



**Office of Education  
Performance Audits**

**INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**HUGH DINGESS ELEMENTARY 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 .....	8
Education Performance Audit.....	9
Commendations.....	9
High Quality Standards .....	10
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	13
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	14
Early Detection And Intervention .....	16
Education Performance Audit Summary .....	17

## INTRODUCTION

An unannounced Education Performance Audit of Hugh Dingess Elementary School in Logan County was conducted April 22, 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 school personnel and school system administrators, observed classrooms, and examined school records.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Allen D. Brock, Coordinator

West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Instructional Technology – Mark Moore, Coordinator

## TEAM MEMBERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>School/County</b>
Larry R. Werry	Retired Principal – Fairview Elementary	Marion County
Dorothy (Becky) Smith	Principal – Ghent Elementary	Raleigh County
Margaret Williamson	Principal – East Lynn Elementary	Wayne 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

### 210 HUGH DINGESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – TRANSITION

Sammy Dalton, Principal  
Grades PK-04, Enrollment 124

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

### Designation Status for Hugh Dingess Elementary School.

Designation:	TRANSITION	Next Year's Target:	63.5535
Index Score:	51.2172	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	61.7011	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

### Supporting Data

Proficiency (60% of the index score)	29.87
Achievement Gaps Closed (0% of the index score)	NA
Observed Growth (15% of the index score)	8.44
Adequate Growth (20% of the index score)	8.00
<u>Attendance Rate (5% of the index score)</u>	<u>4.91</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	51.22

The West Virginia Accountability Index targets are 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 are set with a goal of all elementary schools in West Virginia reaching 74.6679 by 2020. Proficiency targets are set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

Hugh Dingess Elementary School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year. When considering the index target of 63.55 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent of 2020, with a current index score of 51.21, Hugh Dingess Elementary School has a steep trajectory to achieve both the short term and long term targets. A significant gap exists between current performance of each subgroup and the target of 75 percent.

- At least 50 percent of the subgroups at Hugh Dingess Elementary School met the targets in mathematics and reading.
- Hugh Dingess Elementary School acquired 29.87 of the 60 points possible for proficiency.
- Hugh Dingess Elementary School did not have subgroups of at least 20 students; therefore, the achievement gaps closed score was not applicable.
- Hugh Dingess Elementary School acquired 8.44 of the 15 points possible for observed growth as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.
- Hugh Dingess Elementary School acquired 8 of 20 points possible for adequate growth as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.
- Hugh Dingess Elementary School acquired 4.91 points of the 5 possible points for attendance as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.

**HUGH DINGESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
Grade-Level Proficiency Data  
School Year 2013**

Grade-Level and Subgroup		Mathematics			Reading/Language Arts		
Grade	Group	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient
3	White	> 95%	61.11%	38.89%	> 95%	38.89%	61.11%
3	Special Education	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%
3	Total	> 95%	61.11%	38.89%	> 95%	38.89%	61.11%
4	White	> 95%	45.45%	54.55%	> 95%	54.55%	45.45%
4	Special Education	> 95%	80.00%	20.00%	> 95%	80.00%	20.00%
4	Total	> 95%	45.45%	54.55%	> 95%	54.55%	45.45%

**Attendance Rate = 98.20%**

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

**Mathematics.**

- All students demonstrated a participation rate of > 95 percent.
- Grade 4 students with a proficiency rate of 54.55 percent outperformed Grade 3 students (38.89 percent proficient).
- Grade 3 special education students with a proficiency rate of 50 percent outperformed Grade 4 special education students (20 percent proficient).

**Reading/Language Arts.**

- All students demonstrated a participation rate of > 95 percent.
- Grade 3 students with a proficiency rate of 61.11 outperformed Grade 4 students (45.45 percent).
- Grade 3 special education students with a proficiency rate of 50 percent outperformed Grade 4 special education students (20 percent proficient).

## HUGH DINGESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group

**\*Note:** Numbers below represent those students who have at least 1 prior consecutive WESTEST 2 score.

<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	3 ( 14%)	8 ( 38%)	10 ( 48%)	63.0	47.5%	8 ( 38%)	8 ( 38%)	5 ( 24%)	41.0	52.5%
	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%
White Sub-Group	School	3 ( 14%)	8 ( 38%)	10 ( 48%)	63.0	47.5%	8 ( 38%)	8 ( 38%)	5 ( 24%)	41.0	52.5%
	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	*	*	*	76.0	28.6%	*	*	*	34.0	28.6%
	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	*	*	*	52.0	51.5%	*	*	*	41.0	57.6%
	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	*	*	*	52.0	47.5%	*	*	*	23.0	52.5%
	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	*	*	*	63.0	(NA)	*	*	*	47.0	(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	*	*	*	49.0	38.9%	*	*	*	40.0	27.8%
	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	*	*	*	73.0	54.5%	*	*	*	90.0	72.7%
	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 chart, Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group, identifies the percent proficient in each subgroup as compared to the county and the State averages. In addition, subgroup growth is examined and determined to be low, typical, or high growth based on previous performance.

### **Mathematics.**

- The special education and the female subgroups demonstrated high growth in mathematics while all other subgroups demonstrated typical growth.
- 47.5 percent of all students were proficient in mathematics as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- 28.6 percent of the special education subgroup was proficient in mathematics compared to the non-special education subgroup (51.5 percent proficient), which indicated 22.9 percent achievement gap.
- The low-socioeconomic subgroup (47.5 percent proficient) mirrored the all subgroup in mathematics.
- 38.9 percent of the male subgroup was proficient in mathematics compared to the female subgroup (54.5 percent proficient), which indicated a gap of 15.6 percent achievement gap.

### **Reading/Language Arts.**

- The female subgroup demonstrated high growth in reading/language arts and the white, all, non-special education, non-low socioeconomic, and male subgroups demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts. The special education and low-socioeconomic subgroups demonstrated low growth.
- 52.5 percent of all students were proficient in reading/language arts as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- 28.6 percent of the special education subgroup was proficient in reading/language arts compared to the non-special education subgroup (57.6 percent proficient), which indicated a 29.0 percent achievement gap.
- The low socioeconomic subgroup (52.5 percent proficient) mirrored the all subgroup in reading/language arts.
- 27.8 percent of the male subgroup was proficient compared to the female subgroup (72.7 percent proficient), which indicated a 44.9 percent achievement gap.

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

Analysis of the data indicated that Hugh Dingess Elementary demonstrated typical growth in a majority of the subgroups. The special education and the female subgroups in mathematics and reading/language arts demonstrated high growth. The special education subgroup and the low socioeconomic subgroup in reading/language arts demonstrated low growth. Overall, Hugh Dingess Elementary School scored above the county and State in a majority of the subgroups. Some of these subgroups were significantly above that of the county and State. The male subgroup was the only subgroup that scored below the county and/or State in mathematics and reading/language arts.

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

1. Leader in Me.
2. Designing the Classroom for Learning.
3. Math and Science Arts and Bots.
4. Assessment and Grading/Achievement Report.
5. BURST Reading.
6. Title I Orientation.
7. Dibels Next.
8. Phonemic Awareness.
9. Children's Innovation.
10. Ethics of Excellent Implementation.
11. FOSS Science Kits/Project Approach Outdoor Classroom Planning.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

### COMMENDATIONS

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

- 7.1.3. Learning environment.** It was evident that all staff provided an excellent learning environment for students. Given the age of the school, it was extremely clean and well-maintained and conducive to the learning process. The principal had secured funds to install a full, hands-on science laboratory for the elementary school students.
- 7.8.1. Leadership.** The principal demonstrated a wealth of knowledge regarding student achievement levels. He had used this information to develop a direction and vision for the school and had prioritized efforts for continuous school improvement. The principal had a professional development plan for the staff and used walkthrough forms to focus staff on the foundational shifts in curriculum and management, objectives, teaching, engagement, and the learning process.

## 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)**

During the day of the Education Performance Audit, a majority of the instruction observed was teacher directed. Students were on task; however, teachers directed the instruction and students were not given the opportunity to work on their own in most cases.

**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)**

Title I teachers in a co-teaching delivery model were not directly interacting with students and providing instruction. These teachers served more as an aide by handing out papers and generally monitoring students while the general education teachers conducted the class. It is imperative that all teachers take an active role in educating students and delivering the curriculum.

#### 7.2. STUDENT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

**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)**

While teachers had a great deal of student data at their disposal, during the interview process it was difficult for teachers to state how they were using the data to drive curriculum. Teachers could speak somewhat vaguely about how they used the standardized and informal test results; however, the Team could not verify that they applied the data to assist students. The principal was articulate about data presented to the teachers and discussed the needs of the school and classes.

## 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 5 different teachers.

1. Two teachers did not hold certification for the subject(s) in which they provided instruction. One teacher did not hold endorsement in elementary education. Another teacher did not hold the appropriate endorsement/programmatic levels.
2. Five teachers were not highly qualified. Four of the five teachers were on a long term substitute permit while one was on a short term substitute permit. One teacher did not hold the necessary endorsement for science or social studies, and three teachers were on permit (special education, science, and Spanish).

## 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 Hugh Dingess Elementary 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.**

One obstacle the principal faced was five of eight teachers were either short term or long term substitutes. A lack of certified, highly qualified teachers applied for the teaching positions. While the substitute teachers showed a genuine concern for the students' well-being, it was evident that instructional strategies, high quality student engagement, and effective use of student data were impacted by the high number of substitute teachers.

Student achievement scores in the individual subgroups exceeded Logan County's elementary schools and the State in most cases. Students and staff demonstrated a general feeling of safety and security, which the Team believed positively affected student achievement. The Team urged the principal to continue to ensure that all teachers have high expectations for all students and that student data guides all curricular decisions.

## **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 Hugh Dingess Elementary School in achieving capacity, the following resources are recommended.

**18.1. Capacity building is a process for targeting resources strategically to improve the teaching and learning process. School and county electronic strategic improvement plan development is intended, in part, to provide mechanisms to target resources strategically to the teaching and learning process to improve student, school, and school system performance.**

### **Building Capacity - Transition School**

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

Student achievement at Hugh Dingess Elementary School was higher than Logan County and the State in elementary education. The principal was knowledgeable of the school's and students' needs and was working with the high number of substitute teachers in the building.

The principal had implemented high quality professional development sessions for teachers and was active in curriculum leadership. The high number of substitute teachers affected the capacity of the school to improve student and school performance. Student engagement and classroom curriculum were noted previously in this report and may be linked to a lack of highly qualified teachers. The principal must continue to monitor implementation of high quality professional development and aid teachers in disaggregating student data and utilizing teaching methods that will increase student achievement. It was not evident that the school's professional learning communities (PLCs) were as effective as they could be. The principal must ensure that the PLCs are fully utilized to increase student engagement and 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 school site was not five usable acres, was not easily accessible, and not large enough for future expansion. The location was not removed from hazards and undesirable noise and traffic. The topography is not varied enough to provide a desirable appearance but without steep inclines. The site was not stable, well-drained, free of erosion, and in avoidance of floods. The site was not suitable for special instructional needs, such as outdoor learning. The sidewalks were not adequate with designated crosswalks, curb cuts, and correct slope. Sufficient on-site, solid surface parking for staff, visitors, and individuals with disabilities was not provided. The playground/recreational areas were not well equipped and appropriate for the age level. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)

**19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** There was not capacity for on-line research, electronic card catalogs, automated circulation capacity, on-line

periodical indexes, copying equipment, or other materials that are adequate for general reading and reference. Space for technology, including computer laboratories, was not provided and utilized. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)

**19.1.14. Food service.** The food service area was not convenient for deliveries and removal of wastes. (Did not adversely impact program and student performance.)

**19.1.15. Health service units.** A health services unit of adequate size was not provided. There were no curtained or small rooms with cots, bulletin boards, toilet, lavatory, scales, medicine chest, refrigerator with locked storage, first aid kit, work counter, desk and chair, or locked medication box. (May adversely impact student health and safety.)

## 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.**

While the growth model showed typical to high growth in a majority of the subgroups, Hugh Dingess Elementary School missed their index target by almost 10.5 percent. The principal and teachers must ensure that all students are given a high quality, educationally stimulating curriculum in which all students are actively engaged in the learning process. It is vital that the classroom teachers, special educators, and Title I personnel work closely to achieve this task. The school's professional learning communities (PLCs) must be properly utilized and all classrooms must be monitored, given the high number of substitute teachers in the building. The Logan County Central Office, RESA 2, the West Virginia Center for Professional Development, and the West Virginia Department of Education must be utilized to aid the principal in determining the professional development sessions that would be of benefit to the school.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

Hugh Dingess Elementary School's Education Performance Audit examined performance and progress standards related to student and school performance. The Team also conducted a resource evaluation to assess the resource needs of the school. The Team submits this initial report to guide Hugh Dingess Elementary School in improvement efforts.

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

- 7.1.2. High expectations.
- 7.1.5. Instructional strategies.
- 7.2.4. Data analysis.
- 7.6.2. Licensure.

The Team identified two commendations.

- 7.1.3. Learning Environment
- 7.8.1. Leadership

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

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

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

Based upon the results of the Education Performance Audit, the Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education direct Hugh Dingess Elementary 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.