



INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

ROANOKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

LEWIS COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

JUNE 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	8
Education Performance Audit.....	9
High Quality Standards	9
Indicators Of Efficiency.....	11
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	13
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	14
Early Detection And Intervention	15
Education Performance Audit Summary	16

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Roanoke Elementary School in Lewis County was conducted March 20, 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 school personnel and school system administrators, observed classrooms, and examined school records.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

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

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

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

West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Early Learning – Charlotte Webb, Coordinator

TEAM MEMBERS

Name	Title	School/County
Jack Daugherty	Retired Administrator	Nicholas County
Laura Snodgrass	Principal	Harrisville Elementary School, Ritchie County

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

205 ROANOKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – TRANSITION

Denise Sprouse, Principal
Grades PK-04, Enrollment 147

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

Designation Status for Roanoke Elementary School.

Designation:	TRANSITION	Next Year's Target:	52.5854
Index Score:	25.4741	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	48.905	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

Supporting Data

Proficiency (40% of the index score)	5.68
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	8.25
Observed Growth (15% of the index score)	3.75
Adequate Growth (20% of the index score)	3.00
<u>Attendance Rate (5% of the index score)</u>	<u>4.79</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	25.47

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 were set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

Roanoke Elementary School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year. Considering the index target of 52.58 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 25.47, Roanoke Elementary School has a steep trajectory to achieve both short term and long term targets.

- Roanoke Elementary School earned 25.47 of the 100 points possible for the West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI) for the 2012-2013 school year. (The target was 48.91 for 2013 and is 52.59 for 2014.)
- At least 50 percent of the subgroups at Roanoke Elementary School met the targets in mathematics and reading.
- Roanoke Elementary School acquired 5.68 of the possible 40 points for proficiency.
- Roanoke Elementary School acquired 8.25 of the 20 possible for achievement gap closed.
- Roanoke Elementary School acquired 3.75 of the 15 possible points for observed growth.
- Roanoke Elementary School acquired 3 points of the 20 possible points for adequate growth as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.
- Roanoke Elementary School acquired 4.79 of the 5 possible points for attendance as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.

ROANOKE 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	> 95%	79.17%	20.83%	> 95%	70.83%	29.17%
3	Special Education	> 95%	71.43%	28.57%	> 95%	71.43%	28.57%
3	Total	> 95%	79.17%	20.83%	> 95%	70.83%	29.17%
4	White	94.29%	57.58%	42.42%	94.29%	72.73%	27.27%
4	Special Education	> 95%	81.82%	18.18%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
4	Total	94.29%	57.58%	42.42%	94.29%	72.73%	27.27%

Attendance Rate = 95.80%

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.

Mathematics.

- Grade 4 students showed the greatest progress by achieving 42.42 percent proficient in mathematics compared to Grade 3 (20.83 percent proficient).
- Special education students demonstrated higher proficiency in Grade 3 by achieving 28.57 percent proficient in mathematics compared to Grade 4 (18.18 percent proficient).

Reading/Language Arts.

- Grades 3 and 4 students performed at comparable levels. Grade 3 students scored 29.17 percent proficient and Grade 4 students scored 27.27 percent proficient.
- Special education students demonstrated higher proficiency in Grade 3 by achieving 28.57 percent proficient in reading/language arts compared to Grade 4 (less than 5 percent proficient).

ROANOKE 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	15 (43%)	11 (31%)	9 (26%)	40.0	35.0%	17 (49%)	12 (34%)	6 (17%)	35.0	30.0%
	County	471 (34%)	439 (32%)	470 (34%)	50.0	42.1%	522 (38%)	457 (33%)	397 (29%)	44.0	41.1%
	State	51,165 (35%)	45,256 (31%)	50,057 (34%)	50.0	45.1%	50,484 (35%)	45,076 (31%)	50,227 (34%)	50.0	48.7%
White Sub-Group	School	15 (43%)	11 (31%)	9 (26%)	40.0	35.0%	17 (49%)	12 (34%)	6 (17%)	35.0	30.0%
	County	461 (34%)	425 (32%)	460 (34%)	50.0	41.9%	512 (38%)	444 (33%)	386 (29%)	44.0	40.8%
	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	*	*	*	44.0	22.2%	*	*	*	33.0	11.1%
	County	90 (46%)	64 (32%)	43 (22%)	40.0	11.0%	105 (54%)	48 (25%)	42 (22%)	31.0	9.8%
	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	11 (46%)	7 (29%)	6 (25%)	38.0	40.5%	11 (46%)	10 (42%)	3 (13%)	35.0	38.1%
	County	381 (32%)	375 (32%)	427 (36%)	53.0	47.8%	417 (35%)	409 (35%)	355 (30%)	46.0	46.8%
	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	*	*	*	44.0	35.0%	*	*	*	35.0	30.0%
	County	271 (36%)	240 (32%)	244 (32%)	49.0	34.9%	304 (40%)	244 (32%)	203 (27%)	43.0	33.7%
	State	26,545 (38%)	21,619 (31%)	22,119 (31%)	47.0	37.5%	25,763 (37%)	21,435 (31%)	22,576 (32%)	47.0	40.7%
Non-LSES Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	32.0	(NA)	*	*	*	33.0	(NA)
	County	200 (32%)	199 (32%)	226 (36%)	53.0	52.7%	218 (35%)	213 (34%)	194 (31%)	46.0	52.0%
	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	*	*	*	40.0	32.3%	*	*	*	33.0	22.6%
	County	235 (34%)	229 (33%)	235 (34%)	50.0	44.1%	301 (43%)	205 (29%)	190 (27%)	40.0	33.9%
	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	*	*	*	38.0	37.9%	*	*	*	39.0	37.9%
	County	236 (35%)	210 (31%)	235 (35%)	51.0	40.1%	221 (33%)	252 (37%)	207 (30%)	48.0	48.6%
	State	24,052 (33%)	22,817 (32%)	25,442 (35%)	51.0	45.9%	22,999 (32%)	22,817 (32%)	26,180 (36%)	52.0	56.9%

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

*Denotes cell size <20.

The chart, Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group, identifies the percent proficient in each subgroup as compared to the county and the State averages. In addition, subgroup growth is examined and determined to be low (red cells), typical (yellow cells), or high (green cells) growth based on previous performance. This chart does not include Grade 3 scores; it only includes the scores of students who previously participated in the WESTEST2 assessment.

Mathematics.

- The non-low socioeconomic subgroup demonstrated low growth in mathematics while all other subgroups demonstrated typical growth.
- 35 percent of students were proficient in mathematics as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- 22.2 percent of the special education students were proficient in mathematics compared to the non-special education students with 40.5 percent proficient which indicated an 18.3 percent gap.
- 35 percent of low socioeconomic students were proficient in mathematics.
- 32.3 percent of male students were proficient in mathematics compared to female students with 37.9 percent proficient which indicated a 5.6 percent gap.

Reading/language Arts.

- The special education, non-low socioeconomic, and male subgroups demonstrated low growth in reading/language arts while all other subgroups demonstrated typical growth.
- 30 percent of students were proficient in reading/language arts as indicated by 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- 11.1 percent of the special education students were proficient in reading/language arts compared to the non-special education group with 38.1 percent proficient, which indicated a 27 percent gap.
- 30 percent of low socioeconomic students were proficient in reading/language arts.
- Female students (37.9 percent proficient) outperformed male students (22.6 percent proficient), which indicated a gap of 15.3 percent.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY - ANALYSIS

Overall, the scores for mathematics were higher than the reading/language arts scores. The data indicated a need to provide support to the staff in reading/language arts instruction and in closing the achievement gaps for special education students in mathematics and for males in both mathematics and reading/language arts.

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

1. Social Studies Text Book Orientation.
2. Special Education Updates.
3. Next Generation Standards, An Introduction.
4. Data Analysis.
5. Policy Review.
6. Microsoft Innovations Educator Training.
7. Next Generation English Language Arts Standards Deconstructed.
8. Next Generation Mathematics Standards Deconstructed.
9. Educate WV Training.
10. Keeping the Classroom Exciting with Grouping for All Learners.
11. Becoming a National Board Certified Teacher.
12. Common Core, Putting it all Together.
13. Teaching Math Out of a Box.
14. Student Health Issues.
15. Head Start and Preschool Policies and Procedures.
16. Improving Vocabulary in the Common Core Age.
17. West Virginia Universal Preschool Early Learning System.
18. Crises Prevention Training.
19. Autism Training.
20. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5000.
21. Elementary and Secondary Education Act Test Data Introduction.
22. Hewlett Packard Tablet Training.
23. Office of Education Performance Audits Training.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.

7.1. CURRICULUM.

7.1.1. Curriculum based on content standards and objectives. The curriculum is based on the content standards and objectives approved by the West Virginia Board of Education. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)

Interviews and lesson plan reviews indicated that some teachers were not utilizing the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. Teachers communicated that they would like to have more training and support in implementing the approved standards. The professional development calendar indicated teachers had participated in an introduction to the standards in August 2013 and one follow-up session was offered. However, a cohesive plan for professional development to support this need was not evident. One long-term substitute teacher did not recall having any support or training in delivering the required standards. Two teachers indicated having a half-day training three years ago with no formal follow-up.

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 high expectations demonstrated by a few teachers. One example involved a preschool teacher who used WESTEST2 data analysis results to supplement the preschool curriculum. Another teacher utilized small group instruction to meet the needs of all students and another teacher required students to problem solve and then present evidence to support their findings. However, the school as whole did not provide a culture of high expectations for all students. This was demonstrated throughout the day by the following: use of coloring worksheets; a special education aide who did not interact with students during a 30-minute Team observation; and students arriving to a special education class were off task and waiting their turn (up to 10 minutes) for rote multiplication drills. Furthermore, the Team observed minimal student work displayed in classrooms, and with the exception of Grade 1 and Grade 4, student writing posted in the hall was below grade level expectations when compared to the West Virginia Next Generation English Language Arts Content Standards and Objectives. Observations and lesson plan reviews revealed a heavy reliance on textbooks and worksheets in most classrooms. Many social studies, science, and health lesson plans consisted of only video titles.

While four teachers were optimistic and indicated that all students can learn, the principal stated, more than once, “The students here are apathetic.” While the Team believed the teachers had the capacity to affect student achievement, the Team concluded the principal’s attitude conveyed negative expectations for students.

7.1.6. Instruction in writing. Instruction in writing shall be a part of every child’s weekly educational curriculum in grades K through 12 in every appropriate class. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)

Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews indicated that writing was a routine part of most classes. However, Team members could not substantiate students were provided writing instruction weekly in two classrooms or that writing was occurring in all content areas.

7.2. STUDENT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE.

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 concluded that the principal reviewed lesson plans regularly and provided comments such as, “Great parent letter” or initials with a smile. Two sets of lesson plans were vague and incomplete, with no principal comments. One teacher was a long-term substitute working to the best of his/her ability, but a lack of urgency was evident in providing the support this teacher required to be successful. In consideration of the low achievement results, the principal needed to expand lesson plan reviews to include constructive feedback targeting ineffective or inappropriate strategies being implemented with supportive suggestions on strengthening instruction to better meet students’ needs. It is essential the principal follow up on these suggestions to ensure implementation of effective lesson planning.

7.8. LEADERSHIP.

7.8.1. Leadership. Leadership at the school district, school, and classroom levels is demonstrated by vision, school culture and instruction, management and environment, community, and professionalism. (Policy 5500.03)

The school culture was positive as far as interactions between the principal and staff. The principal implemented most of the compliance guidelines and recommended programs set forth by the West Virginia Department of Education; however, the principal's focus on compliance influenced curriculum and instruction. The principal reported spending 80 percent of her time dealing with managerial issues compared to 20 percent dealing with curriculum and instruction. The Team determined the principal needed to develop a balanced leadership structure to address the managerial and curricular demands of the small school. The school did not have a structured walkthrough system in place to support curriculum and instruction. The principal indicated all teachers were on the leadership team for the school. However, the leadership team had not had a formal meeting since fall 2013. The Team concluded a smaller leadership team would better assist the school with developing a formal process that provided focus for improved student achievement. Each school has its own unique culture and level of expectations that can either negatively or positively influence student learning. The Team noted the importance of the principal establishing and communicating high expectations for both students and staff at Roanoke Elementary School.

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 Roanoke 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 school lacked a sound plan to address delivery of the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives. It is crucial that the school develop a plan for delivering English/language arts standards. Due to exceptionally low achievement in reading/language arts, the principal and staff must assure quality reading and writing instruction occurs at all grade levels. The Team believed student achievement will increase in reading/language arts if teachers are provided ongoing, embedded professional development offerings personalized to Roanoke Elementary School. The Team also recommended the principal and staff utilize the professional learning community (PLC) time to become more familiar with the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives, review student work, and analyze data to plan differentiated reading and writing instruction to meet the needs of all students. The principal was in the classrooms routinely; however, the school lacked a structured system of classroom walkthroughs to gauge progress on instructional priorities.

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 Roanoke 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.

Building Capacity - Transition School

The school and students will receive additional support at the request of the school. The majority of services will be led by the local school district, with support from the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) and the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE). The school will complete a targeted strategic plan and will be monitored occasionally for progress. The local school systems may partner with the local RESA and others to provide professional development, technical assistance, and interventions.

Due to low achievement in reading/language arts and the teachers' need for a better understanding of the current mathematics and English/language arts standards, the Team recommended both areas become a prioritized focus for professional development offerings personalized to Roanoke Elementary School. While the West Virginia Next Generation Mathematics and English/Language Arts Content Standards and Objectives were being utilized, the Team recommended the school leadership team, with support of central office personnel, develop an ongoing, embedded professional development plan to provide support to all teachers in delivering the State approved standards. The Team noted the school has the capacity to improve by utilizing the Grade 1 and Grade 4 teachers as mentors to support their colleagues. These teachers demonstrated the capacity to support improved instruction by sharing the research-based instructional strategies they were utilizing during the day of the Education Performance Audit.

The Team further recommended the school leadership team, with central office staff, plan ongoing, embedded professional development at the school which includes opportunities for teachers to analyze examples of exemplary writing at each grade level. Meanwhile, the Team recommended the staff utilize the website, corestandards.org, in which Appendix C provides student writing samples annotated to illustrate the criteria required to meet the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives for writing Grades K-12.

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.

19.1.5. Library/media and technology center. The library did not provide an electronic card catalog, automated circulation capacity, on-line periodical indexes, or copy equipment. (Did not adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas. The art facility did not provide instructional boards, display facilities, bulletin boards, a ceramic kiln or black out areas. (May adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

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 58 percent of the students at Roanoke Elementary School were economically disadvantaged. This, coupled with low student achievement, expedites the need to assure a process is in place to assist school staff in providing quality core instruction and intervention to students needing targeted or intensive support. In order to increase achievement and close subgroup gaps, it is crucial that the school strengthen core instruction to provide support for personalized learning (SPL). It is vital that time is provided for classroom, special education, and Title I teachers to plan for differentiated instruction. The professional learning community meetings could be transformed to provide time for vertical teaming, formative assessments, and student work. This could provide an opportunity for teachers to set goals around specific areas of instruction they want to strengthen, while also establishing short term goals for student achievement.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

Roanoke 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 Roanoke Elementary School in improvement efforts.

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

7.1.1. Curriculum based on content standards and objectives.

7.1.2. High expectations.

7.1.6. Instruction in writing.

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.

7.8.1. Leadership.

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

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

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

Based upon the results of the Education Performance Audit, the Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education direct Roanoke Elementary School and Lewis 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.