



**Office of Education
Performance Audits**

FINAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

KANAWHA COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

JULY 2011

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Cedar Grove Elementary School in Kanawha County was conducted April 28, 2010.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Cedar Grove Elementary School in Kanawha County was conducted April 1, 2011. The purpose of the follow-up review was to verify correction of the findings identified during the original Education Performance Audit. The review was in accordance with West Virginia Code §18-2E-5 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320 which specify that a school that meets or exceeds the performance and progress standards but has other deficiencies shall remain on full accreditation status and a county school district shall remain on full approval status for the remainder of the accreditation period and shall have an opportunity to correct those deficiencies. The Code and policy include the provision that a school “. . . does not have any deficiencies which would endanger student health or safety or other extraordinary circumstances as defined by the West Virginia Board of Education.”

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

39 KANAWHA COUNTY

Dr. Ronald E. Duerring, Superintendent

213 CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Needs Improvement

Franklin Mace, Principal

Grades PK - 05

Enrollment 333 (2nd month 2008-09 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2008-2009

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
Mathematics								
All	164	175	174	99.42	44.78	Yes	No	X
White	162	169	168	99.40	44.09	Yes	No	X
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	112	122	122	100.00	39.28	Yes	No	X
Spec. Ed.	26	28	28	100.00	34.61	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	164	175	175	100.00	57.31	Yes	Yes	✓
White	162	169	169	100.00	56.79	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	112	122	122	100.00	52.67	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	26	28	28	100.00	34.61	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Attendance Rate = 94.3%

39 KANAWHA COUNTY

Dr. Ronald E. Duerring, Superintendent

213 CEDAR GROVE COMMUNITY (ELEMENTARY) SCHOOL – Passed

Dr. Elaine Gayton, Principal

Grades PK - 05

Enrollment 331 (2nd month 2009-10 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2009-2010

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
Mathematics								
All	132	145	144	99.31	33.58	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	130	141	140	99.29	34.10	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Spec. Ed.	29	32	32	100.00	34.48	NA	NA	NA
Low SES	95	106	105	99.05	30.85	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	132	145	144	99.31	28.24	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	130	141	140	99.29	28.68	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Spec. Ed.	29	32	32	100.00	20.68	NA	NA	NA
Low SES	95	106	105	99.05	23.40	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed

Attendance Rate = 95.4%

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Met Standard.

5.1.1. Achievement.

Cedar Grove Elementary School failed to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics for two consecutive years and in the all students (AS) and the racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups in mathematics for the 2008-2009 school year. Cedar Grove Elementary School achieved AYP in the SES subgroup in reading/language arts only by application of the confidence interval. The county curriculum staff and school staff are urged to address these subgroups in the county and school Five-Year Strategic Plans and apply interventions to improve achievement of all students.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Information by Class indicated scores below mastery and novice in both mathematics and reading: Grade 3 – 58.49 percent in mathematics and 27.78 percent in reading; Grade 4 – 60.00 percent in mathematics and 52.00 percent in reading; Grade 5 – 48.33 percent in mathematics and 48.33 percent in reading. These scores have implication for the Five-Year Strategic Plan and school improvement.

West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, *A Process for Improving Education-Performance Based Accreditation System* in Section §126-13-6 provides:

6.1. A system of points on an index will be used to assess and weigh annual performance measures for state accreditation of schools and approval of school systems that gives credit or points on an index to prevent any one measure alone from causing a school to achieve less than full accreditation status or a school system from achieving less than full approval status: Provided, That a school or school system that achieves AYP is eligible for no less than full accreditation or full approval status, as applicable, and the system established pursuant to this subsection shall only apply to schools and school systems that do not achieve AYP.

The index showed that Cedar Grove Elementary School performed within the point range (409-350) for full accreditation status.

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

1. WESTEST2 Overview.
2. Data Analysis.
3. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) – Understanding Depth of Knowledge.
4. Year 1 School Improvement Strategic Planning.
5. Mathematics Webinar.
6. Innovation Zone Grant Team.

7. SAT, School Wide Expectations, and Reading Master Tea.
8. Reading First Book Study.
9. Professional Learning Communities: Second Chances and Corrective Instruction.
10. Professional Learning Communities: The Master Teacher.
11. Professional Learning Communities: Assessment Charts and WESTEST Achievement Goals.
12. Standards Based Mathematics Instruction.
13. Depth of Knowledge in Mathematics.
14. Planning for Writing Assessment and Response to Intervention (RTI) Mathematics.
15. A Framework for Understanding Poverty.
16. Reviewing the Steps and Processes for Everyday Mathematics.
17. 21st Century Curriculum.
18. Parent Involvement Workshop.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

MET STANDARD.

- **Cedar Grove Elementary School achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP) in all subgroups with a cell size of 50 or more. AYP was achieved in all of these groups by application of the confidence interval.**
- **The staff continued trainings such as the ones listed in the original report to improve instruction and student learning.**
- **The staff had implemented the Concerned Based Adoption Model (CBAM) as the school improvement program. The purpose of this program was to keep the school focused on student achievement. It included data analysis to develop "Smart Goals" - these were strategic, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely goals. From the data analysis weaknesses were determined and the staff developed strategies to improve student weaknesses. These were handled in the professional learning communities (PLCs). The school had participated in an Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) as another means to improve instruction.**
- **The staff had additional training on building their plans to provide more Depth of Knowledge (DOK) in classroom instruction.**

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.

7.1. Curriculum

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

Most of the classrooms in the PK-05 section of the building did not have an intercom in place. This was a safety issue in a number of ways, especially in the event of a lock down situation.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. Two way radios had been provided to all staff members and were used to communicate between the school office, school principal, and teachers. Classrooms had intercoms that were operated from the "old school office" which was in the office of the middle school. In case of emergency, a direct telephone link between the elementary school office and the middle school office would provide immediate emergency announcements throughout both schools.

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

The Team observed some co-teaching classes that were ineffective in that the special education teacher did not take an active role in delivering the curriculum. However, the Team observed many examples of Title I teachers effectively implementing the co-teaching method.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. Additional training had been provided to the teachers who worked in co-teaching classrooms. The Team visited several rooms in which special education teachers and/or Title I teachers were co-teaching with the general classroom teachers. Interviews with the teachers provided positive comments about the situation. Lesson plans were meshed and it was impossible to distinguish between the general classroom teacher and the special education or Title I teacher. Instruction in these rooms was very effectively delivered.

- 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)**

Although a laboratory schedule indicated time for each class to go to the computer laboratory weekly, the Team could not verify the extent teachers were following the schedule and making use of the laboratory. The Team observed minimal use of technology in the classrooms and in the computer laboratory.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. Several effective computer based education programs had been provided (Reading Assistant, Pearson Success Net, Scholastic Math Inventory, West Virginia Writes, DIBELS, etc.) which teachers were using in classroom instruction. A full time Technology Interventionist Specialist (TIS) was employed and was providing training and support to the staff in using technology in the classrooms. Wireless Internet had been installed in the school, and a new K-3 computer laboratory has been installed. The Team reviewed technology use in the classrooms and computer laboratories. The logs in computer laboratories and items in teacher lesson plans showed extensive technology use in the building.

- 7.1.13. Instructional day. Priority is given to teaching and learning, and classroom instructional time is protected from interruption. An instructional day is provided that includes a minimum of 315 minutes for kindergarten and grades 1 through 4; 330 minutes for grades 5 through 8; and 345 minutes for grades 9 through 12. The county board submits a school calendar with a minimum 180 instructional days. (W.Va. Code §18-5-45; Policy 2510)**

According to the school's master schedule the classes were not receiving the required amount of instructional time. Time was not shown for transition time between classes. Students had to walk a long distance to art and physical education. This time was included as instructional time.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed the school's master schedule of classes and found the schedule included transition time for class changes and contained the required amount of instructional time.

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.

Five teachers could not discuss the school's goals in the Five-Year Strategic Plan or how the plan's action steps were being implemented in the classrooms. The Five-Year Strategic Plan must be the basis for school improvement.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The staff had been involved in revising the Five-Year Strategic Plan and was very familiar with the school goals, action steps in the plan, and was implementing the action steps in the classrooms.

- 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)

Four teachers' lesson plans were not complete and could not be used to instruct the classes. The remainder of the lesson plans were complete and thorough. The principal had made high quality written feedback on the lesson plans that were insufficient; however, the teachers had not followed the principal's comments.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed a random sampling of teacher lesson plans and specifically the lesson plans of three of the four teachers cited above (the fourth teacher was no longer at this school) and found lesson plans to be complete and of high quality. Interviews with teachers provided evidence the written feedback from the principal was being implemented.

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)**

Two teachers were listed on the WVEIS course assignment schedule as being teachers of study hall. Study hall is not considered to be instructional time.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. These classes were improperly coded with the WVEIS course assignment schedule and were not intended to be study halls. The school master schedule contained no study halls.

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

One new teacher was meeting with her mentor regularly; however, the principal was not involved in any of the meetings and had no input in these meetings. The principal must take an active role in the new teacher/mentor meetings and have input as to what is covered in these meetings.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE.

7.7. Safe, Drug Free, Violence Free, and Disciplined Schools

- 7.7.1. **School rules, procedures, and expectations. School rules, procedures, and expectations are written; clearly communicated to students, parents, and staff; and enforced. (Policy 2510; Policy 4373)**

Five teachers and several students reported that bullying and harassment were problems at the school. Teacher and student interviews indicated that no proactive program (Respect and Protect, etc.) was in place to address the problems. These teachers stated that general discipline was an issue and they did not believe that there were many consequences for poor student behavior.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The staff of Cedar Grove Elementary School implemented a new program, *Capturing Kids Hearts*, during the current year. The faculty received training on implementing the program in August 2010. *Capturing Kids Hearts* is a behavior modification and school culture process developed to meet the needs of individual schools. The school implemented improved communications with parents of students who have

been bullied and students who have done the bullying. The faculty had developed a behavior rubric that provided recommended consequences for certain behaviors including bullying. Interviews with the principal and teachers indicated the discipline problems this year had declined from last year. Teachers reported everyone was more conscious in supervising students in non-classroom school areas, and this had reduced the opportunity for bullying.

RECOMMENDATION

7.2.2. Counseling services. While the counselor was reportedly available for teachers and students, a counseling log was not maintained to show 75 percent direct student contact. The Team recommended that a counseling log be developed and maintained.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED. A thorough counseling log was being maintained.

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 Cedar Grove Elementary School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Kanawha 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 Kanawha 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.

This was the first year for the new principal. This principal demonstrated a vast knowledge of curriculum and instruction and had a clear vision of leading the school. The Team believed that with assistance from the Kanawha County Central Office and the West Virginia Department of Education, the items found in the Education Performance Audit will be corrected in the one year timeline for the follow-up audit. The principal had implemented many high quality staff development sessions and was extremely organized and proactive.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Results of the efforts of the principal and staff along with the assistance of the Kanawha County School District staff had produced student achievement increases as measured on WESTEST2 and the school achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP) in 2010. The staff worked diligently to address the items needing improvement as found in the Education Performance Audit.

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

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

The Team believed that Cedar Grove Elementary School, with assistance from the Kanawha County Central Office and the West Virginia Department of Education, has the capacity to correct the deficiencies found at the school. The principal will be instrumental in these corrections.

The Team recommended that the Kanawha County School System Superintendent and the school administrator contact Mr. Charles Heinlein, Executive Director, Office of Organizational Effectiveness & Leadership at 304-558-3199 to arrange a School Support System for correcting the deficiencies and improving student and school performance.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The West Virginia Department of Education, Office of School Improvement, was contacted and provided assistance in developing a process to revise the school's Five-Year Strategic Plan to address the "needs improvements" found in the initial Education Performance Audit. The school, under the leadership of the principal, had implemented the revised plan and improvement in student achievement had occurred.

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.

- 19.1.1. School location.** The school site was not easily accessible or suited for special instructional needs, i.e., outdoor learning. On-site, solid surface parking was insufficient for staff, visitors, and individuals with limited mobility.
- 19.1.3. Teachers' workroom.** Communications technology was not available.
- 19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** Computer work stations, capacity for on-line research, electronic card catalogs, automated circulation capacity, on-line periodical indexes, and copying equipment were not provided. Space for technology, including computer laboratories, was not provided and utilized.
- 19.1.7. K classrooms.** The Kindergarten classroom areas were not of adequate size and did not have shelving, storage, or pupil storage areas.
- 19.1.8. Grades 1-12 classrooms.** All classrooms were not of adequate size.

- 19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The art facility was not of adequate size and did not have two deep sinks or black-out areas. The music facility was not of adequate size and did not have music chairs with folding arms or acoustical treatment. The physical education facilities did not have a data projector or a 50 inch screen monitor.
- 19.1.15. Health service units.** The elementary school did not have a health clinic. A refrigerator with locked storage and work counter were not available.

A previous Education Performance Audit of Cedar Grove Elementary School May 2, 2006 presented numerous “Facilities Resources Needs and Recommendations.” The follow-up report in March 2008 reported that many safety concerns had been addressed and others remained. However, the basic points presented in the OEPA 2006 report remain relevant. The building constructed in 1954 was originally designed for high school students and later renovated to house PreKindergarten through Grade 8. It is outdated and does not meet preschool, elementary, and middle school students’ educational needs.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

All facility resource needs remained as previously 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 School Support System presented under the Capacity Building Section will be an invaluable resource in guiding school improvement.

FOLLOW-UP SUMMARY

The School Support System had been implemented and the school was seeing improvements in student achievement.

SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

School	Accreditation Status	Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards	Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement	Date Certain
39-213 Cedar Grove Elementary	Full Accreditation			

Education Performance Audit Summary

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education issue Full Accreditation status to Cedar Grove Elementary School.