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INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Hampshire Senior High School in Hampshire County was conducted January 18-21, 2005.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Hampshire Senior High School was conducted January 22-26, 2007. The purpose of the follow-up was to verify correction of the findings identified during the original Education Performance Audit. The review was in accordance with West Virginia Code §18-2E-5 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320 which specify that a school that meets or exceeds the performance and progress standards but has other deficiencies shall remain on full accreditation status and a county school district shall remain on full approval status for the remainder of the accreditation period and shall have an opportunity to correct those deficiencies. The Code and policy include the provision that a school “. . . does not have any deficiencies which would endanger student health or safety or other extraordinary circumstances as defined by the West Virginia Board of Education.”

A Second Follow-up Education Performance Audit Team returned to Hampshire Senior High School May 21, 2008 to check if the remaining noncompliances had been corrected.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

The Second Follow-up Education Performance Audit Team checked identified noncompliances and recommendations to determine if they had been corrected. This section presents the initial Education Performance Audit Team’s findings of noncompliances and recommendations, and the second follow-up review team’s comments and status of compliance with the original citations.

**28 HAMPSHIRE COUNTY**

Cynthia Kolsun, Superintendent

**501 HAMPSHIRE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL - Passed**William Cottrill, Principal

Grades 09 - 12

Enrollment 1,104 (2005-2006 2nd month enrollment report)

**2005-2006 WESTEST**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Enrolled for FAY** | **Number Enrolled on Test Week** | **Number Tested** | **Participation Rate** | **Percent Proficient** | **Met Part. Rate Standard** | **Met Assessment Standard** | **Met Subgroup Standard** |
| **Mathematics** | | | | | | | | |
| All | 274 | 293 | 285 | 97.26 | 67.28 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| White | 269 | 287 | 279 | 97.21 | 68.18 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 105 | 117 | 112 | 95.72 | 60.19 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 35 | 43 | 40 | 93.02 | 32.35 | NA | NA | NA |
| LEP | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| **Reading/Language Arts** | | | | | | | | |
| All | 274 | 293 | 284 | 96.92 | 75.37 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| White | 269 | 287 | 278 | 96.86 | 74.90 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 105 | 117 | 112 | 95.72 | 71.84 | Yes | Yes | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 35 | 43 | 40 | 93.02 | 32.35 | NA | NA | NA |
| LEP | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed  
Graduation Rate = 85.0%**

**28 HAMPSHIRE COUNTY**

Robin J. Lewis, Superintendent

**501 HAMPSHIRE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL – Needs Improvement**Jeff Meadows, Principal

Grades 09 - 12

Enrollment 1,136 (2006-2007 2nd month enrollment report)

**WESTEST 2006-2007**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Enrolled for FAY** | **Number Enrolled on Test Week** | **Number Tested** | **Participation Rate** | **Percent Proficient** | **Met Part. Rate Standard** | **Met Assessment Standard** | **Met Subgroup Standard** |
| **Mathematics** | | | | | | | | |
| All | 280 | 290 | 275 | 94.82 | 61.04 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| White | 272 | 281 | 267 | 95.01 | 62.16 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 118 | 122 | 112 | 91.80 | 54.54 | No | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 51 | 55 | 48 | 87.27 | 19.56 | No | No | Made AYP |
| LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| **Reading/Language Arts** | | | | | | | | |
| All | 280 | 290 | 279 | 96.20 | 72.69 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| White | 272 | 281 | 271 | 96.44 | 73.76 | Yes | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Black | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Hispanic | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Indian | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Asian | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |
| Low SES | 118 | 122 | 114 | 93.44 | 66.96 | No | Confidence Interval | Made AYP |
| Spec. Ed. | 51 | 55 | 50 | 90.90 | 25.00 | No | No | Made AYP |
| LEP | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | NA | NA | NA |

FAY -- Full Academic Year

\* -- 0 students in subgroup

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

**Passed  
Graduation Rate = 86.3%**

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

**Met Standard.**

**5.1.1. Achievement.**

Hampshire Senior High School achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the Annual Performance Measures for Accountability. However, the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics and the all students (AS), racial/ethnicity white (W) and SES subgroups in reading/language arts met AYP only by application of the confidence interval. This indicates that the school must pay particular attention to these subgroups and implement high yield instructional strategies to improve student achievement.

Additionally, the special education (SE) subgroup with a number (N) less than 50 was far below the State’s percent proficient in both mathematics and reading/language arts. Hampshire County’s curriculum staff and school staff are urged to vigorously address these issues. A significant achievement gap exists in the SES and SE subgroups in both mathematics and reading/language arts in relation to the achievement of the AS and W subgroups. The school and county must implement interventions to decrease the achievement disparity.

The following professional development and training opportunities were provided.

1. APL.
2. SREB.
3. I Know Website.
4. Multicultural.
5. Textbooks.
6. Multimedia.
7. Max Thompson.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

Hampshire Senior High demonstrated gains in percent proficient; however, achievement gaps remained between the economically disadvantaged (SES) and special education (SE) subgroups and that of the all students (AS) and racial/ethnicity (W) subgroups.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION

**MET STANDARD. This is the 1st year Hampshire Senior High School did not achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) in one or more subgroups which included the special education (SE) subgroup in both mathematics and reading/language arts. All subgroups in mathematics and reading/language arts declined in the percent proficient from the 2005-2006 school year to the 2006-2007 school year. A new principal had been hired for the school starting with the 2006-2007 school year and the principal discussed several new programs to increase student achievement.**

* **PLATO Learning for Credit Recovery.**

**- After-school tutoring in all core areas.**

**- Positive Behavior Support Program.**

**- Cognitive tutor for the mathematics programs.**

**- Freshman Academy.**

**- In-house mathematics and science tutor 40 hours a week during the day.**

**- Offer a minimum of six Advanced Placement (AP) classes per year.**

**- Honors programs in all core areas.**

**- Guidance and advisory programs.**

**Staff turnover was reported to be a major reason for the lower test scores. Inconsistency in classroom curriculum resulted from the number of teachers that have moved into and out of Hampshire Senior High School.**

**2004 – 2005  Eight new teachers and five vacancies.**

**2005** **– 2006 Eight new teachers, four vacancies, and a new principal.**

**2006 – 2007 Nine new teachers, six vacancies, and a new assistant principal.**

**2007 – 2008 Twenty new teachers, eight vacancies, two new assistant principals, and a new principal.**

**5.1.2. Participation rate.**

**MET STANDARD. This is the 1st year that Hampshire Senior High School did not achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) in one or more subgroups that included the economically disadvantaged (SES) and special education (SE) subgroups in both mathematics and reading/language arts. The participation rate declined for students in all subgroups in both mathematics and reading/language arts.**

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

**Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.**

**6.1. Curriculum**

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

There was no evidence that the curriculum was based on Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) in the classroom of a long-term substitute and that of another substitute. A special education teacher did not address the CSOs. The teacher stated, “My kids can’t do them.” Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) for physical education did not address the CSOs. According to the Department Chairman there were no elective standards for Weight Training (a physical education elective).

A consistent method for identifying that all CSOs had been taught did not exist. Several teachers did not keep track of CSOs that had been taught. Not all the science curriculum conducted 50 percent of inquiry, investigation, experimentation.

The Presidential Physical Fitness Test (PPFT) results were indicative of a greater need to address the CSOs.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

PARTIAL COMPLIANCE. Teachers had lesson plans prepared with the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) referenced. Teachers interviewed were able to articulate CSOs. Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) for weightlifting were available. Due to the severe weather and a two hour delay, the Team was restricted by time and unable to visit all classrooms and conduct observations to verify that all curricular areas had been met. Furthermore, the disrupted instruction and high student absences, both weather related impeded the Team’s ability to thoroughly review the Office of Education Performance Audits findings.

An Instructional Leadership Assessment by Edvantia was conducted this year that noted similar instructional issues. The Team believes that the school has improved greatly, yet is a long way from where it needs to be.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION

**COMPLIANCE. All teachers had copies of the West Virginia Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) and could discuss their proper usage. Teachers had conducted extensive curriculum mapping to guide curriculum and instruction.**

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

The Applied Mathematics served 26 special education students and one (1) regular education student which resulted in a remedial class or ability grouping. Note: During the exit conference, it was reported that collaboration training had been conducted. However, generally the special education teachers as well as the general co-teachers needed more extensive and sustained training to fully benefit the students.

Special education teacher interviews indicated that special education students had been placed in special education programs (consultative) based on the service delivery model available and not based on individual students’ instructional needs.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. Class loads were appropriate, collaboration evident, and coteaching evident. Collaboration training has been provided.

Special education teachers interviewed indicated that Individualized Education Program (IEP) decisions are determined by availability of services and not individual determinations as required by Policy 2419 and IDEA.

New Issue: Special Education staff is concerned about the potential reduction in force of special education teachers due to the failure of the county levy and the county’s necessity to maintain a balanced budget. Special education teachers interviewed indicated that any reduction in special education teacher positions will negatively impact the quality of services and Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION

**COMPLIANCE. Teachers and the county Special Education Director indicated that the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process was based on student need rather than school staffing. It was indicated that the number of students referred for special education testing was declining countywide due to the high quality of instruction, i.e., Tiered Instruction, and Differentiated Instruction from Pre-Kindergarten through the subsequent grades. This was difficult to substantiate as more students in the special education subgroup participated in the WESTEST in 2007 than in 2006.**

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

1. Classes held in the cafeteria were not conducive to learning. Some classes had 32 – 34 students. One health class had 39 students, 31 were special education. Science classrooms were ill equipped to handle the class load of students, i.e., one class had 33 students and another had 31. These facility issues impeded teaching and learning.

2. Eye wash was not available in Room 211.

3. Fire extinguisher and eye wash were not available in Room 208.

4. The Team found an outside door unlocked which allowed entry from unregistered visitors.

5. Hallways had missing and non-operational emergency lighting units.

6. The exterior doors to the facility were not secured.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE.

1. Only one class was being taught in the cafeteria. The principal indicated that special education students were not all in one health class. The Team was unable to check the caseloads of students in science classes.
2. Eye wash was not available in Room 211.
3. Fire extinguisher and eye wash were not available in Room 208.
4. The principal stated that due to the layout of the school and separate buildings, it was necessary for the outside door to remain unlocked. He further noted that the area is closely supervised.
5. Emergency lights in the hallways were operational.
6. Refer to number 4.

The Team reviewed work orders that had been submitted for previous deficiencies.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION

**PARTIAL COMPLIANCE.**

1. **Science caseloads were within reasonable limits.**
2. **Room 211 had an eye wash.**
3. **Room 208 had a fire extinguisher and an eye wash.**
4. **The outside doors remained unlocked as previously identified. Again, the principal stated that the area was supervised.**
5. **Emergency lights remained operational.**

**6.1.9. 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 full spectrum of the science curriculum could not be delivered due to the lack of facilities in the science laboratories. Teachers were impeded in delivering the science Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) because of the lack of fume hoods and critical emergency equipment.

The physical education program of study was not being completely delivered as students were playing games during the Team’s on-site review.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. A work order for fume hoods had been submitted. Parts are still needed to install the devices. The work order was placed 1/06, the hood, received 10/06. Facility concerns still remain in the science classrooms.

Physical Education classes were observed to be actively engaged in direct instruction relating to adopted curriculum (floor hockey, table tennis).

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION

**COMPLIANCE. The fume hood was in place and operational.**

**6.4. Regulatory Agency Reviews**

**6.4.1.** **Regulatory agency reviews.** **Determine during on-site reviews and include in reports whether required reviews and inspections have been conducted by the appropriate agencies, including, but not limited to, the State Fire Marshal, the Health Department, the School Building Authority of West Virginia, and the responsible divisions within the West Virginia Department of Education, and whether noted deficiencies have been or are in the process of being corrected. The Office of Education Performance Audits may not conduct a duplicate review or inspection nor mandate more stringent compliance measures**. (**W.Va. Code §§18-9B-9, 10, 11, 18-4-10, and 18-5A-5; Policy 1224.1; Policy 8100; W.Va. Code §18-5-9; Policy 6200; Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973 §104.22 and §104.23; Policy 4334; Policy 4336)**

The special education Behavior Disorder program was located in the Alternative School building. This was a violation of Harris v. Marockie.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. The special education behavior disorder program was relocated to the Arnold Building, also known as Building 6 – the Weight Training Building. The location of this classroom is in violation of both Harris v. Marockie (located in an outbuilding) and Policy 2419: Regulations for Exceptional Students which requires that classrooms for special education students must be located in close proximity to age-appropriate peers and in adequate and comparable classrooms.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION

**COMPLIANCE. The Special Education Behavior Disorder program was relocated to an area with general education classes in the vicinity. A letter from the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Assessment and Accountability verified that the location was within guidelines.**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**6.1.3. Learning environment.** The Team recommended that the size of the automotive laboratory be increased rather than limiting the number of students permitted to enroll in the class. The Team also recommended that an additional section of Agricultural Education Science I be added. One section had 39 students and another section is needed for safety when students use the Agricultural Mechanics laboratory.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION NOT FOLLOWED. Automotive Laboratory. The size of the automotive laboratory remained as stated in the original report. A capital expense layout would be needed to increase the size of the automotive shop. The assistant principal indicated that a preliminary meeting with the Advisory Committee and the Board of Education was held to investigate School Building Authority funding.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION

**RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED. The administration was currently investigating means to increase the size of the automotive laboratory. The county/school applied for a $1.5 million grant and School Building Authority (SBA) funding.**

**IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCE NEEDS**

A thorough and efficient system of schools requires the provision of an adequate level of appropriately managed resources. The West Virginia Board of Education adopted resource evaluation as a part of the accreditation and evaluation process. This process is intended to meaningfully evaluate the needs for facilities, personnel, curriculum, equipment and materials in each of the county’s schools and how those impact program and student performance.

**17.1. Facilities, equipment, and materials.** Facilities and equipment specified in Policy 6200, Chapters 1 through 14, are available in all schools, classrooms, and other required areas. A determination will be made by using the Process for Improving Education (W.Va. Code §18‑2E‑5) whether any identified deficiencies adversely impact and impair the delivery of a high quality educational program if it is below the West Virginia Board of Education standards due to inadequacies or inappropriate management in the areas of facilities, equipment, and materials. The Education Performance Audit Teams shall utilize an assessment instrument for the evaluation of school facilities which generally follows the requirements of Policy 6200. Note: Corrective measures to be taken in response to any identified resource deficiency will of necessity be subject to the feasibility of modifying existing facilities, consideration of alternative methods of instructional delivery, availability of funding, and prioritization of educational needs through Comprehensive Educational Facilities Plans and the West Virginia School Building Authority. This policy does not change the authority, judgment, or priorities of the School Building Authority who is statutorily responsible for prioritizing “Need” for the purpose of funding school improvements or school construction in the State of West Virginia or the prerogative of the Legislature in providing resources. (Policy 6200 *and Tomblin v. Gainer*)

According to the items checked in the School Facilities Evaluation Checklist, the school was below standard in the following areas. The principal checked and the Team confirmed the following school facility resource needs.

**17.1.2. Administrative and service facilities.**

A. The administrative area did not have an adequate reception/waiting area.

B. The administrative personnel were not provided sufficient workspace and privacy.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Unchanged.

**17.1.3. Teachers’ workroom.**

A. The teachers’ work area was not adequate (84 ft²).

B. The teachers’ work area did not provide access to communications technology.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Technology was available in the work area.

**17.1.8. Grades 1-12 classrooms.**

A. The academic learning areas were not adequate.

B. Classroom storage was not adequate.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Unchanged.

**17.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.**

D1. Art Room - Only one deep sink was available.

D9. Art Room - Blackout areas were not available.

G. Music Room - Adequate storage was not available.

H. Music Room - The Music Room did not have recording devices, microphones, stereo sound systems, or sound equipment.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The Art Room is in a new location, but has still only one sink and no blackout areas noticed. The Music Room was unchanged.

**17.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.**

A. Science rooms were not of adequate size.

B. Rooms were not located with easy access to outdoor activities or isolated to keep odors from the remainder of the facility.

C. Science rooms did not have the required equipment and materials.

C6. Some science rooms did not have fire blankets or emergency showers.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Unchanged.

**17.1.12. Grades 7-12 auditorium/stage.**

E. Broadcasting capabilities were not available.

E6. Distance learning capabilities were not available.

H. The stage did not have adequate storage.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Unchanged.

**17.1.13. Grades 7-12 school site vocational.**

A. The facilities were not adequately equipped.

D. Vocational Automotive Shop – The shop area did not meet the required area stated by Policy 6400 of 160 ft²/student (94 ft²/student).

E. Consumer and homemaking, agricultural education and vocational, industrial and technical education were not offered at the main high school. These courses were offered at the Vocational-Technical Center

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Unchanged.

**17.1.14. Food service.**

A. A teachers’ dining area did not exist.

D. A chalkboard was not available.

H. A locker/dressing room was not available.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Unchanged.

**17.1.15. Health service units.**

A. The health service unit was not adequate in size (102 ft²).

B. Equipment and furnishings were not adequate.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Unchanged.

Recommendations

Room 201 – Floor mounted electrical receptacles posed a tripping hazard. The Team recommended that the outlets be replaced with wall mounted electrical receptacles.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

PARTIAL COMPLIANCE. HVAC units in ON position.

All tiles in classrooms were clean and installed.

Room 201 – The receptacles remained unchanged.

**SECOND FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION**

**17.1.2. Administrative and service facilities.**

**A. A large counter had been removed to increase space.**

**B. Doors were now capable of being closed for privacy.**

**17.1.3. Teachers’ workroom.**

**A. The teachers’ workroom had been relocated to a new room with appropriate size.**

**B. A telephone had been installed and there were plans to install a computer.**

**17.1.8. Grades 1-12 classrooms.**

**Unchanged.**

**17.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.**

**Unchanged.**

**17.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.**

**The principal stated that these issues were inadvertently marked as insufficient by the former principal. However, areas noted within the report showed facility needs which had been remedied during this review.**

**17.1.12. Grades 7-12 auditorium/stage.**

**E. Broadcasting capabilities were available.**

**E6. Distance learning was available.**

**H. The stage had adequate storage.**

**17.1.13. Grades 7-12 school site vocational.**

**A. The facilities were adequately equipped.**

**D. Unchanged.**

**E. These courses were offered on campus.**

**17.1.14. Food service.**

**A. A teachers’ dining area was not provided.**

**D. A chalkboard was available.**

**H. A locker/dressing room was provided.**

**17.1.15. Health service units.**

**The health service unit was being moved to a larger area and furnishings and equipment will be provided in the near future.**

**Recommendation**

**The floor mounted electrical receptacles had been removed and replaced with wall mounted electrical receptacles.**

SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

| **School** | **Accreditation Status** | **Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards** | **Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement** | **Date Certain** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 28-501 Hampshire Senior High | Full Accreditation |  |  |  |

**Education Performance Audit Summary**

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education upgrade Hampshire Senior High School from Conditional Accreditation status to Full Accreditation status.