



**INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**ROBERT C. BYRD HIGH SCHOOL**

**HARRISON COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**JUNE 2014**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

## Table of Contents

	Page
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit Team .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>School Performance .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Annual Performance Measures For Accountability - Analysis .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>High Quality Standards .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Indicators Of Efficiency .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Identification Of Resource Needs.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Early Detection And Intervention .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit Summary .....</b>	<b>25</b>

## INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Robert C. Byrd High School in Harrison County was conducted March 18, 2014. The review was conducted at the specific direction of the West Virginia Board of Education. The purpose of the review was two-fold. The primary purpose was to investigate the reason for performance and progress that are persistently below standard. Secondly, the purpose was to make recommendations to the school, school system, as appropriate, and West Virginia Board of Education on such matters as it considers necessary to improve performance and progress to meet the standard.

The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed the Five-Year Strategic Improvement Plan, conducted 66 teacher interviews, 451 student interviews (individual and whole class), two administrative interviews, two counselor interviews, observed 43 classrooms, and examined school records.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Dr. Michelle Samples, Coordinator

West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Instructional Technology – Gloria Burdette, eLearning Program Assistant

West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Career and Technical Accountability and Support – Dr. Sherri Nash, Executive Director

## TEAM MEMBERS

Name	Title	County
Jeff Harvey	Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Federal Programs, and School Improvement	Doddridge County
Dr. Cynthia Kolsun	Assistant Professor	Marshall University
Beverly Nichols	Director of Exceptional Students	Clay County
Troy Ravenscroft	Assistant Superintendent	Grant County
Kathi Schmalz	Principal, Magnolia High School	Wetzel County
Beverly Shatto	Assistant Principal, Ripley High School	Jackson County
Tammy Wells	Director of Secondary and Vocational Education, Student Assessment, and Strategic Planning	Wetzel County

## SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

### 33 HARRISON COUNTY

Susan Collins, Superintendent

### 506 ROBERT C. BYRD HIGH SCHOOL – TRANSITION

Martin Pigg, Jr., Principal  
Grades 9-12, Enrollment 791

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

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

### Designation Status for Robert C. Byrd High School.

Designation:	TRANSITION	Next Year's Target:	50.2426
Index Score:	40.4617	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	46.662	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

### Supporting Data

Proficiency (35% of the index score)	7.68
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	7.59
Observed Growth (5% of the index score)	2.00
Adequate Growth (10% of the index score)	3.00
<u>Graduation Rate (30% of the index score)</u>	<u>20.19</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	40.46

The West Virginia Accountability Index targets were set for each school to reach progressively higher performance on a defined set of data. Schools have an overall score based on multiple components of student and school performance. All schools were required to meet the same end point, thus defining school-specific trajectories requiring higher rates of improvement for lower performing schools. Targets comprised of the five components listed above were set with a goal of all high schools in West Virginia reaching 71.7260 by 2020. Proficiency targets were set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

Robert C. Byrd High School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year (46.66). Considering the index target of 50.24 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 40.46, Robert C. Byrd High School has a steep trajectory to achieve both short term and long term targets.

The West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Assessment, has created line graphs depicting the annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for math and reading, which can be accessed for each subgroup with a cell size of 20 or more students, through the year 2020. These graphs may be viewed on the My School's Performance webpage (<http://wvde.state.wv.us/esea/performance/>) provided by the West Virginia Department of Education. The trajectory charts revealed significantly larger gaps between observed proficiency scores and projected proficiency scores for the all (11.47 percent), white (12.79 percent), low socioeconomic status (4.52 percent), and special education (19.59 percent) subgroups in reading/language arts compared to mathematics for the 2012-2013 school year. Gaps between observed proficiency and projected proficiency scores for mathematics were less for the all (2.75 percent), white (4.51 percent), and special education (16.03 percent) subgroups, with the low socioeconomic status subgroup slightly exceeding the projected score by 0.48 percent.

Each year the projected proficiency score increases in order for the subgroup to achieve 75 percent proficiency by the year 2020. Given the observed proficiency scores for school year 2012-2013 and the projected proficiency rates for next year, each of the above-referenced subgroups must increase performance by the following percentages to achieve the trajectory target for reading/language arts: All 15.79 percent; white 16.83 percent; low socioeconomic 13.33 percent; and special education 29.79 percent. Similarly, these subgroups must increase performance by the following percentages to meet the projected proficiency rates for 2013-2014 in mathematics: All 7.45 percent; white 8.99 percent; low socioeconomic 5.69 percent; and special education 23.77 percent.

**ROBERT C. BYRD HIGH SCHOOL**  
**Grade-Level Proficiency Data**  
**School Year 2013**

Grade-Level and Subgroup		Mathematics			Reading/Language Arts		
Grade	Group	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient
11	White	> 95%	60.87%	39.13%	> 95%	66.09%	33.91%
11	Black	90.00%	55.56%	44.44%	88.89%	62.50%	37.50%
11	Hispanic	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
11	Multiracial	> 95%	<5%	> 95%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
11	Limited English Proficiency	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
11	Special Education	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	95.00%	5.00%
11	Low Socioeconomic Status	93.15%	67.65%	32.35%	93.06%	70.15%	29.85%
11	Total	> 95%	60.63%	39.37%	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%

**Graduation Rate = 61.41%**

The chart, Grade-Level Proficiency Data for School Year 2013, depicts participation, non-proficient, and proficient percentage rates by grade level and subgroup for mathematics and reading/language arts. As the chart depicts, all subgroups exceeded the 95 percent participation rate, except for the black and low socioeconomic subgroups. Achievement performance varied among subgroups.

**Mathematics.** The multiracial subgroup (>95 percent) had the highest proficiency rate in mathematics, followed by the black subgroup (44.44 percent), the white subgroup (39.13 percent), and the low socioeconomic subgroup (32.35 percent). Less than 5 percent of the Hispanic, limited English proficiency, and special education subgroups were proficient. The proficiency rate for all students in mathematics was 39.37 percent.

**Reading/Language Arts.** With regard to reading/language arts, the black subgroup had the highest proficiency rate with 37.50 percent, followed by the white subgroup (33.91 percent). The low socioeconomic status subgroup achieved 29.85 percent proficiency, while the special education subgroup had a proficiency rate of 5 percent. The Hispanic, multiracial, and limited English proficiency subgroups had proficiency rates less than 5 percent. The proficiency rate for all students in reading/language arts was 33.33 percent.

**ROBERT C. BYRD HIGH SCHOOL**  
**Growth Model School Level Summary**  
**Results by Sub-Group**

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

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

Subgroup		Mathematics 2013					Reading/Language Arts 2013				
		Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient	Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient
All Sub-Group	School	150 (33%)	133 (29%)	171 (38%)	53.0	40.3%	187 (41%)	140 (31%)	125 (28%)	44.0	44.0%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	46.8%	*	*	*	0.0	52.1%
	State	51,165 (35%)	45,256 (31%)	50,057 (34%)	50.0	45.1%	50,484 (35%)	45,076 (31%)	50,227 (34%)	50.0	48.7%
Black Sub-Group	School	14 (45%)	9 (29%)	8 (26%)	42.0	32.4%	11 (35%)	15 (48%)	5 (16%)	45.0	38.9%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	38.2%	*	*	*	0.0	41.9%
	State	2,677 (37%)	2,180 (30%)	2,303 (32%)	47.0	32.1%	2,581 (36%)	2,216 (31%)	2,308 (32%)	48.0	38.5%
Hispanic Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	37.0	45.5%	*	*	*	61.0	45.5%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	38.7%	*	*	*	0.0	43.5%
	State	590 (36%)	523 (32%)	539 (33%)	49.0	39.4%	511 (31%)	500 (31%)	627 (38%)	54.0	44.8%
White Sub-Group	School	132 (33%)	116 (29%)	158 (39%)	56.0	40.5%	172 (43%)	118 (29%)	114 (28%)	43.0	44.0%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	46.9%	*	*	*	0.0	52.3%
	State	47,034 (35%)	41,704 (31%)	46,085 (34%)	50.0	45.7%	46,584 (35%)	41,462 (31%)	46,170 (34%)	50.0	49.2%
Spec.Ed Sub-Group	School	34 (49%)	18 (26%)	18 (26%)	36.0	4.5%	40 (57%)	19 (27%)	11 (16%)	31.0	4.6%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	15.7%	*	*	*	0.0	15.1%
	State	7,956 (43%)	5,628 (31%)	4,781 (26%)	41.0	18.3%	7,406 (41%)	5,488 (30%)	5,291 (29%)	43.0	16.1%
Non-Spec.Ed Sub-Group	School	116 (30%)	115 (30%)	153 (40%)	57.0	47.6%	147 (38%)	121 (32%)	114 (30%)	46.0	51.8%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	52.8%	*	*	*	0.0	59.2%
	State	43,209 (34%)	39,628 (31%)	45,276 (35%)	51.0	49.6%	43,078 (34%)	39,588 (31%)	44,936 (35%)	51.0	54.2%
LSES Sub-Group	School	84 (36%)	68 (29%)	79 (34%)	45.0	29.0%	100 (43%)	73 (32%)	57 (25%)	41.0	34.3%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	32.6%	*	*	*	0.0	37.2%
	State	26,545 (38%)	21,619 (31%)	22,119 (31%)	47.0	37.5%	25,763 (37%)	21,435 (31%)	22,576 (32%)	47.0	40.7%
Non-LSES Sub-Group	School	66 (30%)	65 (29%)	92 (41%)	58.0	53.0%	87 (39%)	67 (30%)	68 (31%)	48.0	54.7%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	59.7%	*	*	*	0.0	65.6%
	State	24,620 (32%)	23,637 (31%)	27,938 (37%)	52.0	58.1%	24,721 (33%)	23,641 (31%)	27,651 (36%)	52.0	62.5%
LEP Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	36.0	28.6%	*	*	*	61.0	14.3%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	54.5%	*	*	*	0.0	43.6%
	State	293 (30%)	287 (29%)	393 (40%)	57.0	42.7%	242 (25%)	319 (33%)	400 (42%)	59.0	42.0%
Male Sub-Group	School	85 (37%)	65 (29%)	78 (34%)	48.0	36.7%	98 (43%)	74 (32%)	58 (25%)	44.0	36.7%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	45.4%	*	*	*	0.0	44.2%
	State	27,113 (37%)	22,439 (30%)	24,615 (33%)	48.0	44.3%	27,485 (37%)	22,259 (30%)	24,047 (33%)	47.0	41.0%
Female Sub-Group	School	65 (29%)	68 (30%)	93 (41%)	57.0	44.4%	89 (40%)	66 (30%)	67 (30%)	44.0	52.0%
	County	*	*	*	0.0	48.3%	*	*	*	0.0	60.2%
	State	24,052 (33%)	22,817 (32%)	25,442 (35%)	51.0	45.9%	22,999 (32%)	22,817 (32%)	26,180 (36%)	52.0	56.9%

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

\*Denotes cell size <20.

The chart, Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group, identifies the percent proficient in each subgroup for Grades 9 through 11 compared to the county and the State averages. In addition, subgroup growth is examined and determined to be low (red cells), typical (yellow cells), or high (green cells) based on previous performance.

**Mathematics.** As depicted in the chart above, all subgroups demonstrated typical growth in mathematics. The percent proficient for all students in mathematics in Grades 9 through 11 was 40.3 percent. The most significant differences in proficiency existed between the special education subgroup (4.5 percent) and non-special education subgroup (47.6 percent), creating a 43.1 percent gap. The low socioeconomic subgroup (29.0 percent) and non-low socioeconomic subgroup (53.0 percent) demonstrated a significant gap of 24.0 percent. Proficiency rate for the female subgroup was 7.7 percent higher than the male subgroup proficiency rate.

**Reading/Language Arts.** All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts except for the special education subgroup which demonstrated low growth. The percent proficient for all students in reading/language arts in Grades 9 through 11 was 44.0 percent. The largest gap in proficiency (47.2 percent) occurred between the special education subgroup (4.6 percent) and non-special education subgroup (51.8 percent). Another significant gap in proficiency (20.4 percent) existed between the low socioeconomic subgroup (34.3 percent) and non-low socioeconomic status subgroup (54.7 percent). Additionally, a proficiency gap of 15.3 percent existed between the female subgroup (52.0 percent) and the male subgroup (36.7 percent).

### **ACT PLAN Assessment Results**

The ACT PLAN® is designed to provide Grade 10 students with measures of their attainment of knowledge and complex critical thinking skills acquired in the early years of high school. Assessment results assist students, parents, and educators in decision-making about educational career plans, interests, and high school course work plans. The test covers four content areas: English, mathematics, reading, and science reasoning. The composite score is the average of the scale scores from the four areas.

ACT PLAN® results provide Grade 10 students with an indication of their educational progress within the context of their post-high educational and career plans. The results from PLAN® can be used to make selections in students' coursework to help ensure that they are prepared for their postsecondary plans. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510: *Assuring the Quality of Education – Regulations for Education Programs* requires students to choose career majors and to create the second part of their individual student transition plans establishing a career major by the end of the Grade 10. Results from PLAN can be used by tenth graders to develop their individual transition plans for grades eleven through post-secondary.

The ACT PLAN® serves as the midpoint measure of academic progress in ACT's College and Career Readiness System, and ACT researchers found that PLAN® test scores are good predictors of success on related Advanced Placement® courses.



Below is a summary of ACT PLAN® trend data over the last three years. Scores in all areas (English, mathematics, reading, and science) for Robert C. Byrd High School were slightly higher for the 2012-2013 school year compared to the previous year. These scores, however, were slightly lower than the State and county averages from 0.1 to 0.7 points for 2012-2013. Compared to the benchmark scores (indicated below), Robert C. Byrd High School students' scores consistently exceeded the benchmark set for English all three years; however, students' scores were lower all three years in mathematics, reading, and science.

Benchmarks: English: 15      Mathematics: 19      Reading: 17      Science: 21

<b>ACT PLAN RESULTS</b>			
<b>Grade 10</b>			
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
English WV	16.3	16.0	16.2
English Harrison County	16.4	16.3	16.6
English Robert C. Byrd High	16.1	15.6	16.1
Mathematics WV	16.2	16.4	16.4
Mathematics Harrison County	16.0	16.4	16.3
Mathematics Robert C. Byrd High	15.2	15.6	16.2
Reading WV	16.1	16.1	16.4
Reading Harrison County	16.0	16.4	16.6
Reading Robert C. Byrd High	15.2	15.6	15.9
Science WV	17.3	17.3	17.4
Science Harrison County	17.2	17.8	17.5
Science Robert C. Byrd High	16.7	16.9	17.0
Composite WV	16.6	16.6	16.7
Composite Harrison County	16.5	16.9	16.9
Composite Robert C. Byrd High	16.1	16.0	16.4

Source: <http://wvde.state.wv.us/oa/actplan.html>

## ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY - ANALYSIS

Analysis of the data for Robert C. Byrd High School showed students demonstrated higher proficiency rates in reading/language arts compared to mathematics in all subgroups. The data also indicated greater support is needed for the special education subgroup, the low socioeconomic subgroup, and the male subgroup in both reading/language arts and mathematics. Significant achievement gaps existed between these subgroups and their counterparts, indicating the need for targeted professional development for teachers in meeting these particular students' needs.

The following professional development and/or training opportunities were scheduled to be provided for the 2013-2014 school year as reported by the principal.

1. Robert C. Byrd New Teacher Evaluation System and Student Data Notebooks.
2. Robert C. Byrd – Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) Data Collection/West Virginia Elementary and Secondary Education Act (WV ESEA) Accountability Data Analysis/Department SMART Goals.
3. College Foundation of West Virginia (CFWV) Presentation.
4. Robert C. Byrd School Safety.
5. Vertical Alignment and Inter-department Collaboration.
6. Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA) Preparation/Best Practices/Departmental Scheduling.

Prior to the Education Performance Audit, the OEPA staff provided an in-service to Robert C. Byrd High School staff on February 18, 2014, to review the indicators in Policy 2320 and prepare staff for the audit.

<b>NUMBER OF ADVANCED PLACEMENT (AP®), HONORS, AND COLLEGE COURSES OFFERED 2013-2014</b>			
<b>High School</b>	<b>Number of AP® Courses</b>	<b>Number of Honors Courses</b>	<b>Number of College Credit Courses</b>
Robert C. Byrd High	5	3	8

The school currently offered five Advanced Placement courses: AP® English Language, AP® English Literature, AP® US History, AP® Calculus, and AP® Art. Policy 2510 states, "A minimum of four College Board AP® Courses (at least one from each core content areas of English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) or the IB Program must be offered annually." The school did not offer an Advanced Placement course in science.

Honors courses being offered included: Grade 9 Honors English, Grade 10 Honors English, and Grade 11 Honors English. Students have access to dual credit courses offered at the Caperton Center by Fairmont State University (English, Finance, Information Systems, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology), as well as two math courses provided on campus by West Virginia University (Algebra III and Trigonometry). Twenty-eight students were enrolled in courses at the Caperton Center in Fall 2013 and 31 were enrolled in Spring 2014. Students must provide their own transportation to participate in these courses.

<b>ADVANCED PLACEMENT TEST (APT) (COLLEGE BOARD)</b>				
Robert C. Byrd High	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.05%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	8.1%	10.9%	9.5%	19.2%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	8.4%	6.0%	12.5%	10.9%
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	33.3%	22.2%	12.9%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	25.0%	15.7%	50.0%

\*NA – Not Available.

During the 2012-2013 school year, 51 students at Robert C. Byrd High School completed examinations for Advanced Placement® classes. These students were comprised of two sophomores, 30 juniors, and 18 seniors. As indicated in the chart above, the percentage of Grade 10 students (1.05 percent) completing the tests increased slightly compared to the previous year; however, the percentage of students scoring a 3 or higher on the examinations (0.0 percent) has remained the same the last three years. The percentage of Grade 11 students completing the exams increased by 9.50 percent, but the percentage of these students scoring a 3 or higher on the exams decreased by nearly the same margin (9.30 percent). Conversely, the percentage of Grade 12 students completing the exams decreased slightly (1.60 percent), but the percentage of these students scoring a 3 or higher on the exams increased significantly compared to the 2011-2012 school year (34.30 percent). The principal and staff must investigate methods to increase the number of students taking the Advanced Placement® test (APT) and also increase the number of students scoring 3 or higher, particularly at the Grade 10 level.

<b>AP TEST TAKERS</b>	
Robert C. Byrd High	2012-13
Total # of test takers.	51
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	0
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	4
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	9

Source: Reported by school.

During the 2012-2013 school year, 51 students at Robert C. Byrd High School completed exams for AP® courses. This was approximately 6.70 percent of the students enrolled in the school as identified through the 2<sup>nd</sup> month enrollment report for 2012. Of the 51 test takers, 13 (25.49 percent) scored a 3 or higher on the examinations. Based upon these results, it is imperative administrators and teachers of Advanced Placement courses utilize the AP Instructional Planning Report to target areas of student deficiency in preparing instructional delivery.

<b>Robert C. Byrd High School</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
2010-2011	68.8%
2011-2012	71.37%
2012-2013	61.41%

Source: Data collected from NCLB Private Data Site and My School's Performance Site at <http://wvde.state.wv.us>

Robert C. Byrd High School obtained 20.19 points of the 30 points possible for graduation rate for the 2012-2013 school year according to the West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI). This was 4.05 points lower than the average points awarded for graduation rate by a high school (24.24). As depicted in the chart above, the school's graduation rate for 2012-2013 (61.41 percent), as calculated using the four-year cohort data, was 9.96 percent lower than the graduation rate for the previous year. The school's graduation rate was 17.91 percent lower than the State average (79.32 percent).

<b>ESTIMATED COLLEGE GOING RATE FALL 2012</b>		
	<b>Number of High School Graduates 2011-2012</b>	<b>Overall College Going Rate Percentage</b>
State	18,335	56.4%
Harrison County	767	63.1%
Robert C. Byrd High	159	57.2%

Source: West Virginia College Going Rates By County and High School Fall 2012, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission.

As the chart above shows, the college going rate for Robert C. Byrd High School (57.2 percent) was slightly above the State rate (56.4 percent), while it was 5.9 percent below the county (63.1 percent). Ninety-one of the 159 Robert C. Byrd High School graduates attended college in Fall 2012. The staff of Robert C. Byrd High School and the Harrison County central office should continue to investigate and implement programs and practices that will increase the number of students attending college.

<b>HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENROLLED IN DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES FALL 2012</b>					
	1 <sup>st</sup> Time WV Freshmen Total #	English Total #	% in Developmental English	Mathematics Total #	% in Developmental Mathematics
State	7,708	1,341	17.40%	2,222	28.83%
Harrison County	338	46	13.61%	101	29.88%
Robert C. Byrd High	93	14	15.10%	24	25.80%

Source: Data collected from NCLB Private Data Site at <http://wvde.state.wv.us/>

High School Graduates Enrolled in Developmental Courses Fall of 2012 showed 93 graduates of Robert C. Byrd High School entered college as first time freshmen. The percentage of students enrolled in a developmental English course (15.10 percent) was slightly higher than the county, but slightly below the State (17.40 percent). More students enrolled in a developmental mathematics course (25.80 percent); however, this was slightly lower than both the county (29.88 percent) and State (28.83 percent) enrollments.

## HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

### Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.

#### 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)**

The Team observed students serving as assistants throughout the day in classrooms and the main office. Of these students, one was observed sleeping on a couch in the library and another was using ear buds to listen to music on his/her phone. A student assistant was placed in a supervisory position in one classroom when the teacher left the classroom unattended. An office assistant reported, "We do this on our own. We give up a credit, so we can come in the office and help." Administrators reported that student assistants received no experiential credit for their services.

Aides in five classrooms were not engaged with students. In one instance, an aide received a personal call during class and left the classroom to talk on the phone. In another instance, an aide made a personal phone call during class. When students were preparing to take an exam in one classroom, the aide told the teacher, "I'm going to help out in the office. Let me know if you need me." Two aides sat at their desks in two classrooms and did not engage with students.

The school's Five-Year Strategic Plan referenced an "incentive program with rewards for students increasing mastery scores in English/Language Arts and Math". When students were asked about incentive programs, they reported there were no incentive programs for such things as attendance or discipline, and indicated the snacks provided during standardized testing were incentives to do well on the WESTEST2.

Based upon classroom observations and teacher and student interviews, the Team determined low expectations for student achievement existed. Instruction observed in nine classrooms was based primarily upon lecture, the textbook, or worksheets that reinforced recall and basic comprehension skills. In two classrooms, students were completing short fill-in-the-blank assessments with word banks provided. Students completing a computerized placement test in another classroom were off task during the assessment and received little redirection from the teacher. The Team observed at least 12 students during the day with their heads down or sleeping in class. Ten of these students were never redirected by the classroom teacher. Teachers demonstrated a learned helplessness regarding increasing student achievement and graduation rate. One teacher stated, "Student performance is out of our control. Students don't care and parents don't care." Another teacher said, "It's our clientele".

Students reported they felt the administration and “about half” the teachers genuinely cared for them. They also reported perceived discrepancies in dispensation of discipline, citing that athletes, students from more affluent families, or students whose parents were actively involved at the school received preferential treatment.

The Team recognized the school was making efforts to increase student voice in decision making through the Eagle Cabinet; however, the Team determined the process utilized for student council membership underscored low expectations. As reported by students, staff, and administration, organization officers are elected, but any student may become a member by paying a \$3.00 fee. The Team was unable to ascertain the purpose for this fee.

The Team also observed that instructional time was not always maximized. A grab and go breakfast was provided after first block, with at least 280 students participating the date of the audit. However, the Team observed many students coming to second block class several minutes late, and teachers holding instruction until these students arrived. For instance, in one class, 15 students were present at 9:15 A.M., the scheduled start time for instruction; instruction did not begin until 9:27 A.M. when 22 students were present.

Two 30-minute lunch periods were provided in the daily schedule. While two classes of students were in lunch, the other two were in a homeroom. Team observations and student interviews revealed that homeroom lacked a set structure, and very little meaningful interaction occurred during this time. Students and teachers reported that Wednesdays were reserved for sustained silent reading. Overall, homeroom served as a study hall and provided social time for students. Students reported, “Half the time in homeroom we just do homework”. Considering the school’s data, which revealed a declining graduation rate and significant gaps in student achievement, the Team recommended a more purposeful structure be implemented for homeroom.

**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)**

Technology integration was listed as a professional development offering in the school’s Five-Year Strategic Plan; however, teachers could not speak to any professional development regarding technology other than that provided for the College Foundation of West Virginia (CFWV). Interviews revealed that technology professional development opportunities were provided, but the majority of staff did not participate. The technology integration specialist (TIS) reported that mostly teachers of career and technical education courses requested assistance with technology. The principal reported at least 75 percent of the staff utilized technology on a daily basis. During the date of the Education Performance Audit, the Team observed seven teachers utilizing technology. Of those seven, four were using PowerPoint and one was using an ELMO to project notes to accompany their lectures. One teacher was utilizing a video to showcase vocabulary words and asked more questions about the actors in the video than the

vocabulary words. Students were observed utilizing technology in 10 classrooms. Students were observed completing computerized assessments in four of the 10 classrooms, and students in another were provided the opportunity to use their phones to locate vocabulary words. In three other classes, the technology was a part of the course curriculum (e.g., Television Production, Advanced Journalism, and Webpage Design). As one student stated, “We have plenty of technology here, just not enough people who know how to use it.”

Students also reported limited opportunities to visit the library; they stated they “never” go to the library as a class, but can go during lunch or homeroom if they ask. They indicated no planned time during classes to access the library.

**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)**

According to the West Virginia Department of Education Course Information for Policy 2510, “A minimum of four College Board AP® Courses (at least one from each core content areas of English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) or the IB Program must be offered annually.”

The master schedule reflected the school currently offered five Advanced Placement courses: AP® English Language, AP® English Literature, AP® Calculus, AP® US History, and AP® Art. The school did not offer an advanced course in science.

**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)**

After interviewing administrators, staff, and students, the Team determined students as a whole did not receive adequate guidance and advisement, particularly in post-secondary planning. Administrators, counselors, and teachers reported an informal mentoring program was in place to provide support to at-risk students. None of these individuals could provide information as to how effective this program had been or how information for those students involved with the mentoring was being managed. Counselors reported that developmental guidance was provided during homeroom; however, Team observations verified that homeroom was utilized as a study hall and socialization period. The counselor also stated that students may not be in the same homeroom all four years of high school, since students are placed alphabetically by last name and this placement changes with each new freshman class. This rotation did not allow continuity and development of true mentoring or advisory relationships between teachers and students.

Although the counselor and administrators reported that teachers were provided professional development regarding the use of the College Foundation of West Virginia (CFWV) website, the Team determined there was no systemic implementation of the site



to advance students' career interests. There was also no indication that students utilized the My Strategic Compass tool provided on the Career and Technical Education page of the WVDE website (<http://westvirginia.strategiccompass.com/>) to explore career options. In a class of 24 students, 20 indicated they had post-secondary plans, but none of them could name exactly what they planned to do and the preparation needed to realize their goals. One group of students reported the last time they visited the local career and technical center was in middle school. Students reported they "need people to talk about careers". Students also shared they felt counselors were inaccessible and performed too many administrative duties.

## **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.**

While goals for the school's Five-Year Strategic Plan were developed based on student achievement and student engagement data, the Team determined the goals were general and did not address specific student achievement issues, such as subgroup gaps or declining graduation rate. The Team ascertained from interviews a general lack of teacher awareness of the plan. Teachers were unable to speak to the goals or their role in implementing strategies to attain the goals. They were also unable to explain who was involved in developing the plan. They indicated they had received a copy of the plan just prior to the Team's visit and could not speak to the professional development mentioned in the plan for technology and classroom management. The Team could not verify that progress in achieving the goals of the plan was monitored on a regular basis.

**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)**

Teachers and administrators reported lesson plans were submitted to the office twice monthly, and review of plans was divided among the three building administrators. After reviewing 38 sets of lesson plans, the Team concluded there was inconsistency in the types of feedback teachers received on their plans. In some instances tickets with a listing of items were attached to plans; sometimes items were checked and other times they were not. Feedback was often not provided regarding the items that had not been checked. A date and initials, along with the ticket, were found in six sets of plans, but no feedback was found. In nine other plans, comments such as, "Great use of SQ3R curricular lessons", "Great lessons – complete with many hands-on" [activities], or "Nicely written; substitute friendly" were seen, but no constructive feedback was provided

targeting ineffective or inappropriate strategies being implemented with supportive suggestions on how to strengthen instruction to better meet students' needs. Administrative reviews were not found in three sets of plans.

Plans for the week were not available for three teachers, and 10 sets of plans did not contain enough detail to be followed by a substitute. These plans provided lists of activities such as "rock formation lab set up" or "P.O.D.; overtime pay".

**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)**

All teachers interviewed referenced a "Data Day" held the previous school year before students' arrival, where staff reviewed student achievement data. However, teachers reported no such opportunity to review data was provided during the current school year. They stated an overview was provided this year, but student data was not examined in-depth. During interviews teachers were unable to name strengths or weaknesses identified based upon the 2012-2013 student achievement data (i.e., WESTEST2, ACT PLAN). As mentioned in the data analysis, significant gaps existed between the special education subgroup and non-special education subgroup in math (43.1 percent) and reading/language arts (47.2 percent), as well as between the low socioeconomic subgroup and non-low socioeconomic subgroup in math (24.0 percent) and reading/language arts (20.4 percent). The Team determined teachers were unable to address these concerns due to their lack of knowledge regarding student data.

A Team review of the four-year cohort graduation rate revealed that it was 61.41 percent for the 2012-2013 school year; this was 9.89 percent lower than the previous year and 17.91 percent below the State average. When the principal was asked to state the school's graduation rate, he reported he could not remember but thought it had "improved over three years". The guidance counselor also stated she did not know the graduation rate but reported she thought it was "positive". Teachers were also unaware of the school's graduation rate.

Due to the lack of knowledge of student data by both administrators and teachers, the Team concluded it would be very difficult for the school to target students' needs through instruction or specific interventions. Supporting this conclusion was teachers' inability to explain Support for Personalized Learning (SPL) or how it was being implemented in the school.

The Team ascertained during student interviews that students were also unaware of their own achievement data. Students and teachers reported that WESTEST2 results were mailed home to students. Students also stated that at least one teacher told them there

was no point to the WESTEST2 and to “just get through it”. Additionally, students were uninformed about their ACT PLAN scores. The listing of professional development provided by the school referenced student data notebooks. When asked, neither students nor teachers could report these notebooks were utilized. One teacher expressed s/he thought they would be implemented the following school year.

## 7.6. PERSONNEL.

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

A review of professional educator licensure was completed by the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Professional Preparation. The following issues were identified:

Ten teachers did not hold the appropriate endorsements for the courses they were listed as teaching.

Eleven teachers did not have content exams electronically on file at the West Virginia Department of Education.

Four teachers were on permit.

One teacher was on permit and not highly qualified.

One teacher did not have the appropriate certification for the course s/he was listed as teaching.

## 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)**

Teachers and administrators reported that the Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) was conducted throughout the school year to provide teachers with information relative to student engagement, and teachers completed self-assessments using the IPI coding system to make instructional adjustments. However, other than the tickets attached to lesson plans, the Team could not verify any other method by which staff were receiving feedback from administration relating to classroom instruction. The ticket included the following items: Aligned with CSO; instructional technology; writing assignment; reteaching; bellringer; closure; and 10-minute talk. Although the tickets indicated a 10-minute talk could be requested by administration, the Team did not see any requests marked on the tickets viewed the day of the audit. Administrators reported no established walkthrough procedure in place and no method for aggregating and sharing walkthrough results with teachers. Students reported they usually did not see administrators in their classrooms.

The Team recognized that the administration had begun developing collaborative time for teachers through departmental meetings; however, a review of the agendas and minutes from these meetings indicated their primary focus was on managerial issues, such as scheduling and school policies and procedures. The Team determined increased emphasis needed placed on utilizing student data to strengthen instruction, thereby improving student achievement. Teachers reported monthly Block Parties held between departments and administrators were “top down” and usually involved administrators sharing information with teachers rather than teachers working collaboratively.

The principal reported he spent 60 percent of his time dealing with management issues versus 40 percent working with curriculum and instruction. He indicated the opposite could be said for the curriculum assistant principal. While the Team recognized there was a division of duties among the administrative team, the Team determined the principal needed to better develop his role as an instructional leader within the school and all members of the administrative team needed to be able to articulate student/school data.

## INDICATORS OF EFFICIENCY

Indicators of efficiency for student and school system performance and processes were reviewed in the following areas: Curriculum delivery, including but not limited to, the use of distance learning; facilities; administrative practices; personnel; utilization of regional education service agency, or other regional services that may be established by their assigned regional education service agency. This section contains indicators of efficiency that the Education Performance Audit Team assessed as requiring more efficient and effective application.

The indicators of efficiency listed are intended to guide Robert C. Byrd High School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Harrison County is obligated to follow the Indicators of Efficiency noted by the Team. Indicators of Efficiency shall not be used to affect the approval status of Harrison County or the accreditation status of the schools.

**8.1.1. Curriculum. The school district and school conduct an annual curriculum audit regarding student curricular requests and overall school curriculum needs, including distance learning in combination with accessible and available resources.**

As indicated earlier in this report, students had access to six dual credit courses offered at the Caperton Center by Fairmont State University (English, Finance, Information Systems, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology), as well as two math courses provided on campus by West Virginia University (Algebra III and Trigonometry). Twenty-eight students were enrolled in courses at the Caperton Center in Fall 2013 and 31 enrolled in Spring 2014. The Team recognized the opportunity this presented for students but concluded accessibility was limited due to the requirement that students provide their own transportation to participate in these courses. The Team recommended the county and school investigate ways of increasing student opportunity to participate in the dual credit courses offered off campus.

## BUILDING CAPACITY TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES

West Virginia Code §18-2E-5 establishes that the needed resources are available to assist the school or school system in achieving the standards and alleviating the deficiencies identified in the assessment and accountability process. To assist Robert C. Byrd High School in achieving capacity, the following resources are recommended.

**18.1. Capacity building is a process for targeting resources strategically to improve the teaching and learning process. School and county electronic strategic improvement plan development is intended, in part, to provide mechanisms to target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process to improve student, school, and school system performance.**

### Building Capacity - Transition School

As part of the expectations outlined in the West Virginia ESEA Flexibility Waiver, approved by the federal government in May 2013, the school and students are to receive additional support. The majority of services are led by the local school district, with support from the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) and the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE). The school must complete a targeted strategic plan and will be monitored occasionally for progress. The local school systems may partner with the local RESA and others to provide professional development, technical assistance and interventions.

Information provided by school administration indicated the school was participating in professional development opportunities provided by the West Virginia Center for Professional Development (WV CPD), Regional Education Service Agency 7 (RESA 7), and the county office. Examples of this support included sessions relative to the Next Generation Content Standards in mathematics, English/Language Arts, and social studies; a support program for beginning secondary teachers; and various opportunities available for teachers and beginning administrators.

Based upon the large gaps in proficiency between special education students and non-special education students, the Team recommended the school continue to seek out professional development from RESA 7 and the county office to obtain information and professional development on not only SPL, but also universal design for learning, formative assessment, and differentiation. The School Improvement Technical Assistance Manual published by the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE), Office of Special Programs can serve as a resource in developing teachers' understanding in all these areas, and copies may be provided through RESA 7 or accessed through the following website <http://wvde.state.wv.us/osp/spi.html>.

It was evident that the administration was attempting to build a more collaborative environment for teachers through departmental meetings. The Team determined these meetings needed to evolve into professional learning communities (PLCs). Agendas from the departmental meetings, as well as interviews with staff, indicated that greater understanding of these entities and their role in student achievement was needed. To

create fully functioning professional learning communities, the Team recommended implementing book studies relative to the topic of professional learning communities, along with creation and utilization of common formative assessments and data analysis to strengthen instruction and improve student achievement.

While the Team determined the school was attempting to identify and support at-risk students through an informal mentoring program, the Team concluded the school needed to develop a formalized process that would offer systemic support for students and their families. Based upon the low graduation rate (61.41 percent), the Team recommended the school investigate successful programs such as the one enacted by Ricardo LeBlanc Esparza and described in the book, *Breaking the Poverty Barrier: Changing Student Lives with Passion, Perseverance, and Performance*.

## IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCE NEEDS

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

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

**None identified.**



## **EARLY DETECTION AND INTERVENTION**

One of the most important elements in the Education Performance Audit process is monitoring student progress through early detection and intervention programs.

The 2013-14 “5-17 Percent Needy Report” indicated 48.23 percent of the students at Robert C. Byrd High School were economically disadvantaged. As data analysis showed, significant gaps in achievement existed between the low socioeconomic status subgroup and the non-low socioeconomic status subgroup in both mathematics (24.0 percent) and reading/language arts (20.4 percent). The largest gaps in achievement existed between special education and non-special education subgroups in math (43.1 percent) and reading/language arts (47.2 percent). The staff at Robert C. Byrd High School had performed a cursory analysis of student data at the beginning of the school year; the Team determined the school needed to delve more deeply into standardized testing data and formative assessment data (Acuity, classroom tests) to identify individual students’ deficiencies. Such analysis would allow teachers to tailor classroom instruction to better support these students, as well as develop a functioning Support for Personalized Learning (SPL) program.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

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

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

7.1.2. High expectations.

7.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.

7.1.9. Programs of study.

7.1.11. Guidance and advisement.

7.2.1. County and School electronic strategic improvement plans.

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.

7.2.4. Data analysis.

7.6.2. Licensure

7.8.1. Leadership

The Team noted an indicator of efficiency (8.1.1.), offered capacity building resources, and noted an early detection and intervention concern.

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

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

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