



**INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**MAN MIDDLE SCHOOL**

**LOGAN 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 .....	10
Education Performance Audit.....	12
Commendations.....	12
High Quality Standards .....	13
Indicators Of Efficiency .....	16
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	19
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	20
Early Detection And Intervention .....	22
Education Performance Audit Summary .....	23

## INTRODUCTION

An unannounced Education Performance Audit of Man Middle School in Logan County was conducted April 24, 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 performance and progress as they relate to the standards outlined in Policy 2320. 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 12 classroom teachers, two school system administrators, and 37 students; observed 10 classrooms; and examined school records.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Deborah Ashwell, Middle School Coordinator

West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Instructional Technology – Bob McCoy

### TEAM MEMBERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>School/County</b>
Lou Maynus	Assistant Superintendent	Middles Schools, Kanawha County
Melissa Lawrence	Principal	Cedar Grove Middle School, Kanawha County
Jason Conaway	Assistant Principal	Eastern Greenbrier Middle School, Greenbrier County
Mary Ann Triplett	Curriculum Facilitator	Clay County Middle School, Clay County

## SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

### 45 LOGAN COUNTY

Phyllis Doty, Superintendent

### 103 MAN MIDDLE SCHOOL – SUPPORT

Cynthia Caldwell, Principal  
Grades 05-08, Enrollment 468

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 Man Middle School a Support school. The majority of student groups did not meet the annual academic goals in mathematics and reading/language arts; and the school did not reach its goals in attendance or graduation rates, student academic growth, and/or learning gaps between student groups. 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 Man Middle School.

Designation:	SUPPORT	Next Year’s Target:	53.2485
Index Score:	33.9264	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	NO
Index Target:	51.289	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

### Supporting Data

Proficiency (40% of the index score)	10.61
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	10.75
Observed Growth (15% of the index score)	3.75
Adequate Growth (20% of the index score)	4.00
<u>Attendance Rate (5% of the index score)</u>	<u>4.81</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	33.93

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 middle schools in West Virginia reaching 65.0053 by 2020. Proficiency targets were set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

Man Middle School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year. Considering the index target of 53.2485 for 2013-2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 33.9264, Man Middle School has a steep trajectory to achieve both short and long term targets. A significant gap exists in both the WVAI target and the target of 75 percent proficient by 2020.

**MAN MIDDLE 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
5	White	> 95%	55.36%	44.64%	> 95%	57.14%	42.86%
5	Black	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%
5	Special Education	> 95%	91.67%	8.33%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
5	Total	> 95%	55.26%	44.74%	> 95%	57.02%	42.98%
6	White	94.29%	43.43%	56.57%	94.29%	57.58%	42.42%
6	Black	> 95%	60.00%	40.00%	> 95%	60.00%	40.00%
6	Hispanic	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
6	Special Education	> 95%	60.00%	40.00%	> 95%	70.00%	30.00%
6	Total	94.59%	44.76%	55.24%	94.59%	58.10%	41.90%
7	White	> 95%	77.78%	22.22%	> 95%	60.19%	39.81%
7	Black	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	57.14%	42.86%
7	Special Education	88.89%	87.50%	12.50%	88.89%	87.50%	12.50%
7	Total	> 95%	79.13%	20.87%	> 95%	60.00%	40.00%
8	White	> 95%	75.96%	24.04%	> 95%	57.69%	42.31%
8	Black	> 95%	60.00%	40.00%	> 95%	20.00%	80.00%
8	Hispanic	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
8	Limited English Proficiency	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
8	Special Education	> 95%	87.50%	12.50%	> 95%	75.00%	25.00%
8	Total	> 95%	75.45%	24.55%	> 95%	56.36%	43.64%

**Attendance Rate = 96.20%**

The Grade-Level Proficiency Data for School Year 2013 chart depicts participation, non-proficient, and proficient percentage rates by grade level and subgroup for mathematics and reading/language arts.

In mathematics, Grade 6 had the highest proficiency level with 55.24 percent proficient, followed by Grade 5 with 44.74 percent proficient, Grade 8 with 24.55 percent proficient, and Grade 7 with 20.87 percent proficient. The special education subgroup exhibited significant gaps in proficiency compared to the total grade level scores. Grade 6 special education students had the highest proficiency level with 40.00 percent proficient, followed by Grades 7 and 8 with 12.50 percent proficient, and Grade 5 with 8.33 percent proficient. The black subgroup scored higher than the total grade level in Grade 5 (50.00

percent proficient) and Grade 8 (40.00 percent proficient). Grades 6 (40.00 percent proficient) and 7 (less than 5 percent proficient) black students scored lower than the total grade level proficiency. The Grades 6 and 8 Hispanic subgroup scored less than 5 percent proficient.

In reading/language arts, Grade 8 had the highest proficiency level with 43.64 percent proficient, followed by Grade 5 with 42.98 percent proficient, Grade 6 with 41.90 percent proficient, and Grade 7 with 40.00 percent proficient. The special education subgroup exhibited significant gaps in proficiency compared to the total grade level scores. Grade 6 special education students had the highest proficiency with 30.00 percent proficient, followed by Grade 8 (25 percent proficient), Grade 7 (12.50 percent proficient), and Grade 5 (less than 5 percent proficient). In all grades except Grade 6, the black subgroup scored higher than the total grade level scores. The Grade 6 black subgroup (40.00 percent proficient) only had a gap of 1.90 percent. The Grades 6 and 8 Hispanic subgroup scored less than 5 percent proficient.

## MAN MIDDLE 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	209 (48%)	126 (29%)	102 (23%)	36.0	36.0%	185 (42%)	140 (32%)	112 (26%)	43.0	41.7%
	County	1,330 (38%)	1,091 (31%)	1,051 (30%)	46.0	36.9%	1,312 (38%)	1,100 (32%)	1,052 (30%)	45.0	43.5%
	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	*	*	*	28.0	26.3%	*	*	*	53.0	52.6%
	County	38 (35%)	39 (36%)	31 (29%)	48.0	33.3%	41 (38%)	30 (28%)	36 (34%)	51.0	43.1%
	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%
White Sub-Group	School	196 (47%)	120 (29%)	100 (24%)	36.0	36.7%	178 (43%)	134 (32%)	104 (25%)	41.0	41.5%
	County	1,279 (38%)	1,041 (31%)	1,013 (30%)	46.0	37.0%	1,263 (38%)	1,059 (32%)	1,004 (30%)	45.0	43.4%
	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	14 (47%)	10 (33%)	6 (20%)	36.0	17.9%	17 (57%)	9 (30%)	4 (13%)	27.0	15.4%
	County	136 (43%)	110 (34%)	73 (23%)	41.0	13.7%	131 (41%)	98 (31%)	90 (28%)	45.0	12.6%
	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	195 (48%)	116 (29%)	96 (24%)	36.0	37.7%	168 (41%)	131 (32%)	108 (27%)	43.0	44.2%
	County	1,194 (38%)	981 (31%)	978 (31%)	47.0	39.8%	1,181 (38%)	1,002 (32%)	962 (31%)	45.0	47.3%
	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	89 (51%)	53 (30%)	33 (19%)	34.0	36.0%	83 (47%)	54 (31%)	38 (22%)	38.0	41.7%
	County	534 (41%)	391 (30%)	384 (29%)	44.0	36.9%	535 (41%)	412 (32%)	356 (27%)	43.0	43.5%
	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	120 (46%)	73 (28%)	69 (26%)	38.0	(NA)	102 (39%)	86 (33%)	74 (28%)	44.0	(NA)
	County	796 (37%)	700 (32%)	667 (31%)	48.0	(NA)	777 (36%)	688 (32%)	696 (32%)	47.0	(NA)
	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	112 (50%)	58 (26%)	55 (24%)	35.0	35.6%	98 (44%)	78 (35%)	49 (22%)	39.0	34.3%
	County	707 (40%)	551 (31%)	502 (29%)	44.0	35.1%	702 (40%)	570 (32%)	485 (28%)	43.0	34.7%
	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	97 (46%)	68 (32%)	47 (22%)	38.0	36.5%	87 (41%)	62 (29%)	63 (30%)	45.0	49.8%
	County	623 (36%)	540 (32%)	549 (32%)	48.0	38.8%	610 (36%)	530 (31%)	567 (33%)	48.0	52.8%
	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 Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group chart identifies the percent proficient in each subgroup 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 growth (green cells) based on previous performance. The black and low socioeconomic subgroups demonstrated low growth in mathematics, while all others demonstrated typical growth. All subgroups with the exception of special education demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts, while the special education subgroup demonstrated low growth.

**Mathematics.** The percent proficient for all students was 36.0 percent. A 10.4 percent achievement gap existed between the black (26.3 percent proficient) and the white (36.7 percent proficient) subgroups. A 19.8 percent achievement gap existed between the special education (17.9 percent proficient) and the non-special education (37.7 percent proficient) subgroups. The male (35.6 percent proficient) and female (36.5 percent proficient) subgroups had an achievement gap of only 0.9 percent.

**Reading/Language Arts.** The percent proficient for all students was 41.7 percent. An 11.1 percent achievement gap existed between the black (52.6 percent proficient) and the white (41.5 percent proficient) subgroups. A 28.8 percent achievement gap existed between the special education (15.4 percent proficient) and the non-special education (44.2 percent proficient) subgroups. The female (49.8 percent proficient) subgroup exhibited 15.5 percent higher proficiency than the male (34.3 percent proficient) subgroup.

### **ACT EXPLORE Assessment Results**

The ACT EXPLORE Test is designed to assess middle school students' general educational development and their complex, critical thinking skills. The tests cover four curriculum areas: English, mathematics, reading, and science reasoning. In addition, information about students' educational career plans, interest, high school course work plans and self-identified needs for assistance is gathered and reported.

The purpose of this assessment is to provide career awareness exploration activities. The results are used by students in Grade 8 to develop their individualized plans for Grades 9 and 10. Assessment results assist students, parents, and educators in decision-making about educational career plans, interests, and high school course work plans. ACT EXPLORE scores provide early indicators of whether students are on track for college. When students are not meeting the national benchmarks, teachers can use this information in a timely manner to focus on areas of need.

Benchmarks: English: 13      Math: 17      Reading: 15      Science: 20

<b>ACT EXPLORE RESULTS</b>			
<b>Grade 8</b>			
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
English WV	14.1	14.1	14.3
English Logan County	13.4	13.2	14.0
English Man Middle	12.3	13.2	14.1
Mathematics WV	14.8	14.6	14.8
Mathematics Logan County	13.9	13.9	14.0
Mathematics Man Middle	13.0	14.0	13.9
Reading WV	14.1	14.0	14.0
Reading Logan County	13.3	13.1	13.7
Reading Man Middle	12.6	13.6	13.8
Science WV	15.9	15.8	16.0
Science Logan County	15.2	15.0	15.6
Science Man Middle	14.4	14.9	15.2
Composite WV	14.8	14.8	14.9
Composite Logan County	14.1	13.9	14.5
Composite Man Middle	13.2	14.1	14.4

Source: [http://wvde.state.wv.us/oaa/EXPLORE/EXPLORE\\_index.html](http://wvde.state.wv.us/oaa/EXPLORE/EXPLORE_index.html)

The ACT EXPLORE trend data over the past three years indicated increases in English, reading, and science and the overall composite score but a decrease in mathematics from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. The national benchmark scores are indicated above the chart. The 2012-2013 ACT EXPLORE results showed that Man Middle School scored above the national benchmark in English but significantly below the benchmark in all other areas. Students scored lower than the State averages in all areas.

## **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY - ANALYSIS**

A review of data from the WV Achieves webpage indicated Man Middle School demonstrated a decrease in achievement in both mathematics and reading/language arts scores from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. In mathematics, great differences existed among the various grade levels. Grades 5 and 6 demonstrated significantly higher scores than Grades 7 and 8, a difference of over 20-30 percent. The schoolwide score dropped 3.63 percent from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. The variance among grade levels was less in the area of reading/language arts; however, the schoolwide average dropped 9.56 percent in this area. ACT EXPLORE scores were in line with the county average, which was below the State average in all areas.

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

- Supporting the Common Core through Literacy.
  - Research Based Strategies for Common Core in English.
- Test Data Analysis.
- Policies and Procedures.
- Teacher Evaluation Process.
- Online Writing Assessment.
- Classroom Instruction That Works.
- Principals' Academy.
- New Teachers' Academy.
  - Classroom Management Strategies.
  - Instructional Strategies.
  - Literacy Strategies.
- Changes in School Law.
- ACT EXPLORE.
- Policy 2419 Monitoring.
- Special Education Topics.
  - Testing Accommodations for Special Needs Population.
  - Standards-based IEP Writing.
  - Next Generation Standards.
  - Objectives and Essential Elements for Secondary and Vocational Schools.
  - Best Practices for School Year 2013-2014.
- Social Studies Textbook Training.
- Support for Personalized Instruction.
- SmartBoard Training.
- Strategic Planning.
- McREL Walk-Through Training.

- Student Assistance Team Training.
- First in Math Anchor Training.
- Support for Personalized Instruction Action Plan.
- Math 5-8 Training.
- Formative Assessment.
- Math I and Math II.
- Physical Fitness and Health.
- Counselor Training.
- Counselor Training on Growth Model Reports.
- Social Media.
- Instructional Practices Inventory Training.
- Bill Daggett.
- Pacing Guides.
- Policy 5000: Hiring Training modules.

The Team had difficulty collecting data and information from all school staff during the Education Performance Audit due to the WESTEST2 administration. According to the administrator, strong teachers were selected to administer the WESTEST2, while other teachers and substitutes covered classes. Teachers provided instruction, but not necessarily to their regular classrooms. Substitute teachers were also called to cover classes of those teachers administering the statewide assessment. In addition, Grade 7 students were in the gymnasium for most of the day while a basketball tournament was held. These students gathered data throughout each game to calculate shooting percentages, rebounds, assists, etc. The tournament bracket also included the educational standards associated with this activity. While this was a unique and creative use of time, the Team surmised it was less effective for students who were not involved in playing the game or keeping the statistics. Many students were in the gymnasium as spectators for long periods of time.

The Team conducted classroom observations and teacher interviews with those teachers who delivered instruction and were available during a regular planning period.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

### COMMENDATIONS

The Education Performance Audit Team reported that Man Middle School had undertaken positive school improvement initiatives. The prominent initiatives and activities included the following.

**7.5.1. Parents and community are provided information.** Man Middle School collected Grade 8 student writing samples about the students' families. These writings were compiled and bound for Parent Night with original student art work on the front and back cover. Each parent who attended Parent Night was given a copy of these original works. Parent attendance increased significantly as a result of this memento of their children's work.

**7.8.1. Student Leadership.** Man Middle School had a Student Leadership Team comprised of a group of students elected by their peers from each Advisor/Advisee group. The students made recommendations to the Teacher Leadership Team, recommended and implemented community service projects (food baskets and Easter baskets for the nursing home; dinner and gifts for less fortunate families); suggested interdisciplinary activities during the WESTEST2 weeks (basketball, volleyball, academic motivation, self-esteem building); and assisted with after-school programs (dance, basketball, volleyball, and flag football). Students were or will be provided a meal, dances, athletic activities, a talent show, field trips, and a move-up day at the end of school as recommended by the Student Leadership Team.

## HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

**Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.**

### 7.1. CURRICULUM.

**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)**

According to the West Virginia Department of Education Course Information for Policy 2510, the following program was not being taught at Man Middle School: Foreign language for students in Grades 7 and 8.

The Team reviewed the master schedule and interviewed the principal and found only one class of Spanish was offered. The Spanish teacher retired two years ago. Last school year, 2012-2013, only Grade 8 students were offered Spanish B following Spanish A the prior year. The school was unable to secure another teacher. The Spanish A course was offered this school year through a blended delivery including Skype and on-site instruction; however, only Grade 7 received instruction.

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

The Team examined the bell schedule, reviewed lesson plans, and interviewed teachers and determined that for approximately 60-70 percent of the school year 336 minutes of instruction occurred daily. Teachers had lesson plans and structured classes for the Advisor/Advisee (AA) period when providing health and LINKS lessons. However, lesson plans were not required when intervention groups were instructed and sustained silent reading occurred. The 336-minute day met the required instructional day for middle schools but left very little banked time for non-academic activities held during the school day.

A May and June schedule, following the completion of the WESTEST2, indicated 10 different days of activities during the school day, many were not academic activities. These activities require a large amount of time banked. Other activities, such as the basketball tournament during the week of WESTEST2, where students were neither receiving instruction nor being assessed, would require additional banked time.

## **7.2. STUDENT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE.**

**7.2.4. 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 reported the majority of lesson plans had been signed and dated by an administrator. Constructive feedback was included in many plans; however, the positive comments did not accurately reflect the quality of some plans. One teacher did not have lesson plans for many weeks beginning in February, including plans for the day of the Education Performance Audit. Another teacher did not have lesson plans for the first week of school and had plans missing occasionally throughout the year. The day of the Education Performance Audit, the substitute teacher did not follow the lesson plan provided. On many pages of one teacher's plans, an administrator had marked across them indicating they were reviewed and in some boxes a question mark had been added. The Team was unsure whether that indicated something was missing or something else needed to be included. This type of coding did not provide sufficient feedback to improve lesson plan development. The majority of the teachers did not differentiate instruction from one period to another when teaching the same subject and grade. Only one lesson plan was developed for use multiple periods with no indication of where each class finished one day and began the next.

**7.2.5. 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)**

While some level of data analysis was conducted prior to the beginning of the school year, the Team did not see evidence of data as the basis for decision-making throughout the school year. Initial intervention and enrichment groups (support for personalized learning – SPL) were set based on the 2012-2013 WESTEST2 data. Students were regrouped weekly for interventions based on teacher recommendations. Teachers did not have benchmark data or progress monitoring data for specific skill development or mastery. Students were moved weekly based on tests administered or class performance during the previous week. Skill lessons were not delivered every day during the Advisor/Advisee (AA) period when SPL was scheduled. One day each week was dedicated to sustained silent reading. LINKS lessons were provided another day each week. Movement activities were also provided on occasion. Health classes were also taught for one grading period during AA. The principal mentioned student data

notebooks; however, the Team was not provided any information from teachers nor provided examples of how data notebooks were utilized with students. The counselor also discussed how each student was made aware of their own test data and ways to improve achievement results. Again, teachers did not discuss the use of specific data. Conversations were vague and cited formative assessments rather than specific data, specific skills, specific strategies, or programs. However, students were more versed in their own results and were aware how close they were to proficiency or how close they were to possibly slipping below the proficiency score for each content area.

Approximately half the teachers indicated their student learning goals in the Educator Evaluation System were based on the WESTEST2 scores or based on what they thought students might be able to master this school year.

The Team did not see evidence of staff addressing content within specific subgroups as a result of WESTEST2 data analysis, i.e., special education in mathematics and reading/language arts or males in reading/language arts. Reminder notes were provided to the staff the week of the Education Performance Audit indicating overall WESTEST2 results and the need to raise mathematics and reading scores, citing reading scores dropped nine standard points and the need to raise scores 15 points to be back on target.

While WESTEST2 data are critical to provide a starting point for instruction, additional benchmark data and progress monitoring data must also be examined to adjust and differentiate instruction. Teachers used appropriate terminology (i.e., summative and formative assessments, pre- and post-tests), but did not provide specific examples, subgroup weaknesses, or strategies to remediate weaknesses and address low subgroup and grade level performance. Teachers stated they used differentiated instruction; however, differentiation was not noted in lesson plans as a means to address class by class differences in the same grade and subject area.

Based on growth model data, mathematics scores were 5.7 percent lower than reading/language arts scores. The strategic plan goals were to increase mathematics by 10 percent and reading/language arts by 15 percent. At this rate, the difference between the student proficiency in mathematics compared to reading/language arts would increase rather than improve both areas equally or increase mathematics slightly more than reading/language arts.

## **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)**



The West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Professional Preparation, reviewed professional educators' licensure. The results involved 10 different teachers. The following issues were identified:

1. Two teachers did not hold certification for the subject(s) in which they provided instruction. One teacher did not hold endorsements in general science or social studies for special education content. Another teacher did not hold an elementary education or health endorsement for the health course.
2. Nine teachers were not highly qualified. Five of the nine teachers did not have a content exam score on file. One teacher did not hold the necessary endorsement for science or social studies, and three teachers were on permit (special education, science, and Spanish).

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

A review of the Educator Evaluation System indicated staff had completed the self-reflection and student learning goals. In addition, the administrators had completed on average, the appropriate number of observations for staff based on the progression level; however, the Team determined teachers were not aware of their progression status. When asked what progression one teacher was in, s/he responded, "Meets Requirements." Further prompting and cuing with Initial and Intermediate terminology was met with a response, "I'm not really sure."

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**7.2.1. County and School electronic strategic improvement plans.** The Team recognized staff was prepared for the Education Performance Audit. Teachers discussed the development of the school strategic plan and spoke about the plan's general goals. The Team learned the strategic plan was updated after each professional development session.

While the strategic plan addressed student achievement in mathematics and reading, the desired increases were not consistent with student results. Based on growth model data, mathematics scores were 5.7 percent lower than reading/language arts scores. The strategic plan identified goals to increase mathematics by 10 percent and reading/language arts by 15 percent which would cause the gap between two areas to grow from 5.7 to 10.7 percent.

## 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 Man Middle School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Logan 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 Logan 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.**

Policy 2419 states,

“The district must provide:

- A continuum of service options in order to respond to the intensity and severity of students’ needs.
- Appropriate grouping of students with exceptionalities for specially designed instruction based upon meeting the students’ similar social, functional and/or academic needs, as specified in their IEPs and without regard to their identified exceptionality.”

The master schedule reflected classes for students with disabilities were available. Through interviews, the Team determined the grouping of students with disabilities was not appropriate to meet the diverse needs of this population. Students identified with significant cognitive disabilities and requiring instruction utilizing the alternate academic achievement standards were grouped with students identified with less severe disabilities receiving instruction through the West Virginia Next Generation Content Standards. These students did not have similar social, functional or academic needs.

**8.1.4. Administrative practices. The school district assesses the assignment of administrative personnel to determine the degree managerial/administrative services provided schools establish and support high quality curriculum and instructional services.**

While the principal was well versed in the curriculum, data, strategic planning, and administrative practices throughout the building, the knowledge and administrative practices of one assistant principal could be strengthened. During a brief conversation

with this administrator, the Team determined she was not fully aware of the basic schedule. All administrators did not have knowledge of the basic operations within the school and were not able to answer questions regarding course offerings and class schedules. According to the principal, new administrators had principal leadership meetings and other administrators were assigned as mentors. Additional training and support is needed to strengthen the skills of newer administrators. This assistant principal will be attending the principals' academy this year.

## **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 Man Middle 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 - Support**

The school and students will receive additional support. 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 throughout the year to review progress. The local school system and the local RESA will partner to provide professional development, technical assistance, interventions and develop an improvement plan. The school must show progress in student achievement each year to improve this designation. A school's designation is determined each year based on prior school year data, including WESTEST2 results.

The OEPA Team concurred with the RESA 2 School Improvement Diagnostic Report dated November 15, 2014. Man Middle School needs to “conduct a thorough analysis of WESTEST2, formative, and classroom data to narrow strategic responses for instructional support to individual students and school strategic goals.” This analysis should lead to more specific goals and action steps to address student achievement among the subgroups.

## 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.**

**19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The music room did not have acoustical treatment. (Did not adversely impact student achievement.)

**19.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.** The science laboratories did not have DC current or compressed air. (May adversely impact program delivery and student achievement.)

**19.1.12. Grades 7-12 auditorium/stage.** The school did not have an auditorium. (Did not adversely impact program delivery or student achievement.)

**19.2. School personnel. Adequate administrative, instructional, support, and service personnel are provided.** Man Middle School is fortunate to have three administrators for a school of 468 students. Through effective mentoring and distributed leadership, these additional administrators could be even more beneficial to the school's

operations. While each administrator has a specific set of assignments or areas of expertise, it is essential all administrators understand the student performance data, have a general understanding of curriculum, and respond to scheduling concerns.

## **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.

Man Middle School had a schedule and provided instruction for students through support for personalized learning (SPL); however, this process was not clearly aligned with data and implemented with fidelity to ensure sufficient supports and remediation to increase student achievement. According to the guidelines for the implementation of SPL, targeted instruction should be 15-30 minutes, three to five times per week for a minimum of nine weeks prior to moving to intensive instruction. Progress monitoring should occur every two to three weeks. Intensive instruction should occur for 30-60 minutes, three to five times per week, with progress monitoring every one to two weeks and continue for a minimum of nine weeks. The Team determined the schedule of regrouping students was too frequent for the instruction to have a significant impact on student achievement. In addition, teachers did not have lesson plans for the skills delivered through SPL.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

Man Middle 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 Man Middle School in improvement efforts.

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

- 7.1.9. Programs of study.
- 7.1.13. Instructional day.
- 7.2.4. Lesson plan and principal feedback.
- 7.2.5. Data analysis
- 7.6.2. Licensure.
- 7.6.3. Evaluation.

The Team presented two commendations (7.5.1. Parents and community are provided information and 7.8.1. Student leadership) and one recommendation (7.2.1. County and School electronic strategic improvement plans), noted two indicators of efficiency (8.1.1. Curriculum and 8.1.4. Administrative practices), 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 Man Middle School and Logan 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.