



INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

RIPLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

JACKSON COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

APRIL 2014

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Education Performance Audit Team	2
School Performance	3
Annual Performance Measures For Accountability - Analysis	9
Education Performance Audit.....	11
Commendations.....	11
High Quality Standards	12
Indicators Of Efficiency	13
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	14
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	15
Early Detection And Intervention	17
Education Performance Audit Summary	18

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Ripley Elementary School in Jackson County was conducted February 27, 2014. The review was conducted at the specific direction of the West Virginia Board of Education. The purpose of the review was two-fold. The primary purpose was to investigate the reason for performance and progress that are persistently below standard. Secondly, the purpose was to make recommendations to the school, school system, as appropriate, and West Virginia Board of Education on such matters as it considers necessary to improve performance and progress to meet the standard.

The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed the Five-Year Strategic Improvement Plan, interviewed 46 school personnel, 45 students and two school system administrators, observed 26 classrooms, and examined school records.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

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

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

West Virginia Department of Education, – Rhonda Fisher, Coordinator, Office of Early Learning

TEAM MEMBER

Name	Title	School/County
Debbie Bever	Director of Instruction	Ritchie County Schools
Stacey Bissel	Principal	New Haven Elementary, Mason County
Jacqueline Hersch	Principal	Pratt Elementary, Kanawha County
Pam Mullins	Director of Instruction	Clay County Schools
Julie Sayre	Principal	Malden Elementary, Kanawha County
Georgia Thornton	Administrative Assistant	Mason County Schools

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

35 JACKSON COUNTY

Blaine Hess, Superintendent

209 RIPLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – FOCUS

Janet Postlethwaite, Principal
Grades PK-5, Enrollment 689 (Uncertified)

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 Ripley Elementary School a Focus school. Focus schools are those schools with persistent and pervasive subgroup achievement/graduation rate gaps. West Virginia's Focus school methodology differs by programmatic level. Elementary and middle schools will use the achievement gap component of the WVAI while high schools will use graduation rate gaps.

An **Elementary/Middle** school designated as a Focus school can exit this status when the school meets its academic achievement goals on the WESTEST2 student subgroups and an elementary/middle school no longer has the largest academic achievement gaps.

Designation Status for Ripley Elementary School.

Designation:	FOCUS	Next Year's Target:	39.6994
Index Score:	31.8936	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	33.8713	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

Supporting Data

Proficiency (40% of the index score)	9.54
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	8.06
Observed Growth (15% of the index score)	4.37
Adequate Growth (20% of the index score)	5.00
<u>Attendance Rate (5% of the index score)</u>	<u>4.92</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	31.89

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

Ripley Elementary School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year. When considering the index target of 39.69 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 31.89, Ripley Elementary School has a steep trajectory to achieve both the short term and long term targets. A significant gap exists between current performance of each subgroup and the target of 75 percent.

- Ripley Elementary earned 31.89 of the 100 points possible for the West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI) for the 2012-2013 school year. (The target was 33.87 for 2013 and is 39.69 for 2014.)
- 50 percent of the subgroups at Ripley Elementary met the targets in mathematics and reading.
- Ripley Elementary acquired 8.06 points of the 20 possible for closing the achievement gap.
- Ripley Elementary acquired 5.00 points of the 20 possible for adequate growth as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.
- Ripley Elementary acquired 4.92 points of the 5 possible points for attendance as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.

**RIPLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Grade-Level Proficiency Data
School Year 2013**

Grade-Level and Subgroup		Mathematics			Reading/Language Arts		
Grade	Group	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient
3	White	92.86%	57.14%	42.86%	92.86%	59.34%	40.66%
3	Hispanic	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
3	Asian	> 95%	<5%	> 95%	> 95%	<5%	> 95%
3	Multiracial	50.00%	>95%	< 5%	50.00%	<5%	> 95%
3	Limited English Proficiency	> 95%	<5%	> 95%	> 95%	<5%	> 95%
3	Special Education	84.00%	76.19%	23.81%	84.00%	85.71%	14.29%
3	Total	92.23%	57.89%	42.11%	92.23%	58.95%	41.05%
4	White	> 95%	56.18%	43.82%	> 95%	56.18%	43.82%
4	Hispanic	> 95%	<5%	> 95%	> 95%	<5%	> 95%
4	Special Education	95.00%	84.21%	15.79%	95.00%	94.74%	5.26%
4	Total	94.74%	55.56%	44.44%	94.74%	55.56%	44.44%
5	White	> 95%	68.47%	31.53%	> 95%	75.89%	24.11%
5	Black	> 95%	<5%	> 95%	> 95%	<5%	> 95%
5	Asian	> 95%	<5%	> 95%	> 95%	<5%	> 95%
5	Limited English Proficiency	> 95%	<5%	> 95%	> 95%	<5%	> 95%
5	Special Education	95.00%	89.47%	10.53%	95.00%	>95%	< 5%
5	Total	> 95%	67.26%	32.74%	> 95%	74.56%	25.44%

Attendance Rate = 98.40%

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

Mathematics.

- Grade 4 students with a proficiency rate of 44.44 outperformed Grade 3 students (42.11 percent proficient) and Grade 5 students (32.74 percent proficient).
- Grade 3 special education students with a proficiency rate of 23.81 percent outperformed Grade 4 (15.79 percent proficient) and Grade 5 (10.53 percent proficient).
- More than 95 percent of Grade 3 and Grade 5 limited English proficiency students scored proficient.

Reading/Language Arts.

- Grade 4 students with a proficiency rate of 44.44 outperformed Grade 3 (41.05 percent proficient) and Grade 5 (25.44 percent proficient).
- Grade 3 special education students with a proficiency rate of 14.29 percent outperformed Grade 4 (5.26 percent proficient) and Grade 5 (<5 percent proficient) in reading/language arts.
- More than 95 percent of Grade 3 and Grade 5 limited English proficiency students scored proficient in reading/language arts.

RIPLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Growth Model School Level Summary
Results by Sub-Group

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

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

Subgroup		Mathematics 2013					Reading/Language Arts 2013				
		Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient	Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient
All Sub-Group	School	87 (42%)	76 (37%)	44 (21%)	41.0	38.0%	71 (34%)	71 (34%)	66 (32%)	48.0	35.6%
	County	925 (34%)	856 (32%)	909 (34%)	50.0	44.2%	803 (30%)	833 (31%)	1,045 (39%)	54.0	51.2%
	State	51,165 (35%)	45,256 (31%)	50,057 (34%)	50.0	45.1%	50,484 (35%)	45,076 (31%)	50,227 (34%)	50.0	48.8%
White Sub-Group	School	86 (42%)	75 (37%)	42 (21%)	40.0	37.8%	71 (35%)	68 (33%)	65 (32%)	47.0	34.7%
	County	909 (34%)	842 (32%)	895 (34%)	50.0	44.3%	791 (30%)	820 (31%)	1,027 (39%)	54.0	51.0%
	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	18 (50%)	13 (36%)	5 (14%)	34.0	16.9%	12 (33%)	13 (36%)	11 (31%)	42.0	7.7%
	County	153 (42%)	110 (30%)	105 (29%)	44.0	16.6%	131 (36%)	102 (28%)	130 (36%)	50.0	12.9%
	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	69 (40%)	63 (37%)	39 (23%)	42.0	43.4%	59 (34%)	58 (34%)	55 (32%)	48.0	42.9%
	County	772 (33%)	746 (32%)	804 (35%)	51.0	49.2%	672 (29%)	731 (32%)	915 (39%)	55.0	58.0%
	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	42 (40%)	35 (34%)	27 (26%)	40.0	38.0%	39 (37%)	37 (35%)	29 (28%)	46.0	35.6%
	County	455 (37%)	378 (31%)	399 (32%)	48.0	38.7%	392 (32%)	377 (31%)	457 (37%)	51.0	43.8%
	State	26,545 (38%)	21,619 (31%)	22,119 (31%)	47.0	37.5%	25,763 (37%)	21,435 (31%)	22,576 (32%)	47.0	40.8%
Non-LSES Sub-Group	School	45 (44%)	41 (40%)	17 (17%)	41.0	(NA)	32 (31%)	34 (33%)	37 (36%)	52.0	(NA)
	County	470 (32%)	478 (33%)	510 (35%)	51.0	54.4%	411 (28%)	456 (31%)	588 (40%)	56.0	64.8%
	State	24,620 (32%)	23,637 (31%)	27,938 (37%)	52.0	58.1%	24,721 (33%)	23,641 (31%)	27,651 (36%)	52.0	62.5%
Male Sub-Group	School	41 (41%)	38 (38%)	22 (22%)	43.0	35.8%	36 (35%)	33 (32%)	33 (32%)	46.0	28.3%
	County	479 (35%)	430 (31%)	468 (34%)	50.0	44.1%	445 (32%)	418 (30%)	510 (37%)	51.0	42.8%
	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	46 (43%)	38 (36%)	22 (21%)	40.0	40.4%	35 (33%)	38 (36%)	33 (31%)	49.0	43.7%
	County	446 (34%)	426 (32%)	441 (34%)	50.0	44.4%	358 (27%)	415 (32%)	535 (41%)	57.0	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 Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group chart identifies the percent proficient in each subgroup compared to the county and State averages. In addition, subgroup growth is examined and determined to be low (red cells), typical (yellow cells), or high growth (green cells) based on previous performance. This chart does not include Grade 3, it only includes the scores of students who previously participated in WESTEST2 assessment.

Mathematics.

- All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in mathematics with the exception of the special education subgroup, which demonstrated low growth.
- 38 percent of all students were proficient in mathematics as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- 16.9 percent of the special education subgroup was proficient in mathematics as compared to the non-special education subgroup with 43.4 percent proficient, which indicated a 26.5 percent gap.
- The low socioeconomic status subgroup mirrored the all subgroup with 38 percent proficient in mathematics.
- 35.8 percent of the male subgroup was proficient in mathematics and 40.4 percent of the female subgroup was proficient in mathematics, which indicated a gap of 4.6 percent.

Reading/Language Arts.

- All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts.
- 35.6 percent of all students were proficient in reading/language arts as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- 7.7 percent of the special education subgroup was proficient in reading/language arts compared to the non-special education subgroup with 42.9 percent proficient, which indicated a 35.2 percent gap.
- The low socioeconomic status subgroup mirrored the all subgroup with 35.6 percent proficient in reading/language arts.
- 28.3 percent of the male subgroup was proficient in reading/language arts and 43.7 percent of the female subgroup was proficient in reading/language arts, which indicated a 15.4 percent gap.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY - ANALYSIS

Analysis of the WESTEST2 data indicated that Ripley Elementary School experienced typical growth in mathematics and reading language arts with the exception of special education students in mathematics which demonstrated low growth. Students demonstrated slightly higher proficiency rates in mathematics compared to reading/language arts in all subgroups except for the female subgroup. The data also indicated greater support is needed for the special education subgroup. Large achievement gaps existed between the special education subgroups and their counterparts in both mathematics and reading/language arts, signifying the need for targeted professional development for teachers in meeting these particular students' needs.

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

Date	Professional Development Session	Staff in Attendance
July 17, 2013	Sherry Parrish – Number Talks	Grade Level Teachers, Guests from other schools, Special Educators
August 19-23, 2013 2:45-3:30	Overview of Educator Evaluation System	All professional staff
August 21, 2013 During planning periods	Imagineer the Perfect Classroom-Goal setting for the year	Grade Level Teacher, Title I teachers
August 26-30, 2013 2:45-3:30	Overview of Self-Reflection Section of evaluation	All professional staff
August 28, 2013	Identifying Big Rocks of English Language Arts in Next Generation Standards-What changes do you see in comparison to previous standards?	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers
September 3-5, 2013	Educator Evaluation System-Completing Self-Reflection	All professional staff
September 4, 2013	What classroom resources do we have to support our English Language Arts standards?	Grade Level Teachers, Title I staff
September 12-13, 2013	Educator Evaluation System-Completing Self-Reflection Section	Special Education Teachers, Kindergarten and Preschool
September 16-20	Overview of Student Goals Section of Educator Evaluation System	All professional staff

September 20, 2013	English Language Arts Big Rocks in Next Generation Standards-Taking a closer look at the clusters	Grade Level teachers, Title I teachers
October 4, 2013	Project Based Learning Overview	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers, special ed. teachers
October 9, 2013	Project Based Learning Overview continued and Planning	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers, special ed. teachers
October 14, 2013	STAR data Training	Grade Level Curriculum team reps. , Title I teachers
October 16-17	Response To Intervention Guy-Pat Quinn Maximizing Core Instruction	Grade Level Curriculum team reps.(2 per grade) Title I teachers
October 14, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 2013	Book Study Meetings <i>Learning by Doing</i>	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers
October 22, 2013	Hands-On Science Training- Tree Kit	Kindergarten teachers
October 25, 2013	Project Based Learning Planning	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers, special ed. teachers
October 29, 2013	Writing through Inquiry	3 rd , 4 th , 5 th Grade, Title I and Grade related special ed. teachers
November 6-7, 2013	Model Project Based Learning Lessons Taught; Afterschool Sessions	2 nd grade teachers, grade level representatives
November 8, 2013	Project Based Learning Planning	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers, special ed. teachers
November 12-14, 18, 20, 2013 2:45-3:30	Vertical Team meetings-Math and ELA trends	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers, special ed. teachers
December 6, 2013	Introduction to iPads in the Classroom	Grade Level Teachers, Title I teachers, special ed. teachers
December 18, 2013	Kansas Writing Training	Grade Level Reps.
December 20, 2013	Utilizing Covey Strategies in the Classroom	All staff
January 15-16, 2014	Formative Assessment Training	2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , 5 th Grade and Grade Level Title I teachers
January 29, 2014	Kansas Writing Training Part 2	Grade Level Reps.
February 6, 2014	Project Based Learning Training	2 nd , 3 rd Grade and Grade Level Title I teachers
February 12, 2014	Project Based Learning Training	4 th , 5 th Grade and Grade Level Title I teachers

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

COMMENDATIONS

The Education Performance Audit Team reported that Ripley Elementary School had implemented positive school improvement initiatives. The prominent initiatives and activities included the following.

7.1.3. Learning Environment. The Team verified the school staff provided a safe and nurturing environment conducive to learning. Students reported, “Our teachers really care about us and want us to learn.” The support for a positive learning environment extended beyond the classroom. Teacher interviews revealed teachers collaborated with outside agencies to provide items such as shoes, clothing, and weekend snack packs for students.

Interviews with administrative staff indicated teachers were dedicated to the school as evidenced by many of them working extra hours to prepare for students, and their willingness to attend a weekly 7:30 A.M. staff meeting to address the needs of the school, without compensation.

The staff also received professional development entitled, Time to Teach, which provided a framework for standardized language for expectations from students that supported classroom management and protected instructional time. This indicated a positive culture existed at the school which supported an environment conducive to learning for students.

7.1.12. Multicultural Activities. Students were exposed to a variety of cultures through a comprehensive plan that included multicultural standards and lessons provided throughout the school year. The principal maintained a notebook as means of tracking the standards delivered at each grade level. The plan included themes that were delivered across all grade levels, such as, “The Olympics” and classroom level activities, such as, “Welcome to the Americas.” The plan also included activities presented by the counselor addressing an anti-bullying initiative.

7.8.1 Leadership. The Team commended Jackson County Schools for providing an associate principal of curriculum and instruction for the 2013-2014 school year. The associate principal significantly impacted teaching and learning in the school. During the interviews, the assistant principal and teachers noted that instruction had changed since the associate principal arrived. Through the teaming process, she has led the teachers in embedded, professional development, modeled lessons for teachers, and assisted in analyzing data to inform instruction. The principal and the assistant principal indicated, prior to the current school year, they found difficulty focusing on curriculum and instruction due to the time required for managing a large facility (95 staff and 689 students), special education requirements, and discipline issues. Both administrators expressed that the associate principal had time to focus primarily on curriculum and instruction.

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 noted that while some teachers had high expectations for students, nine of 26 teachers were using low-level, recall questioning with students. The principal indicated staff had participated in the Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) during the 2012-2013 school year, but they had not started the IPI process for the current school year. She reported she planned to reinstate the IPI process beginning fall 2014.

In one kindergarten classroom, the instructional aide was not engaged with students. During the 30-minute observation, the aide sat for 10 minutes at a desk and then moved to the back of the room and sat for an additional 10 minutes.

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)

Science instruction was provided with 50 percent minimum active inquiry, hands-on, investigation, and experimentation in only two classes. Science instruction mostly involved textbooks, demonstrations, and worksheets. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2520.3 – 21st Century Science K-8 Content Standards and Objectives for West Virginia Schools, states, “Students will engage in active inquiries, investigations, and hands-on activities for a minimum of 50 percent of the instructional time to develop conceptual understanding and research/laboratory skills.”

7.1.9. 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)

While students were provided physical education 45 minutes 2 days a week, the Team could not verify that Ripley Elementary had a current approved alternative plan for providing Physical Education no less than 30 minutes a day, for no less than 3 days a week.

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback. Lesson plans that are based on approved content standards and objectives are prepared in advance and the principal reviews, comments on them a minimum of once each quarter, and provides written feedback to the teacher as necessary to improve instruction. (Policy 2510; Policy 5310)

The Team reviewed 26 lesson plans and reported four were vague and would be difficult for a substitute to follow. The Team saw evidence that the principal provided a checklist of expected components in lesson plans to teachers at least once each quarter; although, Team members reported the comments were not provided relative to improving instruction to address student achievement. The Team recommended the principal use a format that includes written constructive feedback to the teachers reinforcing the instructional changes presented during the embedded professional development being offered.

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)

Ripley Elementary received a Fire Marshal report February 7, 2014. To meet the requirement of a response due to the Office of the State Fire Marshal within 15 days of receipt of the report, central office staff was in the process of composing a plan of correction to address requirements of the report.

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.

None identified.

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 Ripley Elementary School in achieving capacity, the following resources are recommended.

The Focus Assistance Support Team (FAST) comprised of members from the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE), the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) and the local education agency (LEA), work closely to assist the school in implementing the West Virginia School Improvement Framework. This ensures the efforts are aligned and focused to support appropriate interventions to improve student subgroup achievement and graduation rates.

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.

Due to substantial gaps between the special education and non-special education subgroups in both mathematics and reading/language arts, the Team recommended this area become a priority for professional development offerings personalized to Ripley Elementary School. While it was commendable that an instructional coach was working with teachers and students part time, the Team determined that having an associate administrator of curriculum and instruction on staff full-time was positively impacting instruction. The Team recommended the county consider continuing the employment of the associate administrator or work with the school leadership team to create an alternative plan for providing an administrative presence during the grade level team meetings to assist with data analysis to determine the needs of all students in order to close the achievement gap.

The Team found that the school made a shift in the way they utilized the Title I staff at Ripley Elementary for the current school year. Students conveyed they received a lot of help in groups. Title I staff were primarily providing co-teaching during core instruction and during Tier I intervention times in the regular classrooms. The Team observed two classes providing good examples of an effective co-teaching model. Co-teaching can be a very effective way to provide interventions and possibly reduce the number of students being referred for special education services. The Team recommended using the two classrooms mentioned above as models for building capacity for all co-teachers in the building.

The Team determined Ripley Elementary School has the capacity to correct the identified deficiencies. The school had a positive climate and culture and several effective initiatives in place. With support from the central office and RESA 5, the administrators and teachers are capable of developing the data analysis skills needed to improve instruction. If the school continues to analyze data, use the results to address

instructional needs, and provide an effective co-teaching model to assist with interventions, the Team believed Ripley Elementary will experience proficiency growth in both mathematics and reading/language arts and begin to close the achievement gap of the special education subgroup. Evidence will be in the 2014 WESTEST2 results.

IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCE NEEDS

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

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

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

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

19.1.3. Teachers' workroom. The teachers' work areas did not provide access to communication technology. (Did not adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.5. Library/media and technology center. The library did not have on-line periodical indexes. (Did not adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.7. K classrooms. Kindergarten classrooms did not provide 50 sq. ft. per child. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.9. Grades K-12 remedial. One Title I classroom did not have an adequate academic learning area, adequate storage, or instructional bulletin boards. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)

19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas. The art facility did not provide a ceramic kiln or a black-out area. (Did not adversely impact program and student performance.)

The music facility was not located in a quiet area away from the building. The music teacher traveled to each classroom and classrooms were not equipped with chairs with folding arms. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)

The physical education facility did not provide two or more teaching stations, a data projector with a 50-inch screen, or a network connection. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)

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

19.1.15. Health service units. The health services unit was available, but it did not contain a curtained area or small rooms with cots, bulletin board, toilet, lavatory, refrigerator with locked storage, or a work counter. (May adversely impact health and safety.)

EARLY DETECTION AND INTERVENTION

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

The 2013-2014 “5-17 Percent Needy Report” indicated 49.80 percent of the students at Ripley Elementary were economically disadvantaged. This coupled with the size of the school and the number of students identified as requiring special education services expedites the need to assure a process is in place to assist school staff in providing quality core instruction and interventions.

In order to increase achievement and close subgroup gaps, it is crucial that the school continue the instructional leadership delivered through the teaming process as a means of analyzing data and planning instruction. Embedded professional development through modeling and feedback is also a critical factor in increasing student achievement. This process was established during the current school year and could be strengthened to assist in early detection of individual student needs. This could be accomplished by continuing to provide an associate administrator of curriculum and instruction or by assuring a comprehensive plan is in place in which the remaining administrators make curriculum and instruction a priority and continue the grade level teaming meetings during the instructional day and follow-up with walkthroughs and constructive feedback.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

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

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

7.1.2. High expectations.

7.1.4. Instruction.

7.1.9. Programs of study.

The Team presented three commendations (7.1.3. Learning Environment, 7.1.12. Multicultural Activities, and 7.8.1. Leadership) and two recommendations (7.2.3. Lesson plans and Principal feedback and 7.4.1. Regulatory agency reviews), offered capacity building resources, and noted early detection and intervention factors.

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 Ripley Elementary School and Jackson 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.