



**Office of Education  
Performance Audits**

**INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**LEWIS COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL**

**LEWIS COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**JUNE 2014**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

## Table of Contents

	Page
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit Team .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>School Performance .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Annual Performance Measures For Accountability - Analysis .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Commendations.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>High Quality Standards .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Indicators Of Efficiency .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Identification Of Resource Needs.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Early Detection And Intervention .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit Summary .....</b>	<b>26</b>

## INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Lewis County High School in Lewis County was conducted March 19, 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, conducted 58 teacher interviews, 498 student interviews (individual and whole class), one administrative interview, two counselor interviews, observed 44 classrooms, and examined school records.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Dr. Michelle Samples, Coordinator

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

West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Career and Technical Accountability and Support – Dr. Sherri Nash, Executive Director

## TEAM MEMBERS

Name	Title	School/County
Jeff Harvey	Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Federal Programs, and School Improvement	Doddridge County
Dr. Cynthia Kolsun	Assistant Professor	Marshall University
Beverly Nichols	Director of Exceptional Students	Clay County
Troy Ravenscroft	Assistant Superintendent	Grant County
Kathi Schmalz	Principal	Magnolia High School Wetzel County
Beverly Shatto	Assistant Principal	Ripley High School Jackson County
Elizabeth Smith	Principal	Wirt County High School Wirt 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

### 501 LEWIS COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL – FOCUS

Timothy Derico, Principal  
Grades 9-12, Enrollment 762

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 Lewis County High School a Focus school. Focus schools are those schools with persistent and pervasive subgroup achievement/graduation rate gaps. West Virginia's methodology for identifying Focus schools 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.

A high school designated a Focus school may exit this status when the school meets its academic goals on the WESTEST2 and no longer has significant graduate rate gaps. If the school can decrease the graduation rate gap between student groups for two consecutive years and show sufficient progress, it can earn a different designation.

### Designation Status for Lewis County High School.

Designation:	FOCUS	Next Year's Target:	48.2398
Index Score:	37.9601	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	44.3253	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

### Supporting Data

Proficiency (35% of the index score)	4.82
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	7.93
Observed Growth (5% of the index score)	1.41
Adequate Growth (10% of the index score)	1.50
<u>Graduation Rate (30% of the index score)</u>	<u>22.30</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	37.96

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 high schools in West Virginia reaching 71.7260 by 2020. Proficiency targets were set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

Lewis County High School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year. Considering the index target of 48.24 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 37.96, Lewis County High School has a steep trajectory to achieve both short term and long term targets.

Given the components that comprise the Accountability Index, Lewis County High School was 6 percent to 25 percent below the State average for points attained for the five items (Proficiency, Achievement Gaps Closed, Observed Growth, Adequate Growth, and Graduation Rate). The largest gaps between school and State averages existed for the categories of Proficiency (25.12 percent), Observed Growth (21.76 percent), and Adequate Growth (19.65 percent).

The West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Assessment, has created line graphs depicting the annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for math and reading, which can be accessed for each subgroup with a cell size of 20 or more students, through the year 2020. These graphs may be viewed on the My School's Performance webpage (<http://wvde.state.wv.us/esea/performance/>) provided by the West Virginia Department of Education. The trajectory charts revealed greater gaps between observed proficiency scores and projected proficiency scores for the all (13.33 percent), white (13.84 percent), low socioeconomic (8.89 percent), and special education (7.30 percent) subgroups in mathematics compared to reading/language arts for the 2012-2013 school year. Gaps between observed proficiency and projected proficiency scores for reading/language arts were less for the all (9.34 percent), white (9.26 percent), low socioeconomic (7.86), and special education (0.85 percent) subgroups.

**LEWIS COUNTY HIGH 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
11	White	> 95%	71.26%	28.74%	> 95%	68.2600%	31.74%
11	Black	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
11	Hispanic	50.00%	<5%	> 95%	50.00%	<5%	> 95%
11	Limited English Proficiency	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	<5%	> 95%
11	Special Education	> 95%	93.55%	6.45%	> 95%	87.1000%	12.90%
11	Low Socioeconomic Status	94.32%	75.90%	24.10%	94.32%	73.4900%	26.51%
11	Total	> 95%	71.01%	28.99%	> 95%	68.0500%	31.95%

**Graduation Rate = 71.67%**

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. As the chart depicts, all subgroups exceeded the 95 percent participate rate, except for the Hispanic and low socioeconomic subgroups. Achievement performance varied among subgroups.

**Mathematics.** The Hispanic subgroup (>95 percent) had the highest proficiency rate in mathematics, followed by the white subgroup (28.74 percent), the low socioeconomic subgroup (24.10 percent), and the special education subgroup (6.45 percent). The black (<5 percent) and limited English proficiency (<5 percent) subgroups had the lowest proficiency rates. The proficiency rate for all students in mathematics was 28.99 percent.

**Reading/Language Arts.** With regard to reading/language arts, the Hispanic and limited English proficiency subgroups had the highest rates with greater than 95 percent of those students scoring at proficiency. The white subgroup (31.74 percent) and the low socioeconomic subgroup (26.51 percent) had the next highest levels of proficiency, followed by the special education subgroup (12.90 percent). The black subgroup (<5 percent) had the lowest proficiency rate. The proficiency rate for all students in reading/language arts was 31.95 percent.

## LEWIS COUNTY HIGH 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.*

<b>Low</b>	between 1-34th percentile
<b>Typical</b>	between 35th-65th percentile
<b>High</b>	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	199 (40%)	155 (31%)	149 (30%)	44.0	36.1%	221 (44%)	155 (31%)	125 (25%)	40.0	40.8%
	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%
Black Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	20.0	25.0%	*	*	*	46.0	50.0%
	County	*	*	*	42.0	50.0%	*	*	*	33.0	37.5%
	State	2,677 (37%)	2,180 (30%)	2,303 (32%)	47.0	32.1%	2,581 (36%)	2,216 (31%)	2,308 (32%)	48.0	38.5%
Hispanic Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	41.0	50.0%	*	*	*	44.0	66.7%
	County	*	*	*	35.0	45.5%	*	*	*	46.0	54.5%
	State	590 (36%)	523 (32%)	539 (33%)	49.0	39.4%	511 (31%)	500 (31%)	627 (38%)	54.0	44.8%
White Sub-Group	School	196 (40%)	147 (30%)	147 (30%)	44.0	36.0%	216 (44%)	151 (31%)	121 (25%)	40.0	40.2%
	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	30 (45%)	20 (30%)	16 (24%)	39.0	7.6%	39 (60%)	16 (25%)	10 (15%)	29.0	10.1%
	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	169 (39%)	135 (31%)	133 (30%)	46.0	40.9%	182 (42%)	139 (32%)	115 (26%)	42.0	46.0%
	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	99 (38%)	81 (31%)	79 (31%)	47.0	30.5%	106 (41%)	81 (32%)	70 (27%)	42.0	35.9%
	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	100 (41%)	74 (30%)	70 (29%)	41.0	42.7%	115 (47%)	74 (30%)	55 (23%)	37.0	46.5%
	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%
LEP Sub-Group	School	*	*	*	60.0	25.0%	*	*	*	84.0	75.0%
	County	*	*	*	60.0	28.6%	*	*	*	83.0	57.1%
	State	293 (30%)	287 (29%)	393 (40%)	57.0	42.7%	242 (25%)	319 (33%)	400 (42%)	59.0	42.0%
Male Sub-Group	School	103 (41%)	73 (29%)	75 (30%)	41.0	37.9%	128 (51%)	61 (24%)	61 (24%)	33.0	30.6%
	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	96 (38%)	82 (33%)	74 (29%)	47.0	34.3%	93 (37%)	94 (37%)	64 (25%)	44.0	51.5%
	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 for Grades 9 through 11 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) based on previous performance.

**Mathematics.** As depicted in the chart above, all subgroups demonstrated typical growth in mathematics, except for the black subgroup, which demonstrated low growth with a median percentile of 20 percent. This subgroup had a cell size of less than 20 students. The percent proficient for all students in mathematics in Grades 9 through 11 was 36.1 percent. The most significant differences in proficiency existed between the special education subgroup (7.6 percent) and non-special education subgroup (40.9 percent), making for a 33.3 percent gap. The low socioeconomic subgroup (30.5 percent) and non-low socioeconomic subgroup (42.7 percent) also demonstrated a gap of 12.2 percent. The male subgroup proficiency rate (37.9 percent) was slightly higher than the female subgroup proficiency rate (34.3 percent).

**Reading/Language Arts.** All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts except for the special education subgroup (median percentile of 29.0 percent) and the male subgroup (median percentile of 33.0 percent), which demonstrated low growth. The percent proficient for all students in reading/language arts in Grades 9 through 11 was 40.8 percent. The largest gap in proficiency occurred between the special education subgroup (10.1 percent) and the non-special education subgroup (46.0 percent), creating a gap of 35.9 percent. Another significant gap in proficiency existed between the male subgroup (30.6 percent) and the female subgroup (51.5 percent), making a gap of 20.9 percent. Additionally, a gap of 10.6 percent existed between the low socioeconomic status subgroup (35.9 percent) and the non-low socioeconomic status subgroup (46.5 percent).

### **ACT PLAN Assessment Results**

The ACT PLAN® is designed to provide Grade 10 students with measures of their attainment of knowledge and complex critical thinking skills acquired in the early years of high school. Assessment results assist students, parents, and educators in decision-making about educational career plans, interests, and high school course work plans. The test covers four content areas: English, mathematics, reading, and science reasoning. The composite score is the average of the scale scores from the four areas.

ACT PLAN® results provide Grade 10 students with an indication of their educational progress within the context of their post-high educational and career plans. The results from PLAN® can be used to make selections in students' coursework to help ensure that they are prepared for their postsecondary plans. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510: *Assuring the Quality of Education – Regulations for Education Programs* requires students to choose career majors and to create the second part of their individual student transition plans establishing a career major by the end of the Grade 10. Results



from PLAN can be used by tenth graders to develop their individual transition plans for grades eleven through post-secondary.

The ACT PLAN® serves as the midpoint measure of academic progress in ACT's College and Career Readiness System, and ACT researchers found that PLAN® test scores are good predictors of success on related Advanced Placement® courses.

Below is a summary of ACT PLAN® trend data over the last three years. Scores in all areas (English, mathematics, reading, and science) for Lewis County High School were slightly higher (1.0 points to 0.3 points) for the 2012-2013 school year compared to the previous year. Compared to the national benchmark scores (indicated below), Lewis County High School students' scores consistently exceeded the benchmark set for English all three years by as little as 0.9 points in 2010-2011 to as much as 1.3 points in 2012-2013. Students' scores were lower than the benchmarks all three years in mathematics (2010 – 2.9 points; 2011 – 3.4 points; 2012 – 2.8 points), reading (2010 – 0.9 points; 2011 – 1.4 points; 2012 – 0.8 points), and science (2010 – 3.5 points; 2011 – 4.0 points; 2012 – 3.7 points).

Benchmarks: English: 15      Mathematics: 19      Reading: 17      Science: 21

<b>ACT PLAN RESULTS</b>			
<b>Grade 10</b>			
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
English WV	16.3	16.0	16.2
English Lewis County	15.9	15.3	16.3
English Lewis County High	15.9	15.3	16.3
Mathematics WV	16.2	16.4	16.4
Mathematics Lewis County	16.1	15.6	16.2
Mathematics Lewis County High	16.1	15.6	16.2
Reading WV	16.1	16.1	16.4
Reading Lewis County	16.1	15.6	16.2
Reading Lewis County High	16.1	15.6	16.2
Science WV	17.3	17.3	17.4
Science Lewis County	17.5	17.0	17.3
Science Lewis County High	17.5	17.0	17.3
Composite WV	16.6	16.6	16.7
Composite Lewis County	16.7	16.0	16.6
Composite Lewis County High	16.7	16.0	16.6

Source: <http://wvde.state.wv.us/oa/actplan.html>

## ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY - ANALYSIS

Analysis of the data for Lewis County High School showed students demonstrated higher proficiency rates in reading/language arts compared to mathematics in all subgroups except for the male subgroup. The data also indicated greater support is needed for the special education subgroup and low socioeconomic status subgroup in both mathematics and reading/language arts. As revealed by the Growth Model data, both the black and male subgroups need support specifically in the area of reading/language arts. Significant achievement gaps existed between these subgroups and their counterparts, indicating the need for targeted professional development for teachers in meeting these particular students' needs.

The following professional development and/or training opportunities were scheduled to be provided for the 2013-2014 school year as reported by the principal.

1. Staff Handbook/Policy 5310 Training/Policy 4373.
2. Common Core.
3. Data Analysis/Support for Personalized Learning.
4. Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) Training.
5. Data Analysis.
6. Technology Integration/Covering Technology Content Standards and Objectives.
7. Classroom Management/Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI) Recertification.
8. Data Analysis/WESTEST Prep.
9. IPI Data Analysis.

Prior to the Education Performance Audit, the OEPA staff provided an in-service to Lewis County High School staff on February 19, 2014, to review the indicators in Policy 2320 and prepare staff for the audit.

<b>NUMBER OF ADVANCED PLACEMENT (AP®), HONORS, AND COLLEGE COURSES OFFERED 2013-2014</b>			
High School	Number of AP® Courses	Number of Honors Courses	Number of College Credit Courses
Lewis County High	2	10	3

The school currently offered two Advanced Placement courses: AP® Language and AP® Literature. Policy 2510 states, "A minimum of four College Board AP® Courses (at least one from each core content areas of English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) or the IB Program must be offered annually." The school did not offer an advanced course in mathematics, science, or social studies.

Honors courses being offered included: Grade 9 Honors English, Grade 10 Honors English, Honors Math I, Honors Algebra II, Honors Trigonometry, Honors Physical

Science, Honors Biology, Honors US Studies, Honors World Studies, and Honors Contemporary Studies.

Three college courses were offered through Fairmont State University: Earth and Sky; Written English I; and Written English II.

<b>ADVANCED PLACEMENT TEST (APT) (COLLEGE BOARD)</b>				
Lewis County High	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	0.8%	0.9%	2.4%	2.8%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	11.8%	11.5%	22.3%	17.5%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	9.6%	9.4%	16.7%	9.7%
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	100.00%	0.0%	16.6%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	20.8%	20.9%	13.8%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	16.6%	14.7%	23.5%

\*NA – Not Available.

Source: Reported by school.

During the 2012-2013 school year, 52 students at Lewis County High School completed examinations for Advanced Placement courses. These students were comprised of 6 sophomores, 29 juniors, and 16 seniors. Of the six examinations completed by Grade 10 students, one exam or 16.6 percent received a score of 3 or higher. This was an increase from the previous year. Four of the 29 examinations completed by Grade 11 students, or 13.8 percent, received a score of 3 or higher; this was a decrease from the previous year of 7.1 percent. Four of the 17 examinations completed by Grade 12 students, or 23.5 percent, received a score of 3 or higher, which meant an increase of 8.8 percent.

<b>AP TEST TAKERS</b>	
Lewis County High	2011-12
Total # of test takers.	52
Total # of test takers with a score of 3 or higher.	9

During the 2012-2013 school year, 52 students at Lewis County High School completed exams for AP® courses. This was approximately 6.60 percent of the students enrolled as identified through the 2<sup>nd</sup> month enrollment report for the 2012-2013 school year. It is imperative administration and staff develop methods for recruiting more students for rigorous coursework, including communicating the purpose and benefits of AP® classes to parents and students.

<b>Lewis County High School</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
2010-2011	75.8%
2011-2012	72.0%
2012-2013	74.3%

Source: NCLB Private Data Site and My School's Performance Site at <http://wvde.state.wv.us>

Lewis County High School obtained 22.30 points of the 30 points possible for graduation rate for the 2012-2013 school year according to the West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI). This was 1.94 points lower than the average points awarded for graduation rate by a high school (24.24). As depicted in the chart above, the school's graduation rate for 2012-2013 (71.67 percent), as calculated using the four-year cohort data was 0.33 percent lower than the graduation rate for the previous year. The school's graduation rate was 7.65 percent lower than the State average (79.32 percent).

<b>ESTIMATED COLLEGE GOING RATE FALL 2012</b>		
	Number of High School Graduates 2011-2012	Overall College Going Rate Percentage
State	18,335	56.4%
Lewis County	187	55.6%
Lewis County High	187	55.6%

Source: West Virginia College Going Rates By County and High School Fall 2012, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission.

As the chart above shows, the college going rate for Lewis County High School was 0.80 percent lower than the State rate. One hundred and four of the 187 graduates from Lewis County High School attended college in Fall 2012. The staff of Lewis County High School and the Lewis County central office should continue to investigate and implement programs and practices that will increase the number of students attending college.

<b>HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENROLLED IN DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES FALL 2012</b>					
	1 <sup>st</sup> Time WV Freshmen Total #	English Total #	% in Developmental English	Mathematics Total #	% in Developmental Mathematics
State	7,708	1,341	17.40%	2,222	28.83%
Lewis County	64	10	15.63%	23	35.94%
Lewis County High	64	10	15.60%	23	35.90%

High School Graduates Enrolled in Developmental Courses Fall of 2012 showed 64 graduates of Lewis County High School entered college as first time freshmen. Of these 64 students, 10 or 15.60 percent enrolled in a developmental English course. The percentage of students enrolling in a developmental English course was slightly lower than the State (17.40 percent). However, more students 23 or 35.90 percent enrolled in a developmental mathematics course. This percentage was 7.07 percent higher than the State's reported enrollment (28.83 percent).

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

### COMMENDATION

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

- 7.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.** The Team verified the school's technology integration specialist (TIS) was extremely diligent in maintaining the school's website and in assisting classroom teachers with technology integration. A variety of resources were accessible online for students, parents/guardians, and teachers, including extra credit work and additional sites to assist with assignments. Eight hundred and ninety-seven (897) parents and 749 students had active access to the school site. Additionally, the TIS was co-teaching with an English teacher and utilizing areas of the school site similarly to Blackboard, providing students invaluable experience in online instruction, which would be beneficial in postsecondary education. The TIS was also actively providing professional development targeting student achievement for school staff, holding sessions one to two times per month on integration of 21<sup>st</sup> century technology tools. Additionally, after school sessions were being held for parents/guardians on such topics as "Cyber Safety" and "What You Need to Know about the Online Writing Assessment".

## 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)**

On the date of the Education Performance Audit, 10 teachers or 20 percent of the classroom teachers were absent from the building. This included one long-term substitute. Seven of the 10 teachers absent taught core subjects (1 – English, 1 – science, 2 social studies, and 3 – mathematics). The Team determined this exhibited low expectations for the learning and achieving of all students.

Additionally, the Team concluded inconsistencies existed in schoolwide disciplinary expectations. Students reported they were aware of which classroom teachers would permit them to violate established school rules and which ones would not. One Team member observed two students texting in the academic wing of the building; a teacher also observed the students and said nothing. According to page 19 of the 2013-2014 student handbook, “Students are not permitted to have cell phones, personal radios, tape players, MP3 Player[s], CD players, pagers, and other electronic devices in the academic wing of the school.”

Various issues related to instruction and use of classroom time raised concerns for the Team regarding high expectations. Team members observed students with their materials ready to exit class anywhere from five to 10 minutes prior to the end of the class in 12 classrooms. Students reported most teachers gave them five to 10 minutes to “pack up” before the end of class.

In one special education setting, the teacher, a long-term substitute, sat at the desk and read to students from a book. Students had a worksheet to complete based upon the information the teacher was reading. After the teacher read the section that contained the answer, s/he stated the answer for students. A SmartBoard was present in the classroom; however, it was never utilized during the observation period. When asked if they ever used the SmartBoard, students reported, “No. We think someone uses that when we’re not in here.” An aide in the classroom never interacted with students, and three of the seven students in the class were disengaged. The Team determined these students were not being challenged to their potential and would be accountable through the WESTEST2.

In one classroom (World History) students watched a video and completed a 24-question worksheet that coordinated with the video. The teacher repeatedly told students when

answers were shown on the video, “There’s number five.” In another classroom (Contemporary Studies) the Team observed the teacher drawing a map on the board, while a SmartBoard was unused. Students did not take notes, and the teacher did not direct students to do so. The teacher primarily interacted with one row of students and did not engage the majority of the class. Class ended six minutes prior to dismissal time.

Students were unaware of the existence of a student council or how to become a member of student council. They reported that no one asked for their suggestions, particularly with the course schedule. Seniors indicated they did not feel prepared for postsecondary education; some reported they would be attending college the next year and had never taken a semester examination. As stated by one student, “They’re preparing us for testing, not the next step.” The majority of students reported not having a lot of homework in their classes.

After a random review of student learning goals established by teachers as part of the online educator evaluation system, the Team determined teachers’ expectations lacked rigor. Examples included, “Contact 7 out of 10 parents via email or telephone” and “75 percent of my students will use three types of technology this year”. The Team could not determine the baseline data utilized to establish these goals or their direct correlation with improving student achievement. It was also unclear how seven of the eight evaluation goals reviewed would be measured.

#### **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 a variety of instructional strategies in the majority of classrooms during the day, including project-based learning. However, the Team reported the following concerns regarding instructional strategies that contributed to student disengagement.

- Students reported that most hands-on activities occur in their science classes but never in math classes. The Team did not observe any hands-on activities in mathematics classes.
- Lecture was the primary instructional strategy in three social studies classrooms.
- In one social studies classroom, students were given a quiz that consisted of 16 matching items and 10 fill-in-the-blank statements with a word bank provided.
- In one math classroom, students reported receiving worksheets daily, and the Team verified 12 sets of worksheets were prepared to be given to students. This same teacher reported the textbook was her primary resource for teaching and that she rarely incorporated writing. This was particularly concerning due to the shifts in mathematics associated with the Next Generation Content Standards in Mathematics.



- In another math classroom, the teacher attempted to engage students in project-based learning; however, the lack of structure for the assignment caused disengagement among students. The assignment also lacked relativity for students.
- In one science classroom, students reported receiving 81 worksheets during the school year and indicated they completed worksheets nearly every day.
- Differentiation in instruction was not evident between one Honors class and a standard class (Honors English 9 and English 9). Students were completing round robin reading in both classrooms. Text-dependent questioning and higher level thinking skills were not utilized in either classroom.

**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)**

The school had several types of technology (iPads, laptops, desktops, SmartBoards, ELMOs), including an in-house television studio, where student productions were broadcast over local cable stations. The Team observed students actively using technology ranging from calculators to laptops in 12 classrooms, and observed teachers using technology for instructional purposes in 10 classrooms.

While the school possessed a variety of technologies, teachers repeatedly reported difficulties in receiving timely repairs for non-functioning equipment. “We have a whole lot of technology here, but it doesn’t work,” reported one teacher. Another cited having sent in many maintenance requests for a printer that stopped working in September, and the machine was still not repaired. Others reported having multiple computers in their classrooms not functioning for several months.

Teachers also expressed displeasure with being denied access to computer laboratories as the school prepared for the upcoming online WESTEST2. They reported this had an adverse effect on planned lessons. On a student assignment that required use of technology, the following warning was written: “Prepare ahead . . . testing comes first before academics, so we could be kicked out of the lab even though we have it reserved.”

Students reported the school library was scarcely used and indicated they would “get in trouble with the librarian” if they tried entering the library without the appropriate slip. Students told Team members they would like more access to the library and newer books from which to choose.

**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)**

The master schedule reflected the school currently offered two Advanced Placement courses: AP English Language and AP English Literature. The school did not offer an advanced course in mathematics, science, or social studies.

According to the West Virginia Department of Education Course Information for Policy 2510, "A minimum of four College Board AP® Courses (at least one from each core content areas of English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) or the IB Program must be offered annually."

**7.1.11. Guidance and advisement. Students are provided specific guidance and advisement opportunities to allow them to choose a career major prior to completion of grade 10. (Policy 2510)**

The Team received inconsistent reports from students regarding interactions with counselors. Some students complained counselors did not know their names, others said they never saw the counselors, and some reported meeting with the counselor at least twice a year.

The school had no established advisory/mentoring program for students. Students reported developmental guidance did not occur whereby the guidance counselor visited classrooms following a set schedule and presenting an established curriculum. Students were also unaware of any specific career guidance being provided. Teachers and students were unaware of the College Foundation for West Virginia (CFWV) site and were not utilizing the My Strategic Compass site provided by the Division of Career and Technical Education on the West Virginia Department of Education website (<http://westvirginia.strategiccompass.com/>). Seniors who were interviewed stated they had not met with a guidance counselor this school year.

**7.1.14. Alignment with job market opportunities. The technical and adult programs in the school are aligned with first local, and then state, then national job market opportunities. (Policy 2510)**

While one teacher reported individuals from business and industry participate as guest speakers in classrooms, the Team could not verify any formal meetings with professionals occurred to ensure technical program offerings were aligned with local and State job market opportunities. None of the career and technical education teachers could state the dates of advisory council meetings or locate minutes for any such meetings for the past two years. Based on the placement performance issues for completers at Lewis County High School (50 percent positive placement; 0 percent placement in jobs in field; and 36 percent continuing education in field), it is imperative the school hold advisory council meetings at least twice yearly for technical programs.

## **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.**

Teachers reported all staff had the opportunity to serve on the committee which assisted in creating the school's strategic plan, and most teachers could articulate the mission and goals from the plan. The majority of teachers, however, were unaware of the action steps listed in the plan and their role in carrying out these steps.

The Team determined two of the strategic plan goals were not clearly based on data, were not measurable, and were not written to address a specific area of concern. The West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI) utilized gaps in graduation rate among subgroups to identify high schools that received the Focus designation; the Team noted that none of the three goals found in the school's strategic plan addressed graduation rate.

**7.2.2. Counseling services. Counselors shall spend at least 75 percent of the work day in a direct counseling relationship with students, and shall devote no more than 25 percent of the work day to counseling-related administrative activities as stated in W.Va. Code §18-5-18b. (W.Va. Code §18-5-18b; Policy 2315)**

One counselor provided a planner with information written on specific dates, but no times were provided; therefore, the Team was unable to verify the counselor was spending at least 75 percent of the work day in a direct counseling relationship with students. Interviews revealed counselors were heavily involved with duties associated with student scheduling, testing, and programs of study.

**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)**

Teachers and administrators reported inconsistencies in lesson plan reviews. These inconsistencies related to not only the process for submitting plans for review, but also the frequency plans were reviewed. The Team verified through examination of lesson plans that administrative review ranged from zero to as many as six times. In a group of three teachers, two reported they received no administrative feedback on lesson plans. Comments viewed in lesson plans tended to be observational or compliance driven (e.g.,

lesson plan is easy to read and follow; be sure to include technology; students writing and working independently). Team members saw drawings of smiling or frowning faces in some lesson plans. The Team determined, based upon the inconsistency in lesson plan review and the types of comments written, teachers were not being provided feedback necessary to improve instruction.

**7.2.4. 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)**

Based upon teacher and administrator interviews, the Team concluded there was no consistent process utilized for analysis of student data. Teachers reported English teachers reviewed COMPASS scores; EXPLORE scores were used to place students in developmental math or English courses; and WESTEST2 data was reviewed departmentally at the beginning of the school year; however, the Team determined there was no systematic process in place for reviewing and utilizing student data to guide classroom instruction. A general lack of understanding existed among teachers of the significance student data played in improving classroom instruction and increasing student achievement. The following statement made by a teacher exemplified this conclusion, "I don't care about student data. I care about students."

The Team was particularly concerned by the lack of staff knowledge of basic student and school data. When asked to state the graduation rate, the principal reported 84 percent; the counselor reported 94 percent; and teachers reported 92 percent. As stated in the data analysis section of this report, the graduation rate for the 2012-2013 school year was 71.67 percent. Students were the only interviewees during the audit to mention dropout rate as a concern.

The Team also determined efforts were not made by the school to inform students of their data and help them utilize this data to improve achievement. Students reported WESTEST2 results were mailed home with their first nine weeks report cards and no one reviewed the results with them prior to the mailing.

## 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)**

A review of professional educator licensure was completed by the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Professional Preparation. The following issues were identified:

Seven teachers did not hold the appropriate endorsements for the courses they were teaching.

Four teachers needed to provide a copy of their Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) driving record and a copy of their valid West Virginia driver's license per West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2422.2.

One teacher needed to verify completion of Advanced Placement training and the course being taught was also listed on the school's Advanced Placement audit.

One teacher did not hold the appropriate restricted special education content for general science.

There was no special education code in the sixth position for course codes for four teachers.

There was no content exam for mentally impaired (MI) or learning disabilities (LD) for one teacher.

There was no content exam electronically on file at the West Virginia Department of Education for nine teachers (three Art; two English; one Biology; one Math; one Science; and one Spanish).

## 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)**

Lewis County High School's participation in the Safe and Supportive Schools (S3) initiative made evident the principal and staff were working to improve the culture and climate of the school. However, the Team determined it was vitally important the principal, as the instructional leader, ensure schoolwide use of data focused on improving teaching and learning, as well as climate and culture. A key component in this process would be collaborative time for teachers to work together to review data and

plan instructional adjustments. Teachers reported they did not have the opportunity to collaborate unless they made the effort to do so on their own time; it was very evident during interviews that for many the idea of collaborating with their peers had never occurred to them. As one teacher stated, “We’re too busy teaching.” The majority of teachers were clearly working in isolation.

## RECOMMENDATION

### **7.5.1. Parents and the community are provided information. Staff members provide parents and the community with understandable information and techniques for helping students learn.**

The principal reported that the school was removed from the community when it was built in its current location away from the nearby town. He and the teachers indicated it was difficult to involve parents in school activities outside of athletics. Teachers reported low participation rates for parent teacher conferences, and the technology integration specialist (TIS) indicated low turnout for educational sessions held after school. The Team recommended the school explore alternative methods of providing information to and involving parents. The following resources were offered by the Team: the National Education Association ([www.nea.org](http://www.nea.org)); the National Parent Teacher Association ([www.pta.org](http://www.pta.org)); the work of Dr. Joyce Epstein; and the work of principal Ricardo LeBlanc-Esparza, which focuses on creating mentoring programs for students that also increase parent involvement.

## 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 Lewis County High 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.**

Teachers reported not meeting as a staff except on designated dates, such as on instructional support and enhancement (ISE) days. Five of these days were provided in the school calendar. The Team determined these dates could be utilized to better serve students by concentrating on professional development relative to the structuring of professional learning communities with a focus on curriculum and instruction. Learning and sharing of best practices were seen by the Team as significant components for the professional learning communities. Additionally, while the administrators were conducting formal walkthroughs, there was no systematic method for collecting and sharing this data in aggregate with teachers. The Team recommended using walkthrough data to encourage reflective practice among teachers and to provide feedback to the faculty as a whole to identify strong areas, as well as target areas of concern.

## **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 Lewis County High 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 – Focus**

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

The Technology Integration Specialist (TIS) reported low turnout by staff and parents/guardians for training sessions. During the audit Team members observed the positive impact the TIS had in a co-taught classroom. Additionally, the Team noted the TIS's diligence in contacting and providing the opportunity for every teacher in the school to receive support. The Team recommended the school investigate methods for increasing both staff and family involvement in offerings provided by the TIS, as these could directly impact student achievement.



## 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 topography was not varied enough to provide a desirable appearance without steep inclines. (Does not adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The ceramic kiln in the art area was non-operational. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

## **EARLY DETECTION AND INTERVENTION**

The overall graduation rate for Lewis County High School was 71.67 percent. Four-year cohort graduation rates follow: Male – 66.67 percent; students with disabilities – 58.24 percent; and economically disadvantaged students – 64.14 percent. Given these numbers and the designation of Focus School, the Team determined it is very important the school be proactive in identifying at-risk students. Although the school was implementing credit rescue, the Student Assistance Team (SAT) process was reactive rather than proactive. When asked about interventions for students at risk of failing, the counselor reported the Student Assistance Team (SAT) process was most often initiated by parents, not teachers, due to academic concerns.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

Lewis County High 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 Lewis County High School in improvement efforts.

The Team identified 12 high quality standards necessary to improve performance and progress.

7.1.2. High expectations.

7.1.5. Instructional strategies.

7.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.

7.1.9. Programs of study.

7.1.11. Guidance and advisement.

7.1.14. Alignment with job market opportunities.

7.2.1. County and School electronic strategic improvement plans.

7.2.2. Counseling services.

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.

7.2.4. Data analysis.

7.6.2. Licensure.

7.8.1. Leadership.

The Team presented one commendation (7.1.7.) and one recommendation (7.5.1), noted an indicator of efficiency (8.1.1), 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 Lewis County High 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.