



**INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**CHAPMANVILLE REGIONAL HIGH 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
High Quality Standards .....	14
Indicators Of Efficiency .....	23
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	24
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	25
Early Detection And Intervention .....	26
Education Performance Audit Summary .....	27

## INTRODUCTION

An unannounced Education Performance Audit of Chapmanville Regional High 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 31 teachers, 2 counselors, 60 students, and 3 school system administrators, observed 30 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

## TEAM MEMBERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>County</b>
Susan Barrett	School Improvement Coordinator	Nicholas County
Athanasia Butcher	Principal, Gilmer County High School	Gilmer County
David Cottrell	Principal, Clay-Battelle High School	Monongalia County
William Hosaflook	Principal, Ripley High School	Jackson County
John Putnam	Director of Personnel	Roane County Schools Roane County
Karen Ruddle	Coordinator, Office of Special Programs Retired	West Virginia Department of Education

## 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

### 501 CHAPMANVILLE REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL – PRIORITY

Kathryn Moore, Principal  
Grades 09-12, Enrollment 721

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 Chapmanville Regional High School a Priority School. The school is among the lowest performing in the state based on the number of students at or above mastery on the WESTEST2. West Virginia identified a number of priority schools in 2013, those falling among the bottom 5 percent of Title I school performance, proficiency rates for the prior three years with a greater emphasis on 2011-2012 assessment data. Priority schools are those with the lowest performance on the state's general and alternate assessments.

Priority schools, due to their significant need, will not be eligible to exit Priority status until the end of the third year. A school must meet the following criteria to exit Priority status.

1. The school is no longer among the bottom 5 percent of Title I school performance.
2. The school demonstrates successful implementation of school turnaround strategies.
3. The school must demonstrate for the two most recent years that students in the all subgroup are meeting the Annual Measureable Objectives (AMO) or students in the all subgroup are demonstrating adequate growth in the distance between observed growth and target growth.

**Designation Status for Chapmanville Regional High School.**

Designation:	PRIORITY	Next Year's Target:	50.0284
Index Score:	50.8311	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	46.4121	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	YES		

**Supporting Data**

Proficiency (35% of the index score)	7.05
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	16.03
Observed Growth (5% of the index score)	1.46
Adequate Growth (10% of the index score)	.50
<u>Graduation Rate (30% of the index score)</u>	<u>25.79</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	50.83

The West Virginia Accountability Index targets were set for each school to reach progressively higher performance on a defined set of data. Schools earned 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.

Chapmanville Regional High School, with an index score of 50.83, exceeded the index target of 46.41 set for the 2012-2013 school year. This score also exceeded the index target (50.03) set for next year. Given the components that comprise the Accountability Index, Chapmanville Regional High School received the highest number of points in the areas of Achievement Gaps Closed (16.03 out of 20) and Graduation Rate (25.79 out of 30). The school received the fewest number of points in the areas of Adequate Growth (0.50 out of 10); Observed Growth (1.46 out of 5); and Proficiency (7.05 out of 35). Considering the proficiency target of 75 percent proficient by 2020 and overall index target of 71.7260 by 2020, it is imperative Chapmanville Regional High School increase points earned in the latter three components.

The West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Assessment, created line graphs depicting the annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for mathematics and reading/language arts, 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 provided by the West Virginia Department of Education (<http://wvde.state.wv.us/esea/performance/>) and illustrate a school's observed proficiency rate versus the projected proficiency rate needed for the school to achieve 75 percent proficiency by the year 2020. Charts for Chapmanville Regional High School

showed a slightly larger gap between observed proficiency and projected proficiency for reading/language arts compared to mathematics for the all subgroup and the white subgroup. In reading, the all subgroup (36.20 percent) missed the projected proficiency rate (40.06 percent) by 3.86 percent, and the white subgroup (36.02 percent) fell short of the projected proficiency (40.46 percent) by 4.44 percent. In mathematics, the all subgroup (34.57 percent) exceeded the projected target (32.10 percent) by 2.47 percent, and the white subgroup (34.38) exceeded the projected target (32.40 percent) by 1.98 percent.

Each year the projected proficiency score increases for the subgroup to achieve 75 percent proficiency by the year 2020. Given the observed proficiency scores for school year 2012-2013 and the projected proficiency rates for the next year, each of the above-referenced subgroups must increase performance by the following percentages to achieve the trajectory target for mathematics: All – 3.66 percent and white – 4.11 percent. Similarly, these subgroups must increase performance by greater margins to meet the projected proficiency rates for 2013-2014 in reading/language arts: All – 8.85 percent and white – 9.37 percent.

**CHAPMANVILLE REGIONAL 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%	65.62%	34.38%	> 95%	63.98%	36.02%
11	Hispanic	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
11	Asian	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%
11	Special Education	92.31%	> 95%	< 5%	92.31%	> 95%	< 5%
11	Total	> 95%	65.43%	34.57%	> 95%	63.80%	36.20%

**Graduation Rate = 85.97%**

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 participation rate, except for the special education subgroup. Achievement performance varied among subgroups.

**Mathematics.** The Asian subgroup (>95 percent proficient) had the highest proficiency rate in mathematics, followed by the white subgroup (34.38 percent proficient). Less than five percent of the Hispanic and special education subgroups were proficient. The proficiency rate for all students was 34.57 percent.

**Reading/Language Arts.** With regard to reading/language arts, the Asian subgroup (>95 percent proficient) had the highest proficiency rate, followed by the white subgroup (36.02 percent proficient). Once more, less than five percent of the Hispanic and special education subgroups were proficient. The proficiency rate for all students was 36.20 percent.

**CHAPMANVILLE REGIONAL 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.*

**Low** between 1-34th percentile  
**Typical** between 35th-65th percentile  
**High** between 66th-99th percentile

Subgroup		Mathematics 2013					Reading/Language Arts 2013				
		Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient	Low	Typical	High	Median Percentile	Percent Proficient
All Sub-Group	School	216 (45%)	144 (30%)	123 (25%)	40.0	26.4%	221 (46%)	147 (30%)	116 (24%)	37.0	36.1%
	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	214 (45%)	143 (30%)	122 (25%)	40.0	26.1%	219 (46%)	147 (31%)	114 (24%)	37.0	35.9%
	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	12 (34%)	17 (49%)	6 (17%)	44.0	0.0%	12 (34%)	12 (34%)	11 (31%)	43.0	0.0%
	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	204 (46%)	127 (28%)	117 (26%)	39.0	28.6%	209 (47%)	135 (30%)	105 (23%)	36.0	39.1%
	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	66 (46%)	38 (26%)	40 (28%)	40.0	26.4%	68 (47%)	33 (23%)	43 (30%)	37.0	36.1%
	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	150 (44%)	106 (31%)	83 (24%)	39.0	(NA)	153 (45%)	114 (34%)	73 (21%)	37.0	(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	106 (43%)	74 (30%)	68 (27%)	42.0	27.0%	118 (47%)	68 (27%)	63 (25%)	36.0	27.6%
	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	110 (47%)	70 (30%)	55 (23%)	38.0	25.8%	103 (44%)	79 (34%)	53 (23%)	40.0	45.5%
	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 (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; however, all subgroups' proficiency rates were less than 30 percent. The percent proficient for all students in mathematics in Grades 9 through 11 was 26.4 percent. The non-special education subgroup (28.6 percent proficient) had the highest proficiency rate, while the special education subgroup (0.0 percent proficient) had the lowest rate. The male subgroup (27.0 percent proficient) slightly exceeded the female subgroup (25.8 percent proficient), while the white subgroup (26.1 percent proficient) was just slightly less than the all and low socioeconomic subgroups (26.4 percent proficient).

**Reading/Language Arts.** All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts. The percent proficient for all students in reading/language arts in Grades 9 through 11 was 36.1 percent. Similar to the results in mathematics, the largest difference in proficiency in reading/language arts occurred between the non-special education subgroup (39.1 percent proficient) and the special education subgroup (0.0 percent proficient), creating a gap of 39.1 percent. Another significant gap in proficiency (17.9 percent) existed between the female subgroup (45.5 percent proficient) and the male subgroup (27.6 percent proficient).

### **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 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.

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 Logan County	15.6	15.1	15.1
<b>English Chapmanville Regional High</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>15.6</b>
Mathematics WV	16.2	16.4	16.4
Mathematics Logan County	15.6	15.3	15.0
<b>Mathematics Chapmanville Regional High</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>14.9</b>
Reading WV	16.1	16.1	16.4
Reading Logan County	15.6	15.4	15.3
<b>Reading Chapmanville Regional High</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>15.6</b>
Science WV	17.3	17.3	17.4
Science Logan County	16.8	16.5	16.5
<b>Science Chapmanville Regional High</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>16.5</b>
Composite WV	16.6	16.6	16.7
Composite Logan County	16.1	15.7	15.6
<b>Composite Chapmanville Regional High</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>15.8</b>

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

Above is a summary of ACT PLAN® trend data over the last three years. Scores for the 2012-2013 school year revealed slight increases in English and reading (.20 points), a marginal decrease in science (.20 points), and a slightly larger decrease in mathematics (.40 points) compared to the previous school year. Students at Chapmanville Regional High School scored higher than their peers in the county in English and reading by 0.50 points and 0.30 points, respectively; they matched the county score in science (16.5) and were 0.10 points below the county mathematics score (15.0). All scores, except English, were lower than the national benchmarks for all three years.

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

Analysis of the data for Chapmanville Regional High School revealed students demonstrated higher proficiency rates in reading/language arts compared to mathematics in all subgroups. The data also indicated greater support is needed for the special education subgroup and the male subgroup in mathematics and 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. Chapmanville Regional High School Policies and Procedures.
2. Chapmanville Regional High School Test Data Analysis.
3. Chapmanville Regional High School Teacher Evaluations.
4. Chapmanville Regional High School ACT PLAN Instructional Support and Enhancement (ISE) Training.
5. Chapmanville Regional High School Leadership Team – Seven Standards for Highly Effective Schools.
6. Classroom Instruction That Works for Chapmanville Regional High School.
7. Chapmanville Regional High School Technology Integration Training.
8. Chapmanville Regional High School Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) and Online Writing Training.
9. Chapmanville Regional High School Technology Training with Mark Moore.
10. Chapmanville Regional High School WESTEST2 Examiner Training.

<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
Chapmanville Regional High	7	0	2

The school currently offered seven Advanced Placement courses: AP® Calculus AB; AP® Calculus BC; AP® English Language; AP® English Literature; AP® European History; AP® Psychology; and AP® US History. 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 Placement course in science. Three of the current classes (AP® Calculus AB; AP® Calculus BC; and AP® European History) were offered through Virtual School.

Two course offerings provided college credit: College English 101 and College English 102.

No honors courses were offered.

<b>ADVANCED PLACEMENT TEST (APT) (COLLEGE BOARD)</b>				
Chapmanville Regional High	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	6.0%	6.1%	12.8%	14.7%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	41.2%	46.4%	30.3%	27.6%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%)	11.1%	10.0%	9.4%	9.6%
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	0.0%	3.8%	3.8%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	9.5%	8.0%	7.1%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	17.6%	0.0%	17.6%

\*NA – Not Available.

During the 2012-2013 school year, 85 students at Chapmanville Regional High School completed examinations for Advanced Placement® classes. These students were comprised of 26 sophomores, 42 juniors, and 17 seniors. As indicated in the chart above, the percentage of Grade 10 students (14.7 percent) completing the tests increased 1.9 percent from the previous year; however, the percentage of students scoring a 3 or higher on the examinations (3.8 percent) has remained the same the last two years. The percentage of Grade 11 students completing exams decreased 2.7 percent from the previous year, and the percentage of these students scoring a 3 or higher also declined 0.9 percent. The percentage of Grade 12 students completing exams and scoring a 3 or higher increased from the 2011-2012 school year by the following margins: 0.2 percent and 17.6 percent, respectively. As this data illustrates, it is essential the principal and staff at Chapmanville Regional High School continue to investigate methods to increase the number of students taking the Advanced

Placement® test (APT) and also increase the number of students scoring 3 or higher across all grade levels.

<b>AP TESTS TAKEN</b>	
Chapmanville Regional High School	2012-13
Total # of tests taken	113
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	1
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	3
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	3

Source: Reported by school.

During the 2012-2013 school year, 85 students at Chapmanville Regional High School completed 113 exams for AP® courses. This was approximately 11.8 percent of the students enrolled in the school as identified through the 2<sup>nd</sup> month enrollment report for 2012. Of the 113 tests taken, seven (8.2 percent) received a score of 3 or higher. Based upon these results, it is imperative administrators and teachers of Advanced Placement® courses utilize the AP Instructional Planning Report to target areas of student deficiency in preparing instructional delivery.

<b>Chapmanville Regional High</b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
2010-2011	83.24%
2011-2012	86.01%
2012-2013	84.38%

Source: Data collected from NCLB Private Data Site

Chapmanville Regional High School obtained 25.79 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 1.55 points higher than the average points awarded for graduation rate by a high school (24.24). As depicted in the chart above, the school's most recent graduation rate (84.38 percent), as calculated using the four-year cohort data, was 1.63 percent lower than the graduation rate for the previous year. The school's graduation rate was 5.06 percent higher 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%
Logan County	388	59.8%
Chapmanville Regional High	141	59.6%

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 Chapmanville Regional High School (59.6 percent) was 3.2 percent above the State rate (56.4 percent), while it was slightly below the county rate (59.8 percent). Eighty-four of the 141 Chapmanville Regional High School graduates attended college in fall 2012. The Chapmanville Regional High School staff and Logan 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%
Logan County	190	65	34.21%	90	47.37%
Chapmanville Regional High	79	22	27.80%	34	43.00%

Source: Data collected from NCLB Private Data Site at <http://wvde.state.wv.us/>

High School Graduates Enrolled in Developmental Courses Fall of 2012 showed 79 graduates of Chapmanville Regional High School entered college as first-time freshmen. The percentage of students enrolled in a developmental English course (27.80 percent) was lower than the county (34.21 percent), but higher than the State (17.40 percent). More students (34) enrolled in a developmental mathematics course (43.00 percent); again, this percentage was lower than the county (47.37 percent) but higher than the State average (28.83 percent). Given the numbers of first-time freshmen enrolling in developmental courses, it is imperative the administration and staff at Chapmanville Regional High School examine and improve upon instructional rigor to prepare students for success in postsecondary education.

## 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)**

The Team concluded that low expectations for student achievement existed within Chapmanville Regional High School. The following observations exemplified the presence of low expectations in general education classrooms:

- In one math classroom, the teacher reported that constructions were not done with some classes because some “could not be trusted with sharp compasses”. Additionally, this teacher did not appear comfortable with using the graphing calculator and asked a student to demonstrate using the ELMO. When students asked questions, the teacher took the students’ pencils and wrote the work on the students’ paper for them.
- Students were not challenged in at least two science classrooms. In one science class, students were defining 33 vocabulary words using their textbooks and were told 30 out of 33 of the words would be on an upcoming test. The teacher indicated, “Not much going on today.” The teacher lectured on a variety of topics, none of which matched the daily lesson plan. In another science class, the bellringer was a simple completion statement, “Waves transfer \_\_\_\_\_.” The teacher lectured while using a PowerPoint, and students copied notes from the PowerPoint.

The following observations in special education and collaborative classrooms demonstrated low expectations for students:

- In one classroom where a substitute was present, no lesson plans could be found. Although the substitute had been instructed to collect an assignment, 10 students were sitting and socializing with one another, not working on any type of assignment; one student was reading silently.
- In a collaborative classroom, a substitute and special educator were both in the classroom monitoring students. They indicated students had a math worksheet to complete and turn in at the end of class; however, neither teacher assisted students during the observation period, nor were students observed working on the assignment. They were talking in small groups.
- Approximately 80 percent of the instruction was teacher led in each of the seven content area classrooms observed. Collaborative settings defined roles solely as one teach and one support. Rote memory and basic knowledge level queries

dominated teacher-generated discussions. Co-teaching practices/strategies were viewed by at least one general educator as having “an aide in my classroom”.

Additionally, the lack of meaningful instruction occurring during the advisory period provided for students reinforced the culture of low expectations. In one class 12 students were present with no materials and were socializing with one another. Through administrative and teacher interviews, the Team determined the structure of the advisory period was left primarily to teacher discretion and implemented inconsistently across the school.

Based upon teacher and student interviews, the Team concluded the staff lacked a sense of urgency to accelerate learning for all students, including students with individual education programs (IEPs), given the statewide assessment results. Teachers stated, “Kids don’t try on the test; they just fill in the dots.” Students reported athletic coaches push them more to do their best than classroom teachers; they also stated teachers and administrators encourage them to do their best by providing bonus points and positive words of encouragement, but not by challenging them through rigorous coursework. Furthermore, the Team determined there was no student ownership of assessment results, and these results were not being utilized by students to improve their achievement. As reported to the Team, students were called into a general assembly, taught how to interpret WESTEST2 scores, and then provided a copy of their scores in a sealed envelope to take home.

Minutes from the leadership team meeting held on January 31, 2014, stated the following: “The Growth Model says we need to bring ELA scores up 9 points. Writing Assessment is 40 percent of that score.” The minutes went on to identify strategies such as focusing on writing during LINKS and providing teachers with a copy of the writing scoring rubric. The minutes also referenced the development of a “cheat sheet” to provide tips to help students score higher on the test. “Because the writing is graded by a computer, it can be gamed. It cares little about content and more about things that a computer can recognize.” The Team determined this demonstrated a lack of expectations for teaching students actual writing skills.

### **7.1.3. Learning environment. School staff provides a safe and nurturing environment that is conducive to learning. (Policy 2510)**

The Team observed that the overall cleanliness of the building was poor, particularly given that the building was approximately seven to eight years old. Floors and walls in hallways were marked and scuffed. Dust and dirt could be seen in corners. The stairwells were extremely dirty, with multiple black splotches visible on every step and numerous black scuff marks on each landing. Paint was scraped from hand railings, and writing was visible on walls.

Classroom management was poor in one class with one student roaming around the classroom creating a disturbance. The teacher responded by telling the student, “If you are going to act like an idiot, we will treat you like one.” During the same observation

period in the same class, a student walked into the classroom from the hallway and began conversing with other students and the teacher, disrupting the learning environment.

**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 majority of classroom instruction observed by Team members was comprised of teacher-led instruction. In particular, instruction in math classrooms was teacher directed; research-based, high-yield strategies that would increase student engagement, such as cooperative learning, higher order questioning, critical thinking skills activities, or formative assessment, were not observed. Teacher-led instruction was also a large part of science classes that were observed. Team observations were supported by instructional practices inventory (IPI) data collected on three separate dates (December 11, 2013; February 11, 2014; and April 8, 2014), which indicated that teacher-led instruction in core areas was 33.33 percent, 40.86 percent, and 53.70 percent, respectively.

In one social studies classroom, the bellringer activity involved 29 minutes of the available 46 minutes of class time, followed by a worksheet for students to complete. In five of seven special education and collaborative classes observed, students were not provided opportunities for collaboration, and co-teaching teams lacked a structure for common planning.

When asked what one thing teachers could do to help them learn more, students stated, "Go more in depth" with material. Students also reported that many times the projects assigned by teachers were the same ones they had completed in middle school.

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

Teachers reported staff development had been provided in writing across the curriculum; however, math and physical education teachers reported not implementing writing. Many teachers (math, art, science, and social studies) were unaware of student deficiencies on the WESTEST2 Online Writing Assessment and reported never having seen the results of the assessment. Due to inconsistent reports from teachers regarding the implementation of writing and inconsistencies in observing writing assignments in teachers' lesson plans, the Team determined there was no schoolwide plan for addressing the deficient analytic traits from the Online Writing Assessment. Only teachers of English language arts were able to articulate deficiencies and how those were being targeted through classroom instruction. A Usage Summary report produced from the WV Writes writing program indicated five teachers were utilizing the program, and all five of those teachers were teachers of English language arts.

**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)**

Students reported never using the library but did state they use the computer laboratory located within the library on a monthly basis. They indicated the school did not have a lot of technology. Students were observed using technology in one class to conduct research. No means were available to verify student usage of technology (i.e., logs, calendars, etc.); however, students reported minimal use, citing some use of mobile labs in classrooms. The majority of students interviewed by the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Instructional Technology, representative could not articulate how they use technology in their classes. The English language arts teachers were the staff members predominantly utilizing the library.

Teachers reported they need more professional development in the area of technology and when asked if a technology integration specialist (TIS) or technology system specialist (TSS) was available in the building, they indicated they “were not sure anyone has that title”. At least two teachers were mentioned as having been trained as technology integration specialists. However, the Team could not verify the process in place to provide either technology integration support or technology system support to teachers.

**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)**

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.” While Chapmanville Regional High School currently offered seven Advanced Placement® courses (AP® Calculus AB; AP® Calculus BC; AP® English Language; AP® English Literature; AP® European History; AP® Psychology; and AP® US History), the school did not offer an Advanced Placement course in science.

## **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 the school's strategic plan was updated or revised yearly and stated, "It's posted on our wall." Teachers could relate members of the leadership team worked on the plan and sought teacher input through the professional learning communities (PLCs); however, inconsistent knowledge as to the plan's contents existed among teachers. Some could state the mission and goals of the plan; however, most could not.

Additionally, five book studies were noted in the school's strategic plan as professional development being provided to meet the established goals of increasing student achievement in math and reading/language arts. Overall, teachers were unable to speak to participation in book studies; one teacher mentioned an employee from RESA 2 conducting a book study with the math department. The principal also mentioned two books would be utilized during a summer professional development session.

**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 reported receiving administrative feedback such as "be neater" or "good job", along with the respective administrator's initials and the date. In eight sets of lesson plans reviewed, Team members found an administrator's initials and the date but no constructive feedback relative to improving instruction. At least one set of these plans was written on notebook paper, disorganized, and not up to date. The Team also reported inconsistencies in the number of times plans had been reviewed by administrators.

At least two teachers reported they had no lesson plans, with one stating s/he did not know where they were because "they've changed at least three times" and another saying the plans had been left at home. A teacher of an Advanced Placement® course reported the class syllabus was used in lieu of lesson plans at the recommendation of the College Board; no administrative review was found.

## 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 27 different teachers. The following issues were identified:

One teacher was listed in the master schedule as teaching a course for which the code could not be found in the WVEIS Course Code Manual. The same teacher also did not hold the appropriate certification for two courses assigned to her in the master schedule.

Five entries in the master schedule contained incomplete information.

One teacher did not hold the appropriate content endorsement for a course assigned to her in the master schedule and also did not hold the appropriate content endorsement for math.

A course code assigned to one special education teacher did not have any special education code in the sixth position.

Four teachers of Advanced Placement (AP) courses needed to verify AP training had been completed and that the course being taught had been approved on the school's audit.

One teacher did not hold an endorsement for grades 10-12, and there were courses assigned to her in the master schedule in which students in these grades were enrolled.

One teacher needed to provide a copy of his valid West Virginia driver's license and a copy of his Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) driving record according to Policy 2422.2.

Two teachers did not hold the appropriate content endorsement for a course assigned to them in the master schedule.

Seven teachers did not have a content exam electronically on file at the West Virginia Department of Education.

One teacher was on permit.

Ten teachers were on permit and not highly qualified.

**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)**

Based upon review of various elements of the online educator evaluation system (i.e., teacher self-reflection and student learning goals), the Team determined the administration and staff needed additional staff development in understanding the components of the system and their role in the school improvement process. A review of five student learning goals from mathematics and reading/language arts revealed these were not written in measurable terms and were based on WESTEST2 data from the previous year, not individual students' results.

Policy 5310, Section 9.3.a. states, "Evidence must be noted in the system for a distinguished rating on either/both the self-reflection and/or the evaluation." At least one educator's self-reflection showed a rating of distinguished for every standard and no evidence was provided. Administrators seemed unaware of the evidence requirement, and the Team could not verify that evidence was to be requested for the summative evaluation.

On 14 elements, Standards 1 through 5, of the self-reflection, the overwhelming majority of staff rated themselves as emerging. In particular, for Element 2.2, *The teacher establishes and maintains a safe and appropriate learning environment*, Standard 2, 59.5 percent of the teachers rated themselves as emerging. For Element 5.3, *The teacher promotes practices and policies that improve school environment and student learning*, Standard 5, 71.4 percent of the teachers rated themselves as emerging. Administration reported being unaware of the self-reflection results and did not understand that reports generated by the online educator evaluation system could be utilized for the purposes of professional development and overall school improvement goals. Based upon this information, the Team was concerned self-reflections had not been reviewed by administrators.

## **7.7. SAFE, DRUG FREE, VIOLENCE FREE, AND DISCIPLINED SCHOOLS.**

**7.7.1. School rules, procedures, and expectations. School rules, procedures, and expectations are written; clearly communicated to students, parents, and staff; and enforced. (Policy 2510; Policy 4373)**

In one science classroom, a young child of approximately 4 – 5 years of age was present during a lab demonstration regarding pressure, which involved heating an aluminum can filled with water on a hot plate. The child was playing near the lab station without any protective gear. The Team determined this constituted a safety issue.

**7.7.2. Policy implementation. The county and schools implement: a policy governing disciplinary procedures; a policy for grading consistent with student confidentiality; policies governing student due process rights and nondiscrimination; the Student Code of Conduct policy; the Racial, Sexual, Religious/Ethnic Harassment, and Violence policy; an approved policy on tobacco use; an approved policy on substance abuse; and an approved policy on AIDS Education. (W.Va. Code §18A-5-1 and §18-8-8; Policy 2421; Policy 2422.4; Policy 2422.5; Policy 4373; Policy 2515)**

Team members smelled the strong odor of cigarette smoke in rest rooms and hallways. Students were observed arriving late to classes smelling strongly of cigarette smoke. Teachers also complained about tobacco smoke in the school and reported that tobacco use is the school's worst problem. Some rest rooms had been closed due to smoking and were inaccessible by students as a form of discipline. It was unclear to the Team what actions the school was taking to monitor rest rooms and identify and discipline students in violation of the tobacco policy.

## **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)**

During the Education Performance Audit, the Team observed inconsistencies in the enforcement of discipline (wearing hats and cell phones usage). By 10:00 A.M., at least 22 students were observed in hallways during class time. Several of these students were seen using cell phones and being disruptive. The Team determined this demonstrated ineffective management of the instructional environment by administration.

The Team was concerned by the principal's lack of awareness of the multiple facets of the online educator evaluation system and the role the system could play in planning professional development and/or support for individual teachers. While observations of teachers were divided among the four administrators based upon the content area background for each administrator, there appeared to be no method for identifying and supporting struggling teachers. This was particularly evident with the review of lesson plans, as Team members confirmed very little if any instructional feedback had been provided to teachers. While the Team appreciated the support the school was receiving from the West Virginia Department of Education and external consultants, the Team determined it was vitally important the principal develop her role as instructional leader.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**7.2.4. Data analysis.** Agendas from professional learning communities and leadership team meetings indicated that the Chapmanville Regional High School staff were beginning the work of reviewing student data. The Team noted that this process had begun with reviewing WESTEST2 data and identifying deficiencies; however, the Team recommended the staff continue their work in expanding this process to include more current student-specific data, including classroom-based formative and summative assessments. These assessments could then be utilized to make instructional adjustments and plan goals, such as those required in the online educator evaluation system.

## 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 Chapmanville Regional High 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.**

Administrators reported the school had no written or electronic programs of study guides and that none was provided from the central office. As reported by the principal, the school relied on Policy 2510 for programs of study information, but the Team could not verify how the staff, students, and parents were informed of the policy requirements, or how school-based procedures for student retention and course placement were communicated to all stakeholders; therefore, the Team recommended the school develop a written plan for programs of studies, which could be communicated and utilized by all.

**8.1.3. Facilities. Schools are operated efficiently, economically, and without waste or duplication, and the number and location of schools efficiently serves the student population. (W. Va. Code §18-9D-15 and §18-9D-16 (d))**

During the education performance audit, teachers and students reported they did not use the distance learning laboratory located in the school. The Team ascertained the lab is primarily used for the presentation of senior projects at the end of the school year; the principal indicated the lab had been used last year by students to view a medical procedure. The Team determined the facility and its accompanying technology were not being used efficiently by the school and that the room could play an integral part in the education of students if utilized effectively.

## 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 Chapmanville Regional 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 – Priority School

For those schools identified as *Priority* schools, the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) will provide targeted support that promotes schoolwide efforts aligned to the Turnaround Principles and West Virginia's Standards for High Quality Schools which include the following.

1. Establishing a positive climate and cohesive culture.
2. Building capacity and supporting effective school leadership.
3. Aligning instruction with standards-focused curriculum and assessments.
4. Building infrastructure for student support services and family/community Connections.
5. Developing and maintaining educator growth and development.
6. Building the infrastructure to support efficient and effective management.
7. Building a culture of continuous improvement.

As reported by the principal, the school was receiving assistance from the central office, RESA 2, and the West Virginia Department of Education. The Team determined adequate support was available to build the instructional leadership capacity of the principal, develop administrative and teacher skills in analyzing data, and strengthen classroom instruction. The Team concluded that the methods utilized to deliver these supports needed to be provided consistently and monitored frequently for fidelity in implementation (i.e., leadership team meetings, professional learning communities, analysis of student work, development of common formative assessments, administrative walkthroughs/lesson plan review and feedback to teachers, online educator evaluation system).

Due to the school's low performance in both mathematics and reading/language arts, the Team recommended the school leadership team, with the support of pertinent central office personnel, develop an ongoing, embedded professional development plan to provide support to all teachers in strengthening instruction in these areas. Given the large gaps that exist between special education students and non-special education

students, the Team determined professional development for special educators and general educators participating in collaborative environments was vital to meeting these students' needs. The Team also suggested the school give more detailed study to the low performance of males in reading/language arts and investigate and implement practices to increase achievement for these students in this area.

## 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*)

**None identified.**

**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 site did not have 15 usable acres + 1 acre for each 100 students over 800. (Did not adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** The library did not have electronic card catalogs or automated circulation capacity. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The music facility did not have music stands, or recording devices, microphones, stereo sound system, piano, and instructional technology equipment. (Adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.** All science rooms did not have AC and DC current. (Adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.15. Health service units.** The Health service area did not have a refrigerator with locked storage. (Adversely impacted 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.

**None identified.**

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

Chapmanville Regional 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 Chapmanville Regional High School in improvement efforts.

The Team identified 13 high quality standards necessary to improve performance and progress.

7.1.2. High expectations.

7.1.3. Learning environment.

7.1.5. Instructional strategies.

7.1.6. Instruction in writing.

7.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.

7.1.9. Programs of study.

7.2.1. County and school electronic strategic improvement plans.

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.

7.6.2. Licensure.

7.6.3. Evaluation.

7.7.1. School rules, procedures, and expectations.

7.7.2. Policy implementation.

7.8.1. Leadership.

The Team presented one recommendation (7.2.4. Data analysis), noted two indicators of efficiency (8.1.1. Curriculum and 8.1.3. Facilities), and offered capacity building resources.

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 Chapmanville Regional High 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.