



**Office of Education
Performance Audits**

**FINAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT
FOR
ALUM BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
LEWIS COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM
MARCH 2008**

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Alum Bridge Elementary School in Lewis County was conducted on March 8, 2007.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Alum Bridge Elementary School was conducted January 31, 2008. The purpose of the follow-up was to verify correction of the findings identified during the original Education Performance Audit. The review was in accordance with West Virginia Code §18-2E-5 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320 which specify that a school that meets or exceeds the performance and progress standards but has other deficiencies shall remain on full accreditation status and a county school district shall remain on full approval status for the remainder of the accreditation period and shall have an opportunity to correct those deficiencies. The Code and policy include the provision that a school "... does not have any deficiencies which would endanger student health or safety or other extraordinary circumstances as defined by the West Virginia Board of Education."

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

41 LEWIS COUNTY

Dr. Joseph Mace, Superintendent

201 ALUM BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Passed

Thomas Garrett, Principal

Grades PK - 04

Enrollment 90 (2nd month enrollment report)

WESTEST 2005-2006

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	26	27	27	100.00	65.38	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	25	26	26	100.00	64.00	NA	NA	NA
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	22	23	23	100.00	63.63	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	26	27	27	100.00	69.23	Yes	Averaging	✓
White	25	26	26	100.00	68.00	NA	NA	NA
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	22	23	23	100.00	72.72	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Attendance Rate = 96.3%

41 LEWIS COUNTY
 Dr. Joseph Mace, Superintendent
201 ALUM BRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Passed
 Dan Hoover, Principal
 Grades PK - 04
 Enrollment 105 (2nd month enrollment report)

WESTEST 2006-2007

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
Mathematics								
All	28	29	29	100.00	89.28	Yes	Yes	✓
White	28	29	29	100.00	89.28	NA	NA	NA
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	19	20	20	100.00	94.73	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	28	29	29	100.00	92.85	Yes	Yes	✓
White	28	29	29	100.00	92.85	NA	NA	NA
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	19	20	20	100.00	94.73	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year
 * -- 0 students in subgroup
 ** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Attendance Rate = 95.1%

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

5.1.1. Achievement. Alum Bridge Elementary School demonstrated a significant increase in percent proficient over the previous year in both mathematics and reading/language arts for all subgroups.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.

6.1. Curriculum

6.1.7. 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 use was not evident in K-2 classrooms. The Team did not find evidence through teacher interviews, student interviews, and classroom observations that technology was used.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team observed classrooms, interviewed teachers, and reviewed computer laboratory logs and reported that technology was being used in the K-2 classrooms and in the school computer laboratory.

6.1.9. Programs of study. Programs of study are provided in grades K-12 as listed in Policy 2510 for elementary, middle, and high school levels, including career clusters and majors and an opportunity to examine a system of career clusters in grades 5-8 and to select a career cluster to explore in grades 9 and 10. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)

The Team could not verify that science was being taught in Grade 4 on a daily basis or that the equivalent of daily instruction was being provided.

The Team could not verify that the Pre-K students received daily opportunities for experiences in science or social studies.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed the Grade 4 teacher's lesson plans and the master schedule and interviewed the teacher, and verified that science was being taught daily.

The Team interviewed the kindergarten teacher and reviewed lesson plans and verified daily experiences were provided in science and social studies.

6.2. Student and School Performance

6.2.1. Unified County and School Improvement Plan. A Unified County Improvement Plan and a Unified School 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.

The staff could not articulate the components of the school's Five-Year Strategic Plan. It was evident that the plan was not being used by teachers to guide their curriculum based on student needs.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed documents showing a summary of the action steps of the Five-Year Strategic Plan and the person(s) responsible for the action steps had been prepared and discussed with the faculty during staff planning at the beginning of the school year. The Team reviewed a schedule that showed several meetings of the school strategic plan steering committee (which contained about half the faculty). Faculty Senate minutes showed a discussion of the Five-Year Strategic Plan on October 8, 2008. Minutes of the school curriculum committee showed the committee discussed the plan in preparing curriculum for the year. Interviews with staff provided evidence the staff was actively involved in planning and knowledgeable of improvement plans.

6.2.3. 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)

All teachers did not have well-developed lesson plans. One teacher had no lesson plans and reported to the Team that she did not know where her plan book was. Other teachers had incomplete lesson plans.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed all teachers' lesson plans and found them to be comprehensive and addressed the West Virginia Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs).

6.2.4. 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)

Through teacher interviews, the Team found that the staff had examined the WESTEST data only one time this school year, and that was at the beginning of the school year. Data analysis and benchmarking were not done on a regular basis to target student needs and to determine the lessons to be taught to correct the deficiencies.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. Some time has been provided for staff members to meet and review student progress. DIBELS and QPS (Quick Phonics Screener) were two methods being used to benchmark student progress. Teacher interviews and a review of their information showed the staff was involved in mapping student progress and adjusting instruction to meet student needs.

6.4. Regulatory Agency Reviews

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

Two Fire Marshal citations of 01/04/07 had not been corrected as of the date of the Education Performance Audit. They were, "Provide heat detectors for all storage rooms" and "Pull stations at all exits."

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. Heat detectors and pull stations had been installed.

6.6. Personnel

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

One professional personnel observation was not signed within five working days. The observation was on 10/31/07 and was signed on 12/01/07.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed personnel evaluations for the 2007-2008 school year and found them to comply with policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1.3. **Learning environment.** The custodian's closet was not locked and contained cleaning chemicals. Students could easily access these chemicals. The Team recommended that the storage room remain locked or the chemicals be placed in a locked storage container.

The smoke detector in the Kindergarten room was chirping, indicating a low battery. The Team recommended that batteries in all smoke detectors be checked or replaced.

It was reported to the Team that the front doors remained locked throughout the school day; however, the door remained unlocked the entire day of the Education Performance Audit. The Team recommended that all outside doors remain locked to ensure student and staff safety.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWED.

6.8.1. Leadership. When asked about the direction that the school was going in educational progress, the teachers were not aware of the planning of the other teachers. The Team recommended that the school investigate means for collaborative planning of the teachers to ensure that everyone is aware of the future direction of the school.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

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 Alum Bridge Elementary School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Lewis 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 Lewis 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.

The administration and staff must be more thorough with the data analysis. The student weaknesses are evident in these data and will provide a roadmap as to what needs to be taught to increase student achievement. Also, all teachers must be aware of the educational components of the school's Five-Year Strategic Plan and provide instruction that will address the needs of the students.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

Under the leadership of the new school principal, assessment data had been analyzed and was being used to guide instruction. The staff instituted student progress benchmarking and was using this information to adjust instruction to meet the students' needs. The Five-Year Strategic Plan has been the focus of staff discussion and review. This created a focus on school improvement that was helping the staff improve instruction.

Building Capacity to Correct Deficiencies

- 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.**

Capacity must be developed by all teachers to address the decline in reading scores. This should be done through a thorough analysis of the school's data and by addressing the needs in the school's Five-Year Strategic Plan.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The school was working to develop the teachers' capacity to improve reading instruction. A consultant has been contracted to work with the school staff on methods to improve reading instruction and has met with the staff numerous times this school year to help them analyze data, review student progress, and adjust instruction. Numerous training activities have been provided, such as, effective use of learning centers, Kansas Writing Strategies, Blooms Taxonomy, and Marzano's High Yield Strategies. The principal instituted classroom walkthroughs.

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 site was not large enough for future expansion and was not removed from undesirable noise and traffic.
- 19.1.2. Administrative and service facilities.** The administrative office area did not include an adequate reception/waiting area and administrative personnel were not provided sufficient workspace and privacy. Both the principal and secretary shared the same office.
- 19.1.3. Teachers' workroom.** The teachers' work area was not of adequate size and communications technology was not provided.
- 19.1.4. Counselor's office.** The counselor's office was not of adequate size and did not insure privacy.

- 19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** Newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, recordings, and tapes were not provided.
- 19.1.7. K classrooms.** The Kindergarten classroom was not of adequate size. Shelving, storage, a wrap area, and a carpet area were not available.
- 19.1.8. Grades 1-12 classrooms.** The academic learning areas did not provide communication technology and were not located near related educational areas and away from disruptive noises. Storage was not adequate and there were no audiovisual equipment, controllable light, and outlets were not adequate.
- 19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The art facility did not have adequate storage. The following equipment/materials were not available: Two deep sinks, hot and cold water, counter space, chalkboards, display facilities, bulletin boards, outlets, a ceramic kiln, and blackout areas.
- The music facility was not located away from quiet areas of the building and did not have adequate storage. A chalkboard and bulletin board, folding chairs, music stands, instructor's desk, and acoustical treatment were not available.
- The physical education facilities were not of adequate size and were not located away from quiet areas of the building. The following equipment/materials were not available: Provisions for two or more teaching stations, display case, bulletin board, seating, outlets, and a ceiling height of 24 feet.
- 19.1.14. Food service.** The food service area did not provide for receiving, storage, cooking, serving, dining, and dishwashing. The area was not convenient to a service drive for deliveries and removal of wastes. Drinking water was not available. A teachers' dining area of adequate size was not available. The kitchen was not of adequate size. Food and non-food storage was not adequate. A locker/dressing room, lavatory, chairs, and toilet were not available.
- 19.1.15. Health service units.** A health services unit of adequate size was not available. The following equipment/materials were not available: Curtained or small rooms with cots, bulletin board, toilet, lavatory, scales, medicine chest, work counter, and desk and chair.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The findings remained the same as reported in the March 7, 2007 Education Performance Audit.

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.

Given the dramatic decline in reading/language arts scores, Alum Bridge Elementary School and Lewis County must implement high yield instructional practices and programs that will improve achievement. Lewis County must actively pursue assistance from RESA VII, the West Virginia Department of Education, and the West Virginia Center for Professional Development to assist with school improvement efforts. Curriculum must be data-driven and instruction must be relevant to the curriculum and provide all students the opportunity to learn.

FOLLOW-UP TEAM SUMMARY

The Lewis County School District provided staff training in analyzing and using DIBELS, small group instruction, Differentiated Instruction, and the Tier 3 Model. The county has provided a contracted consultant to help the staff implement and improve the Tier 1 reading program. Training in using the new reading program was provided by a Scott Foresman consultant.

RESA VII provided staff development in the Kansas Writing Program and Differentiated Instruction.

The West Virginia Department of Education provided training on Tier 1 instruction.

School Accreditation Status

School	Accreditation Status	Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards	Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement	Date Certain
41-201 Alum Bridge Elementary	Full Accreditation			

Education Performance Audit Summary

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education continue the Full Accreditation status of Alum Bridge Elementary School.