



**Office of Education
Performance Audits**

INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

MAN SENIOR 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	9
High Quality Standards	13
Indicators Of Efficiency	22
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	23
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	24
Early Detection And Intervention	26
Education Performance Audit Summary	27

INTRODUCTION

An unannounced Education Performance Audit of Man Senior High School in Logan County was conducted April 23, 2014. The review was conducted at the specific direction of the West Virginia Board of Education. The purpose of the review was two-fold. The primary purpose was to investigate the reason for performance and progress that are persistently below standard. Secondly, the purpose was to make recommendations to the school, school system, as appropriate, and West Virginia Board of Education on such matters as it considers necessary to improve performance and progress to meet the standard.

The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed the Five-Year Strategic Improvement Plan; interviewed 67 students (individually and in classrooms), 14 teachers, two administrators, and one counselor; observed 25 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

Name	Title	County
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

503 MAN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL – PRIORITY

Sandra Manning, Principal
Grades 09-12, Enrollment 416

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) indicates Man Senior 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 Man Senior High School.

Designation:	PRIORITY	Next Year's Target:	47.9261
Index Score:	46.3589	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	YES
Index Target:	43.9594	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	YES		

Supporting Data

Proficiency (35% of the index score)	6.08
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	15.42
Observed Growth (5% of the index score)	2.60
Adequate Growth (10% of the index score)	1.50
<u>Graduation Rate (30% of the index score)</u>	<u>20.76</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	46.36

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.

Man Senior High School, with an index score of 46.36, exceeded the index target of 43.96 set for the 2012-2013 school year. This score is slightly below the index target (47.93) set for next year. Given the components that comprise the Accountability Index, Man Senior High School received the highest number of points in the areas of Achievement Gaps Closed (15.42 out of 20); Observed Growth (2.60 out of 5); and Graduation Rate (20.76 out of 30). The school received the fewest number of points in the areas of Adequate Growth (1.50 out of 10) and Proficiency (6.08 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 Man Senior High School increase points earned in the areas of Adequate Growth and Proficiency.

The West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Assessment, created line graphs depicting the annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for math and reading, which can be accessed for each subgroup with a cell size of 20 or more students, through the year 2020. These graphs may be viewed on the My School's Performance webpage (<http://wvde.state.wv.us/esea/performance/>) provided by the West Virginia Department of Education 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 Man Senior High School showed a significant gap between observed proficiency and projected proficiency for math for the all subgroup and the white subgroup. The all subgroup (26.14 percent) missed the projected proficiency rate (39.81 percent) by 13.67 percent, and the white subgroup (26.83 percent) fell short of the projected proficiency (39.90 percent) by 13.07 percent. Results were mixed in the area of reading with the all subgroup's (38.64 percent) observed proficiency rate falling slightly below the projected proficiency rate (39.81 percent) by 1.17 percent. However, the white subgroup's observed proficiency rate (39.02 percent) exceeded the projected proficiency rate (38.88 percent) by 0.14 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 math: All – 18.7 percent and white – 18.08 percent. These subgroups must increase performance by smaller margins to meet the projected proficiency rates for 2013-2014 in reading: All – 6.20 percent and white – 5.02 percent.

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%	73.17%	26.83%	> 95%	60.98%	39.02%
11	Black	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%
11	Multiracial	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%
11	Special Education	> 95%	83.33%	16.67%	> 95%	83.33%	16.67%
11	Total	> 95%	73.86%	26.14%	> 95%	61.36%	38.64%

Graduation Rate = 69.20%

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. As the chart depicts, all subgroups exceeded the 95 percent participation rate. Achievement performance varied among subgroups.

Mathematics. The multiracial subgroup (33.33 percent proficient) scored the highest proficiency rate in mathematics, followed by the white subgroup (26.83 percent proficient) and special education subgroup (16.67 percent proficient). Less than five percent of the black subgroup was proficient. The proficiency rate for all students in mathematics was 26.14 percent proficient.

Reading/Language Arts. The white subgroup (39.02 percent proficient) achieved the highest proficiency rate in reading/language arts; the black and multiracial subgroups each had 33.33 percent proficient. The special education subgroup had the lowest proficiency rate with 16.67 percent proficient. The proficiency rate for all students in reading/language arts was 38.64 percent proficient.

**MAN SENIOR 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	88 (31%)	103 (36%)	93 (33%)	52.0	33.4%	90 (32%)	108 (38%)	85 (30%)	49.0	44.7%
	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	*	*	*	49.0	33.3%	*	*	*	50.0	33.3%
	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	84 (31%)	97 (36%)	91 (33%)	52.0	33.8%	88 (32%)	101 (37%)	82 (30%)	47.0	44.8%
	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 (44%)	8 (30%)	7 (26%)	37.0	5.9%	11 (41%)	7 (26%)	9 (33%)	54.0	5.9%
	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	76 (30%)	95 (37%)	86 (33%)	53.0	36.9%	79 (31%)	101 (39%)	76 (30%)	49.0	49.6%
	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	32 (34%)	32 (34%)	31 (33%)	49.0	33.4%	29 (31%)	35 (37%)	31 (33%)	54.0	44.7%
	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	56 (30%)	71 (38%)	62 (33%)	52.0	(NA)	61 (32%)	73 (39%)	54 (29%)	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	56 (35%)	59 (37%)	45 (28%)	48.0	29.6%	52 (33%)	58 (36%)	50 (31%)	49.0	35.5%
	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	32 (26%)	44 (35%)	48 (39%)	55.0	38.3%	38 (31%)	50 (41%)	35 (28%)	50.0	56.4%
	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 illustrated in the chart above, all subgroups demonstrated typical growth in mathematics. The percent proficient for all students in mathematics in Grades 9 through 11 was 33.4 percent. The female subgroup (38.3 percent) had the highest proficiency rate among all subgroups and exceeded the male subgroup (29.6 percent) by 8.7 percent. The largest difference in proficiency occurred between the special education subgroup (5.9 percent) and the non-special education subgroup (36.9 percent), creating a gap of 31.0 percent.

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 44.7 percent. Comparisons among subgroups yielded results similar to those for mathematics. The female subgroup (56.4 percent) had the highest proficiency rate among all subgroups and exceeded the male subgroup (35.5 percent) by 20.9 percent. The largest gap in proficiency existed between the special education subgroup (5.9 percent) and the non-special education subgroup (49.6 percent), creating a disparity of 43.7 percent.

ACT PLAN Assessment Results

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

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

ACT PLAN RESULTS			
Grade 10			
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
English WV	16.3	16.0	16.2
English Logan County	15.6	15.1	15.1
English Man Senior High	15.1	14.9	14.4
Mathematics WV	16.2	16.4	16.4
Mathematics Logan County	15.6	15.3	15.0
Mathematics Man Senior High	15.5	15.4	14.7
Reading WV	16.1	16.1	16.4
Reading Logan County	15.6	15.4	15.3
Reading Man Senior High	15.5	15.9	14.8
Science WV	17.3	17.3	17.4
Science Logan County	16.8	16.5	16.5
Science Man Senior High	16.7	16.8	16.2
Composite WV	16.6	16.6	16.7
Composite Logan County	16.1	15.7	15.6
Composite Man Senior High	15.9	15.8	15.2

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

Above is a summary of ACT PLAN® trend data over the last three years. Scores for the 2012-2013 school year revealed decreases in all subjects compared to the previous school year: English (0.5 points); Mathematics (0.7 points); Reading (1.1 points); and Science (0.6 points). In particular, English and math scores have fallen for two consecutive years. Students at Man Senior High School scored lower than their peers in the county in all tested areas by the following margins: English (0.7 points); Mathematics (0.3 points); Reading (0.5 points); and Science (0.3 points). Compared to the State averages, students at Man Senior High School again scored lower by the following margins: English (1.8 points); Mathematics (1.7 points); Reading (1.6 points); and Science (1.2 points). All scores, except English in 2010-2011, were lower than the national benchmarks for all three years.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY - ANALYSIS

Analysis of the data for Man Senior High School revealed students demonstrated higher proficiency rates in reading/language arts compared to mathematics in all subgroups, except the special education subgroup which achieved the same score (5.9 percent) in both areas. Student performance indicated greater support is needed for the special education and male subgroups 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. Learning, Individualized Needs, Knowledge and Skills (LINKS).
2. Priority Schools.
3. Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) Training Overview/Collection/Collaboration.
4. SmartBoard Training.
5. iPad Training.
6. Teacher Evaluation.
7. Confidentiality.
8. WV Writes.
9. WESTEST2.
10. Harassment/Bullying/Policy 2510 and 2340.
11. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).
12. SMART Goals/Essential Knowledge.
13. Support for Personalized Learning (SPL)/Support for Personalized Instruction (SPI).
14. Formative Assessments.
15. On Target – Credit Recovery.
16. West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS)/WVEIS on the Web (WOW).
17. Highly Qualified Teachers.
18. Science Instructional Strategies.
19. Lesson Plans – Carla Williamson.
20. Math I/Math II.
21. Student Motivation.
22. Co-Teaching.
23. Student Growth Model.
24. Informational Text.
25. One Step at a Time (Book Study).
26. PLCs – Stages.

27. Plan.
28. Learning by Doing (Book Study for Leadership Team).
29. Five-Year Strategic Plan.
30. Counselor Workshop.
31. Principal Leadership Academy.
32. ACT PLAN Training.
33. Data Analysis.

NUMBER OF ADVANCED PLACEMENT (AP®), HONORS, AND COLLEGE COURSES OFFERED 2013-2014			
High School	Number of AP® Courses	Number of Honors Courses	Number of College Credit Courses
Man Senior High	6	5	2

The school offered six Advanced Placement courses: AP® English Language and Composition; AP® English Literature and Composition; AP® US History; AP® Government and Politics; AP® Psychology; and AP® Calculus. 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.

Five honors courses were provided to students: Physical Science 9; Biology; English 9; Math II; and US History to 1900.

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

ADVANCED PLACEMENT TEST (APT) (COLLEGE BOARD)				
Man Senior High	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
10 th Grade Test Takers (%)	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	13.3%
11 th Grade Test Takers (%)	27.6%	30.9%	37.5%	38.5%
12 th Grade Test Takers (%)	13.5%	14.7%	21.8%	38.5%
10 th Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11 th Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	26.9%	10.2%	10.7%
12 th Grade Test Takers (%) with a score of 3 or higher	NA	23.0%	10.5%	12.5%

*NA – Not Available.

During the 2012-2013 school year, 56 students at Man Senior High School completed 75 examinations for Advanced Placement® classes. Fifteen examinations were completed by sophomores, 28 by juniors, and 32 by seniors. As indicated in the chart above, the percentage of Grade 10 students (13.3 percent) completing the tests increased slightly (0.3 percent) from the previous year, and the percentage of students scoring a 3 or higher on the examinations (0.0 percent) remained the same the last three years. The

percentage of Grade 11 students completing exams increased 1.0 percent from the previous year, and the percentage of these students scoring a 3 or higher also increased slightly (0.5 percent). The percentage of Grade 12 students completing exams and scoring a 3 or higher increased from the 2011-2012 school year—16.7 percent and 2.0 percent, respectively. As this data illustrates, it is essential the principal and staff at Man Senior 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, particularly in Grade 10.

AP TESTS TAKEN	
Man Senior High School	2012-13
Total # of tests taken	75
10 th Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	0
11 th Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	3
12 th Grade Test Takers (#) with a score of 3 or higher	6

During the 2012-2013 school year, 56 students at Man Senior High School completed 75 examinations for AP® courses. This was approximately 14.0 percent of the students enrolled in the school as identified through the 2nd month enrollment report for 2012. Of the 75 examinations, nine students (12.0 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.

Man Senior High	
Year	Graduation Rate
2010-2011	79.57%
2011-2012	69.31%
2012-2013	69.07%

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

Man Senior High School obtained 20.76 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 3.48 points lower than the average points awarded for graduation rate by a high school (24.24). As shown in the chart above, the school's graduation rate (69.07 percent), as calculated using the four-year cohort data, was 0.24 percent lower than the previous year and 10.5 percent lower than the rate in 2010-2011. The school's graduation rate was 10.25 percent lower than the State average (79.32 percent).

ESTIMATED COLLEGE GOING RATE FALL 2012		
	Number of High School Graduates 2011-2012	Overall College Going Rate Percentage
State	18,335	56.4%
Logan County	388	59.8%
Man Senior High	67	56.7%

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

As shown in the chart above, the college going rate for Man Senior High School (56.7 percent) was 0.3 percent higher than the State rate (56.4 percent), while it was 3.1 percent lower than the county rate (59.8 percent). Thirty-eight of the 67 Man Senior High School graduates attended college in fall 2012. The Man Senior 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.

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENROLLED IN DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES FALL 2012					
	1 st 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%
Man Senior High	30	12	40.00%	9	30.00%

High School Graduates Enrolled in Developmental Courses Fall 2012 showed 30 graduates of Man Senior High School entered college as first-time freshmen. The percentage of students enrolled in a developmental English course (40.00 percent) was 5.79 percent higher than the county (34.21 percent), and higher than the State (17.40 percent) by 22.6 percent. Fewer students (nine) enrolled in a developmental mathematics course (30.00 percent); again, this percentage was lower than the county (47.37 percent) by 17.37 percent, but slightly higher than the State (28.83 percent) by 1.17 percent. Given the numbers of first-time freshmen enrolling in developmental courses, it is imperative the administration and staff at Man Senior 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 Man Senior High School. The following observations exemplified the presence of low expectations.

In one advanced mathematics class, students worked problems at the board and the teacher told them if they were right or wrong; then students were assigned word problems involving writing expressions. The teacher told students to use a calculator, explaining, "Word problems are so difficult for you." The teacher remained seated at his/her desk, calling out questions. Questions were low level, such as "What is a sum? How many degrees in the angle of a rectangle? How many sides?" The same teacher was observed in another class sitting at his/her desk and having students come to the desk to ask questions. During class, the teacher was heard to say frequently, "This will be on your test." Instruction was led primarily from the teacher's desk in the back of the room.

In one classroom, no instruction was observed during the entire class period. Students were handed an assignment to finish; all problems were similar and repeated the same skill. The bellringer was the same as the problems students were assigned. The teacher circulated throughout the room, providing help if asked. There was no example worked at the board, no question and answer, no discussion, and no connection to why or how. The objective posted on the board did not match the instruction occurring in the classroom. The teacher repeatedly told students who were talking to "shut up" after papers were collected.

In two special education classes observed, each was teacher led and the teacher queried students with knowledge level questions and asked for opinions. Justification for opinions was lacking.

During the date of the Education Performance Audit, English language arts teachers were proctoring the WESTEST2 exam. One class had a sign posted asking students to report to the gymnasium. The Team member found students sitting in the gymnasium without an assignment, and the physical education teacher did not have any lesson plans for the class.

The majority of students reported discipline procedures were not consistent for the same infractions for all students, stating, “It depends on who you are” and “It depends on your name”.

With regard to schoolwide expectations for student achievement, the Team identified the following concerns. When asked how teachers prepared them for the WESTEST2, students consistently responded, “Worksheets.” It was also reported that students received monetary compensation for good performance on the WESTEST2. Additionally, as reported by the principal, students were not required to complete any type of comprehensive examination. The Team determined this established low expectations for students seeking postsecondary education opportunities.

The Team observed many displays of recognition for athletes within the building; however, very little recognition was provided for student academic success. The principal reported the leadership team had been discussing creating an academic hall of fame for alumni achievement.

Male rest rooms were not clean, lacked hand soap, and tissue paper was located on the floor rather than in a dispenser. The Team determined the environment was not one that encouraged students to be respectful of the space. Some rest rooms were inaccessible due to discipline issues; however, it was unclear to the Team what actions the school was taking to monitor bathrooms and identify and discipline students.

Throughout the day the Team heard from administration, counselors, and teachers about the lack of parent involvement in the school. When asked to rate parent involvement in the school, the principal reported involvement related to academics was a four on a scale of one to ten, while it was a nine in relation to athletics. Neither teachers nor administration described interactions with parents (focus meetings, surveys) that would provide information on how best to increase their involvement in their students’ academic lives, and the Team determined low expectations for parent involvement existed in the school.

7.1.5. Instructional strategies. Staff demonstrates the use of the various instructional strategies and techniques contained in Policies 2510 and 2520. (Policy 2510; Policy 2520)

The Team was specifically concerned about students who were in special education settings for classes. These students used different textbooks and received most instruction in the form of lecture and discussion that required only basic levels of knowledge. Variations in instructional strategies for these students appeared not to exist, and Team observations verified there was a lack of urgency and consistent intense instruction for skill development. Teachers were aware of low student performance on the WESTEST2 but seemed to lack a specific plan for providing remediation in deficient skills. This was particularly concerning given the large gaps in achievement between special education students and non-special education students in mathematics (31.0 percent gap) and reading/language arts (43.7 percent gap).

Students reported they had completed three laboratory activities for the school year in chemistry. During interviews this was not denied by the classroom teacher, and lesson plan reviews confirmed that the instruction being provided did not meet the requirements of Policy 2520: “Students will engage in active inquiries, investigations and hands-on activities for a minimum of 50% of the instructional time to develop conceptual understanding and research/laboratory skills”.

The school had begun implementing sustained silent reading; however, there was a lack of consistency in its implementation. Considering the large difference in reading proficiency between the male and female subgroup (20.9 percent), the Team determined this strategy could be an important tool in closing the gap.

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)

Students reported completing writing assignments primarily in English and social studies courses, particularly the Advanced Placement® courses. Students stated that little writing was completed in science classes and none in math courses. Team observations and review of lesson plans verified student reports. Teachers of all subjects, as well as the principal, were unaware of the Writing Assessment results and could not identify areas of concern based upon student results. Due to inconsistent reports from teachers regarding the results of the WESTEST2 Online Writing Assessment 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 assessment.

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)

When asked what teachers could do to help them learn, students stated implementation of more “hands-on” lessons, stronger connections to real life, and better integration of technology. One group of students specifically said, “Use the SmartBoards.” Another group reported they had not been to a computer lab the entire school year. Team member observations and interviews with students confirmed that technology usage by students, in general, was confined primarily to calculators for mathematical computation and laptops for conducting research.

Minimal to no technology usage by students in the special education environment was observed, and teachers reported seldom using technology for instruction or career exploration. Special education students being serviced through the pull out program had access to five new laptops; however, these laptops contained no software such as Microsoft Office or other interactive applications and allowed for use of Internet only.

Teachers and administration reported receiving various technologies (Apple TVs, SmartBoards, ELMOs, iPads). Receipt of these varied by department (e.g., Apple TVs – social studies; SmartBoards – science); however, the Team could not verify that a plan was in place to provide professional development to teachers in the integration of these materials in their classrooms, or that there was a schoolwide technology plan. Science teachers reported not having had much technology training this school year. Many teachers indicated the need for more professional development related to technology.

Students and teachers reported Internet service in the building was intermittent, and the principal reported that testing had been cancelled the morning before due to the Internet being inaccessible. The school did not have a technology integration specialist (TIS) or technology system specialist (TSS) on staff. Teachers stated they often helped one another with technology problems or had to wait until someone from the county office could come to the school.

The majority of students reported never using the library. Teachers also stated they did not take classes to the library; however, they reported the librarian would collect materials related to class assignments/projects and supply those to the 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)

Two of the Advanced Placement (AP) courses currently offered by Man Senior High School were English Language and Composition and English Literature and Composition. Sophomores were enrolled in English Literature and Composition and juniors were enrolled in English Language and Composition. Based upon guidance provided by the College Board, as well as no Grade 10 students were scoring a 3 or higher on the Advanced Placement exams, the Team had concerns about the sequence in which the courses were being provided. The College Board's AP English Development Committee developed these courses to align with college offerings, which typically are a composition course during the first semester and an introductory literature course during the second semester. The Team recommended the school follow this sequencing in offering these courses to students.

The Team determined the school also was not following guidelines established by West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510 with regard to Advanced Placement course offerings. 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.

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 school currently provided seven periods of instruction daily; each period was 49 minutes in length. Although a period identified as LINKS/credit recovery/clubs was noted in the schedule equaling 30 minutes, instruction based upon content standards and objectives was not consistently provided for all students on a daily basis during this time. The Team determined the instructional day at Man Senior High School equaled 343 minutes, falling just short of the 345 minutes required by West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510.

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.

One goal in the strategic plan stated the school “will have 60 percent of parents involved in school sponsored activities”. Action steps for this particular goal consisted of a listing of school activities, including Prom Walk and the Christmas program. This, in addition to the fact that on the Online Educator Evaluation system, 82.9 percent of the teachers rated themselves as emerging for Standard 5, Element 5.2., *The teacher works with parents, guardians, families and community entities to support student learning and well-being,* led the Team to determine that staff needed professional development in meaningful parent involvement that will support student achievement.

A second goal in the strategic plan stated the school “will increase active student engagement to 40% as measured by IPI data”. When questioned if this meant the school would like to see the number of 5s (student learning conversations) and 6s (student active engaged learning) increase to 40 percent of the codings during data collection, the principal responded positively. The Team commended the school’s desire to increase student engagement, but determined the goal demonstrated a misunderstanding of typical percentages for the various IPI categories present in high schools. Based upon the research of Dr. Jerry Valentine (2007), co-creator of the IPI process, typical percentages of student active engaged learning and student learning conversations for high schools range from 18-25 percent (Reference *The Instructional Practices Inventory: Using a Student Learning Assessment to Foster Organizational Learning* located at <http://education.missouri.edu/orgs/mlc/Upload%20Area->

Docs/IPI%20Manuscript%2012-07.pdf.) The Team recommended the school revisit this goal in light of Dr. Valentine's research.

Not all teachers appeared to be familiar with the components of the strategic plan. Most could articulate goals involving the Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) and parent involvement; however, the majority of teachers could not explain how they were individually assisting in meeting the goals or how they were integrating the goals in their classrooms.

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)

Team members verified that administrators reviewed lesson plans regularly; however, feedback was mainly related to formatting, e.g., including enough detail in plans, and not directly related to improving instruction. Where administrative comments were relative to instruction, Team members observed no changes in instructional practices or strategies by those teachers receiving such comments.

In one English language arts class, where students in special education were mixed (standard diploma and modified diploma), all had the same instruction and assignments with no notation in lesson plans as to the standard for those working toward standard diploma and no reference to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) goal/objective for the student working toward a modified diploma.

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)

When asked about data analysis, teachers named different types of data (WESTEST2, school climate survey, Advanced Placement scores, professional learning community data, and teacher assessments) that had been reviewed. However, it was evident through teacher interviews that not all teachers were familiar with the same data and a comprehensive schoolwide approach was not in place to address student deficiencies in mathematics, reading/language arts, or writing. There were indications throughout the Education Performance Audit that teachers did not yet comprehend the role of data analysis in the school improvement process. When asked, "How do you know if students have mastered the standards?" one teacher responded, "You can tell by facial expression if they don't get it." Teachers also reported basing student learning goals for

the Online Educator Evaluation System on past teaching experience to identify concepts with which students struggled most often rather than student-specific data. Teachers reported a concerted focus was placed on Grade 11 students, as this was the group utilized for accountability purposes.

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 15 different teachers. The following issues were identified:

Four entries in the master schedule contained incomplete information.

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.

One teacher was listed in the master schedule as teaching two courses for which the codes could not be found in the WVEIS Course Code Manual.

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.

Two teachers did not have a special education exceptionality(ies) listed for collaborative teaching course codes.

Three teachers did not hold the appropriate content endorsements for courses assigned to them in the master schedule.

One teacher did not hold the appropriate content endorsement for a course assigned to him in the master schedule and also 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 per Policy 2422.2.

One teacher 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.

Two teachers were on permit and not highly qualified.

One teacher was on an out-of-field permit and not highly qualified.

One teacher was on permit.

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

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)

Of the 32 staff members listed in the Online Educator Evaluation system, six were in the Initial Progression and one was in the Intermediate Progression; all others were in the Advanced Progression. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5310, *Performance Evaluation of School Personnel*, established the following observation requirements for those teachers in the Initial Progression:

13.4.a. Teachers in the Initial Progression will be observed a minimum of four (4) times for the summative performance evaluation. Two (2) observations shall be scheduled with the classroom teacher, and shall be conducted during an instructional activity.

13.4.a.1. The first instructional observation shall be completed with the teacher and shall occur on or before November 1.

13.4.a.2. The second observation is to be completed between November 1 and January 1.

13.4.a.3. The third observation is to be completed between January 1 and March 1.

13.4.a.4. The final observation is to be completed between March 1 and May 1.

As of the date of the Education Performance Audit, teachers in the Initial Progression should have had three observations completed. One teacher had been observed once, and three others had been observed two times. The principal reported the required observations were on paper and had not yet been entered into the evaluation system.

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, 57.1 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, 77.1 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 professional development and overall school improvement goals.

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. Baseline data were not provided for some goals. 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 professional development in understanding the components of the evaluation system and their role in the school improvement process.

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)

On the date of the Education Performance Audit, a teacher roll generated from the West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS) with the names, grade levels, birthdates, telephone numbers, and WVEIS identification numbers of 25 students was found on the floor in the school. The Team determined this violated confidentiality of student records.

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)

Students reported a lot of tobacco use at the school and perceived not much was being done to stop it. Team members observed evidence of tobacco use in student rest rooms. 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)

Although a leadership team meeting agenda dated August 30, 2013, listed "Growth Model/data analysis" as one of the topics for discussion, the principal was unfamiliar with the school's growth model data. When asked about the gaps in proficiency between male and female students in mathematics and, particularly, reading/language arts, the principal indicated she was unaware of the gap. The Team determined this supported observations throughout the day regarding a generalized data analysis that did not identify specific student needs.

The assistant principal who dealt primarily with discipline indicated that morning tardies and students leaving early were the school's biggest discipline issue. A discipline report from West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS) indicated referrals for disruptive/disrespectful behavior (138) were the school's most frequently occurring issue. The Team concluded this too exemplified a lack of knowledge of student data.

The principal reported iPads and laptops had been purchased for every teacher three years ago; she stated that she used an iPad for classroom walkthroughs but was uncertain how teachers were using the iPads. The Team determined this lack of knowledge was reflective of the absence of a schoolwide technology plan that included professional development for teachers. It also raised the concern that technology integration was not being encouraged and monitored as an instructional strategy.

All administrators were not visible in classrooms; one assistant indicated he had been relieved of conducting classroom walkthroughs as his duties related to discipline and athletic director were requiring too much of his time. The Team appreciated the many duties of the assistant but concluded there should be a balanced division of duties among administration that would allow all to visit classrooms on a regular basis and provide a variety of feedback to teachers.

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 Senior 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.

Administration reported the school did not have a written or electronic programs of study guide and 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.

Staff, students, and administrators at Man Senior High School reported periodic lapses in Internet access. This had repeatedly affected instruction, including testing the day prior to the Education Performance Audit. The Team recommended the principal and leadership team work with pertinent central office staff to resolve this issue and ensure consistent school access to this technology. The superintendent reported this issue had been investigated and the problem was a technical issue with the Internet provider.

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 Senior 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; however, based upon information collected the date of the Education Performance Audit, the Team determined additional support is needed in the school with regard to technology integration and

recommended the leadership team work with the appropriate central office personnel to develop a sustained, embedded professional development plan to address this concern.

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 school had either put in place or was in the process of instituting leadership team meetings, professional learning communities, analysis of student work and assessment results, and development of formative assessments. It was the Team's conclusion that these supports needed to be provided consistently and monitored frequently for fidelity in implementation. Additionally, the Team determined administrators needed to utilize classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews to provide meaningful instructional feedback to teachers.

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 both the special education environment and 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*)

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.)

The site was not large enough for future expansion. (Did not adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

The site did not have sufficient on-site, solid-surface parking for staff, visitors, and individuals with disabilities. (May adversely impact access by individuals with mobility issues.)

19.1.6. Grades 9 through 12 computer laboratory. Computer laboratories were not adequate in size (40-50 ft²/student). (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

19.1.8. Grades 1-12 classrooms. Size of academic learning areas was not adequate (28-30 ft²/student). (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas. The art facility was not adequate in size (45-50 ft²/student). (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

The art facility did not have two deep sinks. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

The art facility did not have a ceramic kiln. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

The music facility did not have acoustical treatment. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

19.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities. Science facilities (Room 200 and Room 201) were not adequate in size (45-60 ft²/student). (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

Science facilities (Room 200 and Room 201) were not located with easy access to outdoor activities and isolated to keep odors from the remainder of the building. (Did not adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

Science facilities (Room 200 and Room 201) did not have a sink, hot and cold water, and gas. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

Science facilities (Room 200 and room 201) did not have AC and DC current, and compressed air. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

19.1.12. Grades 7-12 auditorium/stage. The auditorium was not of adequate size (seats 1/3 student body or a minimum of 250 people). (Did not adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

The auditorium did not have acoustical treatment. (Adversely impacted program delivery and student performance.)

19.1.15. Health service units. No health service unit was available with adequate size (250-400 ft²). (May adversely impact student health and safety.)

The health service unit did not have adequate furnishings and equipment. (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.

The overall graduation rate for Man Senior High School was 69.07 percent. This represented a 0.24 percent decrease from the previous year and a 10.5 percent decrease since 2010-2011. Four-year cohort graduation rates follow: Male – 64.91 percent; students with disabilities – 33.33 percent; and economically disadvantaged students – 64.62 percent. Although the school was implementing credit rescue for freshmen and providing credit recovery for upperclassmen, the Team determined it was very important the school be proactive in identifying at-risk students and implementing interventions as soon as possible.

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

Man Senior 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 Man Senior High School in improvement efforts.

The Team identified 14 high quality standards necessary to improve performance and progress.

7.1.2. High expectations.

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.

7.1.13. Instructional day.

7.2.1. County and school electronic strategic improvement plans.

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.

7.2.4. Data analysis.

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 noted an indicator of efficiency (8.1.1.), offered capacity building resources, and identified 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 Senior 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.