



**Office of Education  
Performance Audits**

**FINAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**MCNINCH PRIMARY SCHOOL**

**MARSHALL COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**JANUARY 2012**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

## Table of Contents

	Page
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit Team .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>School Performance .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Annual Performance Measures for Accountability .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>High Quality Standards .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Indicators of Efficiency .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Building Capacity to Correct Deficiencies.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Identification of Resource Needs .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Early Detection and Intervention .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit Summary .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## **INTRODUCTION**

An announced Education Performance Audit of McNinch Primary School in Marshall County was conducted on November 18, 2010.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of McNinch Primary School was conducted December 7, 2011. The purpose of the follow-up review was to verify correction of the finding(s) identified during the original Education Performance Audit. The review was in accordance with West Virginia Code §18-2E-5 and West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320 which specify that a school that meets or exceeds the performance and progress standards but has other deficiencies shall remain on full accreditation status and a county school district shall remain on full approval status for the remainder of the accreditation period and shall have an opportunity to correct those deficiencies. The Code and policy include the provision that a school “. . . does not have any deficiencies which would endanger student health or safety or other extraordinary circumstances as defined by the West Virginia Board of Education.”

### **EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM**

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Dr. Gus Penix, Director

## SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

### 48 MARSHALL COUNTY

Alfred Renzella, Superintendent

### 207 MCNINCH PRIMARY SCHOOL

Jane Duffy, Principal

Grades PK - 02

Enrollment 415 (2<sup>nd</sup> month 2010-2011 enrollment report)

## DIBELS RESULTS

### Grade K

Year	Grade	LNF (Letter Naming Fluency)			ISF (Initial Sound Fluency)	
		Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3	Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2
2008 - 2009	K	61% Low Risk 17% Some Risk 22% At Risk	55% Low Risk 24% Some Risk 21% At Risk	56% Low Risk 22% Some Risk 22% At Risk	58% Low Risk 26% Some Risk 16% At Risk	44% Low Risk 42% Some Risk 14% At Risk
2009 - 2010	K	52% Low Risk 25% Some Risk 23% At Risk	58% Low Risk 23% Some Risk 19% At Risk	64% Low Risk 18% Some Risk 18% At Risk	57% Low Risk 20% Some Risk 23% At Risk	35% Low Risk 54% Some Risk 11% At Risk
2010 - 2011	K	66% Low Risk 28% Some Risk 6% At Risk	74% Low Risk 15% Some Risk 11% At Risk	79% Low Risk 13% Some Risk 14% At Risk	44% Low Risk 12% Some Risk 44% At Risk	66% Low Risk 17% Some Risk 17% At Risk

Year	Grade	PSF (Phoneme Segmentation Fluency)		NWF (Nonsense Word Fluency)	
		Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
2008 - 2009	K	46% Low Risk 28% Some Risk 26% At Risk	43% Low Risk 47% Some Risk 10% At Risk	54% Low Risk 21% Some Risk 25% At Risk	47% Low Risk 30% Some Risk 23% At Risk
2009 - 2010	K	40% Low Risk 38% Some Risk 22% At Risk	50% Low Risk 38% Some Risk 12% At Risk	53% Low Risk 27% Some Risk 20% At Risk	44% Low Risk 31% Some Risk 25% At Risk
2010 - 2011	K	69% Low Risk 12% Some Risk 19% At Risk	74% Low Risk 17% Some Risk 9% At Risk	61% Low Risk 21% Some Risk 18% At Risk	52% Low Risk 36% Some Risk 12% At Risk

## Grade 1

Year	Grade	LNF (Letter Naming Fluency)	PSF (Phoneme Segmentation Fluency)		
		Benchmark 1	Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
2008 - 2009	1	58% Low Risk 35% Some Risk 7% At Risk	42% Low Risk 50% Some Risk 8% At Risk	90% Low Risk 10% Some Risk 0% At Risk	71% Low Risk 29% Some Risk 0% At Risk
2009 - 2010	1	58% Low Risk 24% Some Risk 18% At Risk	37% Low Risk 49% Some Risk 14% At Risk	85% Low Risk 14% Some Risk 1% At Risk	73% Low Risk 27% Some Risk 0% At Risk
2010 - 2011	1	73% Low Risk 19% Some Risk 8% At Risk	60% Low Risk 23% Some Risk 17% At Risk	No longer administered in Benchmark 2	No longer administered in Benchmark 3

Year	Grade	NWF (Nonsense Word Fluency)		
		Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
2008 - 2009	1	44% Low Risk 40% Some Risk 16% At Risk	36% Low Risk 57% Some Risk 0% At Risk	56% Low Risk 44% Some Risk 21% At Risk
2009 - 2010	1	48% Low Risk 29% Some Risk 23% At Risk	49% Low Risk 43% Some Risk 8% At Risk	62% Low Risk 33% Some Risk 5% At Risk
2010 - 2011	1	57% Low Risk 22% Some Risk 21% At Risk	47% Low Risk 29% Some Risk 24% At Risk	53% Low Risk 15% Some Risk 32% At Risk

Year	Grade	ORF (Oral Reading Fluency)		RTF (Retell Fluency)	
		Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
2008 - 2009	1	38% Low Risk 52% Some Risk 10% At Risk	48% Low Risk 41% Some Risk 11% At Risk	34% Low Risk 51% Some Risk 15% At Risk	57% Low Risk 36% Some Risk 7% At Risk
2009 - 2010	1	56% Low Risk 31% Some Risk 13% At Risk	52% Low Risk 30% Some Risk 18% At Risk	47% Low Risk 50% Some Risk 3% At Risk	15% Low Risk 60% Some Risk 25% At Risk
2010 - 2011	1	46% Low Risk 17% Some Risk 37% At Risk	44% Low Risk 21% Some Risk 35% At Risk	No longer administered in Benchmark 2	54% Low Risk 46% Some Risk 0% At Risk

## Grade 2

Year	Grade	NWF (Nonsense Word Fluency)	ORF (Oral Reading Fluency)		
			Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
2008 - 2009	2	Benchmark 1	Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
		44% Low Risk 40% Some Risk 16% At Risk	46% Low Risk 25% Some Risk 29% At Risk	56% Low Risk 21% Some Risk 23% At Risk	40% Low Risk 23% Some Risk 27% At Risk
2009- 2010	2	41% Low Risk 45% Some Risk 14% At Risk	29% Low Risk 40% Some Risk 31% At Risk	49% Low Risk 18% Some Risk 33% At Risk	33% Low Risk 28% SomeRisk 39% At Risk
2010 - 2011	2	% Low Risk % Some Risk % At Risk	% Low Risk % Some Risk % At Risk	% Low Risk % Some Risk % At Risk	% Low Risk % Some Risk % At Risk

Year	Grade	RTF (Retell Fluency)		
		Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
2008 - 2009	2	Benchmark 1	Benchmark 2	Benchmark 3
		54% Low Risk 36% Some Risk 10% At Risk	26% Low Risk 62% Some Risk 12% At Risk	42% Low Risk 52% Some Risk 6% At Risk
2009- 2010	2	25% Low Risk 63% Some Risk 12% At Risk	25% Low Risk 63% Some Risk 12% At Risk	31% Low Risk 56% SomeRisk 13% At Risk
2010 - 2011	2	% Low Risk % Some Risk % At Risk	% Low Risk % Some Risk % At Risk	% Low Risk % Some Risk % At Risk

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

1. Gross Motor Skills.
2. DIBELS.
3. Everyday Mathematics.
4. SAT Referral Process.
5. Response to Intervention Boxes.
6. TechSteps.
7. Pre-K Symposium.
8. Whiteboard Training.
9. "New Directions for Effective Family & Community Involvement Programs for Student Success".
10. Bullying Prevention.
11. "Setting Up Classrooms Routines That Really Work for Kindergarten".
12. Learning Centers.
13. "Building Successful Partnerships" and "Creating Parent and Family Involvement".
14. Health Issues.

DIBELS (reading) benchmark results showed the following for the 2009-2010 school year.

**Kindergarten** The percentage of students at risk decreased on all reading areas except Nonsense Word Fluency which increased from 20 percent on the mid-year Benchmark 2 to 25 percent on the final Benchmark 3.

**Grade 1** The percentage of students at risk decreased on all reading areas except Oral Reading Fluency which increased from 13 percent on the mid-year Benchmark 2 to 18 percent on the final Benchmark 3 and Retell Fluency which increased from 3 percent on Benchmark 2 to 25 percent on Benchmark 3.

**Grade 2** The percentage of students at risk increased in Oral Reading Fluency from 31 percent on the Benchmark 1 to 39 percent on Benchmark 3. The percentage of students at risk on the Retell Fluency increased slightly from 12 percent on the Benchmark 1 to 13 percent on the Benchmark 3.

The school did not administer a mathematics assessment for the 2009-2010 school year.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**DIBELS (reading) benchmark 2010-2011 school year.**

**Kindergarten** The percentage of students at risk decreased on all reading areas except Letter Naming Frequency which increased from 6 percent on the first Benchmark 1 to 14 percent on the final Benchmark 3.

**Grade 1** The percentage of students at risk decreased on all reading areas except Nonsense Word Frequency which increased from 21 percent on the first Benchmark 1 to 32 percent on the final Benchmark 3.

**Grade 2** The percentage of students at risk decreased in all reading areas except Oral Reading Fluency which increased slightly from 29 percent on the first Benchmark 1 to 32 percent on the final Benchmark 3.

The school did not administer a mathematics assessment for the 2010-2011 school year.

The school staff continued to improve student achievement through additional staff development. Some of the additional staff development sessions are listed.

- 1. Everyday Mathematics Algorithms**
- 2. PECS Training**
- 3. Solution Tree-Professional Learning Community Teams**
- 4. Guided Mathematics**
- 5. Ashlock Explicit Instruction Templates and Lesson Maps**

6. DIBELS Data Charting
7. Building Successful School-Family Partnerships
8. Rtl How It Works
9. Tier I-How to Reach All Students
10. Getting Started on the Road to Writing
11. Journaling-Enhancing All Content Areas
12. DIBELS Next
13. Interactive Whiteboard and Reading/Mathematics
14. Intervention Strategies
15. LETRS Training
16. Professional Learning Communities
17. DIBELS/WESTEST Analysis
18. Kindergarten Common Core Standards
19. Data Based Instruction and the 21 Day Planner
20. Technology Integration
21. Boardmaker and Skill Streaming
22. Developmental Guidance
23. Bullying Prevention
24. Engaging Students Through Music
25. Feeding and Swallowing Clinic
26. Evaluating Speech
27. Foundations Training
28. Everyday Mathematics CSOs Unit Alignment
29. Foundations Preparation and Review
30. Everyday Mathematics Assessments
31. Discovery Education/United Streaming
32. Carol Tolman Meetings
33. Foundations Modeling and Meetings
34. WV Writes
35. Read WV
36. Qwizdom
37. Everyday Mathematics Modeling and Meetings



## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

### HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

#### Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.

#### 7.1. Curriculum

**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 minimum 315 instructional minutes was not provided on Wednesdays. Marshall County Schools held Professional Learning Communities for one hour each Wednesday morning countywide. This resulted in 60 instructional minutes lost each week.

The Team found that the school had an inordinate amount of movies and parties. This combined with the hour lost weekly was detrimental to the educational process and did not maximize instructional time.

#### FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

**COMPLIANCE.** Marshall County requested and was granted a waiver to Policy 2510, Section 7.2.4c (Instructional Day – 12 hours per week for pre-k, and an instructional day of 315 minutes for kindergarten and grades 1-4, 330 minutes for grades 5-8, and 345 minutes for grades 9-12) for the 2011-2012 school year.

#### 7.2. Student and School Performance

**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)

At least half of the lesson plans could not be followed by a substitute teacher. These plans failed to include enough material and information to instruct the classes. Three teachers had lesson plans generated by the mathematics textbook company. In these classes the textbook was guiding the curriculum rather than the students' needs as based on data. The principal signed these lesson plans and comments were overall positive with no feedback to the teachers to improve instruction.

## **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**COMPLIANCE.** Lesson plans were clear and discernible and could be followed by a substitute teacher.

All lesson plans were developed by teachers and focused on the delivery of the appropriate grade level content standards and objectives (CSOs). Lesson plans did not appear to be textbook generated as noted in the Initial Education Performance Audit report. The principal made positive comments on lesson plans, with only one comment indicating a need for improvement.

### **7.7. Safe, Drug Free, Violence Free, and Disciplined Schools**

**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)

An AIDS Education Policy was not in place at the school.

## **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**STANDARD MET.** Marshall County Schools had in place a policy, Health Regulations, Procedures and Personnel, which outlined the delivery of instruction for AIDS education in all schools. The principal indicated the school was providing AIDS instruction to students according to the provision of the policy.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**7.1.2. High expectations.** Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) were inside lesson plan books of the two pre-kindergarten special needs classes. One of these teachers had one IEP on the desk in preparation of a parent meeting later in the day. The Team recommended that the IEPs be kept in a secured location.

The Team also recommended that McNinch Primary School administer mathematics assessments to determine students' mastery of the mathematics West Virginia 21st Century content standards and objectives (CSOs).

## **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWED.** Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) were kept in a secure location.

The school was using the *Everyday Math* textbook recommended assessments to assess student mastery of the mathematics CSOs.

**7.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.** The school did not have a computer laboratory sign-in sheet to document laboratory

usage. The Team recommended that a sign-in sheet that includes the number of students actually using the laboratory be developed and implemented.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED.**

#### **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 McNinch Primary School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Marshall 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 Marshall 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.**

The principal must ensure that all lesson plans include enough information so that a substitute teacher could follow the lesson plans.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**Lesson plans were being reviewed frequently by the principal. Teachers were utilizing substitute lesson plans to provide additional clarification to the intended instruction and/or provide additional materials to complete instruction.**

### **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 McNinch Primary 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.**

The Team believed that the principal possessed the capacity to correct the deficiencies found at the school.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

**The principal demonstrated skills necessary to guide McNinch Primary School in a positive and productive manner to increase student achievement.**

## Identification of Resource Needs

A thorough and efficient system of schools requires the provision of an adequate level of appropriately managed resources. The West Virginia Board of Education adopted resource evaluation as a part of the accreditation and evaluation process. This process is intended to meaningfully evaluate the needs for facilities, personnel, curriculum, equipment and materials in each of the county's schools and how those impact program and student performance.

- 19.1. Facilities, equipment, and materials.** Facilities and equipment specified in Policy 6200, Chapters 1 through 14, are available in all schools, classrooms, and other required areas. A determination will be made by using the Process for Improving Education (W.Va. Code §18-2E-5) whether any identified deficiencies adversely impact and impair the delivery of a high quality educational program if it is below the West Virginia Board of Education standards due to inadequacies or inappropriate management in the areas of facilities, equipment, and materials. The Education Performance Audit Teams shall utilize an assessment instrument for the evaluation of school facilities which generally follows the requirements of Policy 6200. Note: Corrective measures to be taken in response to any identified resource deficiency will of necessity be subject to the feasibility of modifying existing facilities, consideration of alternative methods of instructional delivery, availability of funding, and prioritization of educational needs through Comprehensive Educational Facilities Plans and the West Virginia School Building Authority. This policy does not change the authority, judgment, or priorities of the School Building Authority of West Virginia who is statutorily responsible for prioritizing "Need" for the purpose of funding school improvements or school construction in the State of West Virginia or the prerogative of the Legislature in providing resources. (Policy 6200 and *Tomblin v. Gainer*)

**According to the items checked in the School Facilities Evaluation Checklist, the school was below standard in the following areas. The principal checked and the Team confirmed the following school facility resource needs.**

- 19.1.1. School location.** The school site was not five acres, plus one acre for each 100 students over 240.
- 19.1.3. Teachers' workroom.** Communication technology was not provided.
- 19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** Computer work stations and on-line periodical indexes were not available.
- 19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The art facilities did not have mechanical ventilation, a ceramic kiln, or black-out areas. The music facilities did not have music chairs with folding arms, a podium, or acoustical treatment.

**19.1.14. Food service.** A locker/dressing room was not available.

**19.1.15. Health service units.** A bulletin board was not available.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW CONCLUSION**

All facility resource needs remained as previously identified except for 19.1.15. A bulletin board has been installed in the health service area.

### **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.**

Student progress in mathematics will need to be monitored to ensure instruction is based on student mastery of skills instead of the textbook being the single determinant of instruction.

### **FOLLOW-UP REVIEW TEAM SUMMARY**

**Teacher lesson plans indicated that teachers were basing instruction on the adopted CSOs and student needs.**

## SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

<b>School</b>	<b>Accreditation Status</b>	<b>Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards</b>	<b>Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement</b>	<b>Date Certain</b>
<b>McNinch Primary School 48-207</b>	<b>Full Accreditation</b>			

### Education Performance Audit Summary

The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education continue the Full Accreditation status of McNinch Primary School.