

OFFICE OF EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDITS



FINAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT FOR ROANOKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

LEWIS COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

MARCH 2005

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The West Virginia Office of Education Performance Audits conducted an Education Performance Audit of Roanoke Elementary School in Lewis County March 11, 2004.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Roanoke Elementary School was conducted January 10, 2005. 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."

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

NONCOMPLIANCES

5.1.1. Achievement.

This is the 1st year that Roanoke Elementary School did not attain adequate yearly progress (AYP) in 5.1.1. Achievement. Three subgroups designated in 5.1.1, Achievement, included: All students (AS), white students (W), and economically disadvantaged (SES). In accordance with Section 10.5 of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, *A Process for Improving Education: Performance Based Accreditation System*, the school was notified of any subgroup that initially did not make AYP in one year on any indicator. Roanoke Elementary School and Lewis County were encouraged to revise the school and county Unified Improvement Plans when a subgroup is identified in any one year.

The Team determined that the Unified School Improvement Plan (USIP) had been revised to address Achievement.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. Roanoke Elementary School met adequate yearly progress (AYP) in all applicable subgroups.

7.1 Curriculum

7.1.14. Multicultural education. Multicultural education is taught at all programmatic levels, K-4, 5-8, and 9-12 with an emphasis on prevention and zero tolerance for racial, sexual, religious/ethnic harassment or violence. (Policy 2421)

Although individual teachers could produce activities dealing with multiculturalism, there was no written multicultural curriculum across all grade levels K-4.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1.1. Achievement.** The Team reviewed 2002-2003 assessment data, which indicated that the percentage of students scoring in quartiles 3 and 4 in the all students (AS), white students (W), and economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroups was below 50 percent. The Team recommended that a concerted effort be made and specific strategies and programs be used to increase the performance of all students.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

- 7.1.1. Mission and goals.** Although teachers referred to the Mission and Goals as being in the Unified School Improvement Plan (USIP), these were not observed posted in all classrooms and were not clearly understood by the staff. The Team recommended that the Mission and Goals of the school guide all classroom and school activities and that the principal monitor classrooms for implementation.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

- 7.1.2. Curriculum based on content standards and objectives.** Although the Team saw evidence in lesson plans that were provided by teachers that the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) were being used in reading/language arts, the Team could not confirm that the CSOs were being used in all content areas and at all grade levels. The Team recommended that the faculty members develop a method for assuring that the CSOs are implemented in all content areas. The Team determined that, overall, the Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) were used to guide curriculum; however, the school's staff needed to make them more prominent in curriculum and instruction.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

- 7.1.6. Instructional strategies.** The Team observed mainly direct instruction in large groups in the upper grades. While there was evidence of a few other strategies being used, the Team recommended that the classroom teachers utilize varied instructional strategies, methods, and techniques that allow students to be actively engaged in learning.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

7.1.7. Instruction in writing. The Team did not find evidence that students were required to write in all curricular areas. This observation was confirmed during the student interviews. While the Team observed excellent examples of writing instruction in several areas, the Team recommended that teachers incorporate the writing process in all curricular areas.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

7.1.8. Library/educational technology access and technology application. Although individual classrooms were equipped with three or four computers, the Team observed their use in only one classroom. The students interviewed indicated that they use the classroom computers; however, they are often required to share. Students also indicated that there was not always a specific assignment or a specific time when they utilized the computer. The Team did not find evidence of computer logs. The Team recommended that the technology Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) be implemented in conjunction with focused student assignments. The Team also recommended that teachers schedule a regular computer time within the instructional day and develop a systematic approach to ensure that all students have equal technology time. The issue of students sharing computers could be addressed by the administration and faculty.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

7.2.4. Lesson plans and principal feedback. The Team observed a wide range in the quality of the lesson plans. Several plans did not have adequate information and showed a need for improvement. The Team recommended that the principal utilize a checklist that would provide helpful written input to teachers.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

- 7.7.7. Codes of conduct.** The Team did not find the Student Code of Conduct or the Employee Code of Conduct in every classroom. The Team recommended that the principal obtain sufficient copies of both codes of conduct and ensure that they are prominently displayed in each classroom to promote the principles contained in the codes.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

- 7.11.1. School rules, procedures, and expectations.** The Team did not observe School Rules, Procedures and Expectations posted in all classrooms. The Team recommended that School Rules, Procedures, and Expectations be developed and posted in each classroom to ensure that students, teachers, and parents are aware of school rules, procedures, and expectations.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.

BUILDING CAPACITY TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES

- 17.1. Capacity building is a process for targeting resources strategically to improve the teaching and learning process. School and county Unified 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 determined that Roanoke Elementary School and Lewis County have the capacity to correct the noncompliances listed in the report.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The noncompliances listed in the report have been corrected.

SCHOOL SYSTEM APPROVAL AND SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education continue the Full Approval status of the Lewis County School System and continue the Full Accreditation status of Roanoke Elementary School.