce copies of agreed upon lists of goals for the evaluation process for the 2008-2009 year. The Team found lists of goals for the 2007-2008 administrators’ evaluation with some administrators.

Three administrators did not have evaluations for the 2008-09 school year. One administrator had only one evaluation for the 2007-08 and 2008-09 years and should have had two evaluations each year. One administrator’s evaluation for the 2007-08 school year was not signed by the evaluator.

### Superintendent’s Evaluation.

According to the Board Meeting Minutes of February 24, 2009, the superintendent’s evaluation was not completed by the board “Because the September 15, 2008, deadline for establishing agreed upon goals for the superintendent for the 2008-2009 year had not been met (goals were not accepted by the board until September 23, 2008), the board did not complete an evaluation for the superintendent.”

Additional Evaluation Issue.

The OEPA school Team noted that the administrator at Petersburg High School did not have a plan for completing the observation and evaluation of professional personnel by the November 1 deadline.

**7.6.4. Teacher and principal internship. The county board develops and implements a beginning teacher internship program and a beginning principal internship program that conform with W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies. (W.Va. Code §18A-3-2b and 2d; Policy 5899; Policy 5900)**

The OEPA school Team noted several teachers who had not gone through the mentorship program. These included four teachers at Petersburg High School and one teacher at Union Educational Complex School.

Information concerning the beginning teacher internship program was not available for review. However, the county had employed NEOLA to develop their policies. NEOLA has a policy on the beginning teacher internship program; however, the Team found no policy for a beginning principal internship program. A list showing four mentors for Grant County beginning teachers were hired at the October 14, 2009 board meeting. The postings for the mentors were not available for review; however, the board agenda noted that the mentors were hired under contracted services rather than an extracurricular assignment which would appear to be more appropriate. Two new teachers were hired on July 14, 2009 and two were hired August 11, 2009. No new teacher or principal was interviewed concerning the beginning teacher program. No new principal was identified. Positions for mentors should be posted upon the employment of the new teacher or principal so that mentors will be in place to assist the new teacher at the beginning of the school year.

## **7.7. SAFE, DRUG FREE, VIOLENCE FREE, AND DISCIPLINED SCHOOLS.**

**7.7.2. Policy implementation. The county and schools implement: a policy governing disciplinary procedures; a policy for grading consistent with student confidentiality; policies governing student due process rights and nondiscrimination; the Student Code of Conduct policy; the Racial, Sexual, Religious/Ethnic Harassment, and Violence policy; an approved policy on tobacco use; an approved policy on substance abuse; and an approved policy on AIDS Education. (W.Va. Code §18A-5-1 and §18-8-8; Policy 2421; Policy 2422.4; Policy 2422.5; Policy 4373; Policy 2515)**

W.Va. Code §18A-1-12a (17) states, "All official and enforceable personnel policies of a county board must be written and made available to its employees."

The following areas indicated that the listed policies needed to be reviewed.

Grant County policies on Programs of Study were not up-to-date with West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510, effective date July 7, 2008. The following portions of Grant County's policies were out-dated.

**Policy 2230 – Program of Study Early Childhood (revised 10/9/07).** The section describing the K-2 subject requirements only mentioned an uninterrupted 90 minute reading block, instead of the language which requires “a daily uninterrupted 90 minute reading/English language arts block.” The section that listed the other content areas in the Grant County Program of Study at K-2 just contained the information that “specific content area instruction in the following content areas **may or may not be offered daily.**” It did not reflect the new language of Policy 2510, “Sufficient emphasis must be placed on the given content areas to ensure that students master content knowledge and skills as specified in the 21<sup>st</sup> century content standards and objectives for each subject.” The Grant County Program of Study for Grades 3-4 contained the language requiring 60 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction. This is no longer in Policy 2510. The physical education requirement has also changed.

**Policy 2230.01 – Program of Study Middle Level Education (adopted 2005).** The Grant County Program of Study for Grades 5-8 required a 90-minute reading and English/language arts block within a 225 minute day, while Policy 2510 requires a core block of courses (Reading and English/Language Arts, Mathematics/Algebra I, Science and Social Studies) for no less than 180 minutes. The semester requirement for physical education was also missing.

**Policy 2230.02 – Program of Study Adolescent Education (Grades 9-12) (2006).** Graduation requirements for Grades 9-12 were not according to the current Policy 2510. This entire section of the Grant County Program of Study needed to be updated and reflect current requirements of Policy 2510.

## 1000 – ADMINISTRATION

1120 - 1240 no subsection– Evaluation of Superintendent - no date

## 2000 – PROGRAM

2105 –Mission of the County – no date

2111 – Parent Involvement in the School Program – no date

2220 – Adoption of Programs of Study – 2007 – revised – 10/9/07 (out-dated)

2230 – Program of Study Early Childhood – 2006 – revised 10/9/07 (out-dated)

2230.01 -- Program of Study Middle Level Education – 2005 (out-dated)

2230.02 – Program of Study Adolescent Education (Grades 9-12) – (out-dated)

2250 - no subsection

2312 – Class Size – no date

2350 and 2360 - no subsections

2412 and 2415 - no subsections  
2416 – Student Privacy and Parental Access to Information – 2007 – revised  
10/9/07 - please check sentence on page 9 of 18 under *Prior Consent for  
Disclosure Not Required* – first “is” – should read “if”

2430.01 - no subsection  
2430.02 – Participation in Extra Curricular Activities – 2005 Confusion in Manual  
-- Top of this subsection reads “Second Reading” “Attachment VIII.7” approved  
date – 7/10/07  
2460 – Special Education Administration of Services – 2005 page 2 – Caseloads  
– July 16, 2001 -- Check new regulations

### 3000 – **PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

3113 and 3114 - no subsections  
3120 – Employment of Professional Personnel – 2006 - no subsections for  
3120.02, .04, .05, .06, .07 in tab section table of contents but the subsection for  
.05 was in place  
3124 – Probationary Contract – 2005 - no subsection for 3124.01  
3132 – Vacancies – Professional Positions – 2005  
3133, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 no subsections  
3170 – no subsection  
3431 – Personal Leave – 2007 – 4/29/08  
3432 – Personal Leave Bank – Not in Manual  
3432.02 – Personal Leave Donation Program – 2007 – Adopted 7/21/08

### 5000 – **STUDENTS**

5130 – Withdrawal from School – Missing first 2 pages  
5200 – Attendance – Confusion in Manual – “Seconding Reading” “Attachment  
VIII.4” – revised 3/13/07 – approved 5/22/07, yet Board of Education Minutes –  
July 14, 2009 shows Second Reading, but no subsequent BOE  
minutes showed approval  
5410 – Promotion, Acceleration, Placement, and Retention – no date  
5460 – Graduation Requirements – no date

### 8000 – **OPERATIONS**

8340 – Letters of Reference – Not in Manual  
8420 – Emergency Evacuation of School – Not in Manual

## 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)**

W.Va. Code §18A-2-12a (1) provides “The effective and efficient operation of the public schools depends upon the development of harmonious and cooperative relationships between county boards and school personnel.”

The Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA) Team interviewed the President of the Grant County Board of Education and the other four board members, the interim superintendent, former superintendent (July 1 to September 30, 2009), superintendent’s secretary, county office staff, principals, teachers, retired teachers, parents, community and business individuals, and Grant County officials. A large number of people requested to talk with the OEPA Team concerning the Grant County School District’s educational system.

The Team reviewed agendas and minutes of the Grant County Board of Education meetings, relevant memoranda, letters, and documents; conferred with Team members checking Curriculum, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), the County Five-Year Strategic Plan, Facilities, Finance, Personnel; and reviewed the individual school audit reports.

Multiple sources were used as the basis for the following conclusions about leadership conditions present in the Grant County School System.

### **Findings**

1. **Board Member Training.** Only one board member had participated in the required training in boardsmanship, governance effectiveness, and school performance issues as prescribed by W.Va. Code 18-5-1a(f).
2. **Evaluation of Superintendent.** The Grant County Board of Education neither developed the former county superintendent’s goals and objectives for the 2008-09 school year as prescribed by W.Va. Code §18-4-6 nor conducted the superintendent’s evaluation.
3. **Local School Improvement Council.** Required meetings with the board and each school’s local school improvement council (LSIC) were not held as required by W.Va. Codes §18-5-14 and §18-5A-2. The Team reviewed board agendas from July 2008 to the present (October 2009). There was no evidence that the board received or discussed the schools’ Five-Year Strategic Plans with the LSICs.

4. **Board of Education Meetings.** The Grant County Board did not hold meetings if the county superintendent could not be present. The board rescheduled meetings for the superintendent with the exception of one meeting in which the assistant superintendent was appointed designee. The OEPA Team determined that important board business was delayed due to this practice.
5. **Board Authority.** Grant County Board of Education Policy Series 0000 Bylaws, 0110. Identification, Section C states “. . . the Board of Education has been assigned specific authority through statute, and the Board shall not relinquish or fail to exercise that authority.”

**Board minutes and agendas showed instances in which a member or members of the board of education failed to exercise their statutory obligations pertaining to public education and carrying out the board's responsibility.** Specific board meeting dates and examples are listed.

- August 26, 2008. The minutes did not show that the board came out of executive session to open session to dismiss the meeting.
- November 17, 2008. County Office Director appeared before the board during “Delegations” and read a letter of support of the superintendent. The director also handed a letter to the board from the principals in support of the superintendent.
- December 9, 2008. Motion made and seconded to extend superintendent's contract for two years. Motion failed 3 to 2. Superintendent's contract was not extended. This decision was not respected since the item was placed on two future meeting agendas.
- January 13, 2009. New business – minutes did not record that the superintendent made a recommendation on action taken by the board. Minutes stated the next meeting will be February 10, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.
- January 22, 2009. Agenda and board minutes were missing.
- February 10, 2009. Motion to renew superintendent's contract for one year. Motion failed. Discussion of superintendents goals approval after deadline. One board member requested superintendent's evaluation be an agenda item at the next meeting.
- February 14, 2009. Board minutes listed “Superintendent's Evaluation” as an item. The minutes revealed that the goals for the superintendent were not accepted by the board until September 23, 2008. According to the minutes one member provided data on the date the goals were provided to the board prior to the September 15 deadline for approval. The minutes stated the evaluation for the

superintendent will not be completed because the board did not accept the goals by the deadline and did not have sufficient time to complete the evaluation by the deadline as well.

- February 24, 2009. Superintendent's evaluation discussed.
- March 24, 2009. Minutes indicate adjourned meeting and will convene Tuesday, April 21, 2009. If reconvened, the meeting should have been recessed. Special meetings were held between the March 24, 2009 recess and the April 21, 2009 reconvened meeting. The special meetings occurred March 27, March 30, April 1, and April 9.

March 24, 2009. Citizens Appeal hearing listed as January 10, 2009. The date was incorrect. It should have stated February 10, 2009.

- April 21, 2009. Approved minutes for February 10, March 24, March 22, March 30, April 1, and April 9 meetings.
- May 26, 2009. The board removed the administrative placement of the out-going superintendent from the personnel list to be voted on separately. This was placed under "unfinished business" and failed with 2 ayes; 3 nays. The board president "noted that in light of the present litigation he hopes everyone has talked with their legal counsel as to whether they can or cannot vote."

It is irregular for the superintendent to place herself on the personnel recommendations and it is further irregular for a board of education to consider this recommendation.

- June 9, 2009. Agenda item "Letter received by the board from the superintendent was placed on the June 9, 2009 agenda and recorded in the minutes. Three members recused themselves from this item due to "pending litigation by the current superintendent . . . ." Minutes of this meeting indicated that a board member was responding to citizens who had questions about the letter that had been addressed to him and sent to all board members from the newly hired superintendent who would be taking office July 1, 2009. The Team found this item irregular. Since the letter in question was only sent to board members, it was questionable as to how community members had been informed of its existence. Additionally, the public response of two board members, the reading of portions of the letter by a board member in the meeting, and copies of the letter for the public at the board meeting in addition to copies of litigation by the current superintendent against three board members demonstrated a disregard for prudent board of education actions to diffuse a conflicting situation.

It is highly unconventional for board of education members to publicize correspondence related to personnel issues. The comments in the board minutes during this item said “the letter was threatening . . . .” The OEPA Team felt this discussion established an adversarial climate for the incoming superintendent.

- June 30, 2009. Three board members did not attend this meeting; therefore, a quorum was not present. On July 14, 2009 a board member moved and the motion was seconded to approve the 6-30-09 meeting and the 7-1-09 meeting. The motion passed for 6-30-09 with 5 ayes; 0 nays. For the 7-1-09 meeting, the vote was 3 ayes; 2 abstentions.
- July 1, 2009. A board meeting was called by the vice president with the purpose to ratify the signing of the new superintendent’s contract on behalf of the board. Two members, the board president and another member were not present. Various reports were made to the Team regarding notification of this meeting. The Team observed a special meeting announcement signed by the three attendees. This announcement was dated July 29, 2009, the day prior to the June 30, 2009 meeting that three members did not attend.

The board president never signed the newly hired superintendent’s contract. This constituted an abandonment of the board president’s responsibilities. This superintendent was hired by a 5 ayes member vote.

- July 23, 2009. The board entered executive session under W.Va. Code §6-9A-4, SubParagraph 2A and 12 and reconvened into open session at 8:06 p.m. Minutes did not include the statement, “No action taken.”
- September 8, 2009. Minutes reported one board member vacated the meeting after executive session.
- August 8, 2009. County Office Director appeared before Board during “Delegations” to share information from the previous superintendent who is President of the West Virginia Association of School Administrators (WVASA) on OPEB.

Again this was irregular for a county employee (the same employee who spoke during Delegations November 17, 2008) to deliver this message from a former superintendent.

- October 1, 2009. An emergency meeting was called “mainly to take care of” the posting for a human resources/secondary education director. The interim superintendent, assumed office that day and was not postured to make a recommendation. The board should not be initiating a meeting to hire personnel without the county superintendent’s recommendation (W.Va. Code §18-5-32).

- October 13, 2009. A regular meeting of the Grant County Board of Education was announced and held at 7:00 p.m. The announcement and agenda included "A Planning Session at 5:00 p.m." The "Planning Session" was the Grant County Board of Education's review and rating of applications for the superintendent's position for Grant County Schools. The announcement was misleading to the public and the board's rating of candidates was conducted in a public meeting. While this meeting may or may not have been legal, it demonstrated a veiled attempt of informing the public about the purpose of this meeting relative to hiring a superintendent to replace the one who resigned effective September 30, 2009.

All board members indicated that the superintendent hired to begin July 1, 2009 and was elected by unanimous board vote because the board made an agreement to place the former superintendent into an administrative position and agreed to vote for the appointment of the superintendent. The majority of the board members "renege" on this agreement and this apparently created the complete split in the board and made it difficult for the incoming superintendent to work with the board.

This appears to be an obstacle in the intra-workings of the board as it affects the way board members think about each other and their actions. Discussions relative to this matter have consumed board meetings and resulted in turmoil among board members. It has also negatively affected county board of education as a staff in charge of personnel and secondary curriculum has not be hired. Litigation filed in federal court by a former superintendent as employment discrimination resulted in board division. A former superintendent has sued three members of the county board of education. There is a sharp division in the board with three board members voting together and controlling the actions of the board. Just about all issues involving the former superintendent that come before the board are disposed of on a 3-2 vote.

## 8.1 INDICATORS OF EFFICIENCY

**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.**

No central office staff member was assigned the duties for the secondary level curriculum. This position has been vacant since July 1, 2009.

Dorcas Elementary School had a half-time principal assigned from 7:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m., after which the principal serves as assistant principal at Petersburg Elementary School. After 10:30 a.m. each day a curriculum and instructional leader is not available at Dorcas Elementary School.

Programs of study issues were listed in school reports at Maysville Elementary School, Petersburg High School, and Union Educational Complex School. Distance learning was not being used at the two high schools to meet the schools' curriculum needs.

**8.1.4. Administrative practices. The school district assesses the assignment of administrative personnel to determine the degree to which managerial/administrative services provided to the schools establish and support high quality curriculum and instructional services.**

Administrative practices in the Grant County School District obstructed managerial/administrative services provided schools and did not support high quality curriculum and instructional services. These practices are included throughout the county level report and the individual school reports. The Team reported that misdirected attention and resources to curriculum and instructional services have not served to improve student performance.

The board of education acted on student placement in teachers' classes for the 2009-10 school term. The assignment process was done at the central office and monitored by two central office directors. This is a school level process and the board should function at a higher level than engage in school-based decisions. Furthermore, valuable time of two central office directors was used by this activity. If student/teacher assignment is problematic at the school level, the appropriate chain of command should be followed. The board should provide the policy for administrators to follow.

Other instances were presented by educators and community members indicating that the former superintendent managed school-based issues that again should have proceeded through the progression of employee to supervisor.

Several complaints/grievances/litigation issues are now in progress in the county. One has lingered unresolved for over two years.

**8.1.5. Personnel. The school district assesses the assignment of personnel as based on West Virginia Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies to determine the degree to which instructional and support services provided to the schools establish and support high quality curriculum and instructional services.**

The central office staff seems to be fragmented. Staff interviewed seemed to be unsure of what duties they were assigned. Huge gaps were left unattended, such as, the personnel director and secondary curriculum specialist (currently assigned to the interim superintendent). When the Team asked for certain documentation, many staff members referred to people who were no longer employed by Grant County Schools. A mechanism was not in place to ensure continuity during personnel changes. An interview with the interim superintendent revealed that she recognized the need for the organization of central office personnel with clear assignments of specific duties.

The Team noted that the principal at Union Educational Complex also served as the county attendance director. They felt that his duties in this stipend position caused the principal to struggle with the multiple tasks assigned to being a principal. The school did not have an assistant principal; therefore, the principal identified team leaders at each programmatic level to handle the discipline and most instructional issues. Teachers identified them as the “instructional leaders” of the school.

Current personnel needs included: A director of personnel or secretary of personnel, secondary curriculum specialist, and additional substitute bus operators.

## **CAPACITY BUILDING**

**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.**

Grant County School District has failed to demonstrate the capacity to operate effectively and efficiently and to provide mechanisms to target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process to improve student, school, and school system performance. The system has operated without an excess levy for six years.

The county office leadership and the Grant County Board of Education has been in a tumultuous state since at least October 2008. Consequently, central office staff, schools, and the community at large are affected by the actions and/or inactions of the local board of education and the county office leadership.

## RECOMMENDATION

The Education Performance Audit of the Grant County School District revealed irreconcilable conditions present in the school district that prevent a thorough and efficient education system. These include, but are not limited to, the following conditions.

1. Leadership stability. Grant County has had three superintendents this calendar year.
2. No one has been in charge of personnel from July 1, 2009 to October 1, 2009. An official position remains vacant.
3. No one has been in charge of secondary curriculum since July 1, 2009.
4. School-level performance has declined.
5. Central office staff mistrust has affected cooperative work relationships and time-on-task in responding to schools' needs.
6. Serious deficiencies existed in the schools and at the central office level.
7. The Grant County Board of Education is not exercising its duties and responsibilities according to West Virginia Code.

Due to the preceding conditions and the inability of Grant County to govern itself, the Office of Education Performance Audits finds that students are not being provided a thorough and efficient system of schools as required by law.

The provisions of W.Va. Code §18-2E-5(q) state,

Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the state board may intervene immediately in the county school system with all the powers, duties, and responsibilities contained in subsection (p) of this section if the state board finds the following: (1) That the conditions precedent to intervention exist . . . and that delaying intervention for any period of time would not be in the best interest of the county school system.

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education issue the Grant County School System Nonapproval status and declare a state of emergency in the school system. It is further recommended that the State Board intervene immediately in the operation of the

**school system and exercise full intervention as authorized by W.Va. Code §18-2E-5 (p)(C).**