



**INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**RIDGEDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

**MONONGALIA COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**JULY 2014**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<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 - Analysis .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Commendations.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>High Quality Standards .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Identification Of Resource Needs.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Early Detection And Intervention .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Education Performance Audit Summary .....</b>	<b>17</b>

## INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Ridgedale Elementary School in Monongalia County was conducted April 15, 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, the school system, as appropriate, and the West Virginia Board of Education on such matters as it considers necessary to improve performance and progress to meet the standard.

The Education Performance Audit Team reviewed the Five-Year Strategic Improvement Plan, interviewed school personnel and school system administrators, observed classrooms, and examined school records.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Charlene Coburn, Coordinator  
West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Technology – Julia Legg, Coordinator  
West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Early Learning – Rhonda Crawley, Coordinator

## TEAM MEMBERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title/School</b>	<b>County</b>
Shelly Crites	Principal, Maysville Elementary School	Grant County
Danielle Gillum	Principal, North View Elementary School	Harrison County
Don Johnson	Retired Principal	Braxton County
Steve Wotring	Director of Curriculum/Federal Programs	Preston County

## SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

### 56 MONONGALIA COUNTY

Frank Devono, Superintendent

### 204 RIDGEDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – FOCUS

Chad Skolny, Principal  
Grades PK-05, Enrollment 458

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 Ridgedale Elementary School a Focus school. Focus schools are those schools with persistent and pervasive subgroup achievement/graduation rate gaps. West Virginia's methodology for identifying Focus schools differs by programmatic level. Elementary and middle schools will use the achievement gap component of the WVAI while high schools will use graduation rate gaps.

An elementary/middle school designated as a Focus school can exit this status when the school meets its academic achievement goals on the WESTEST2 student subgroups and an elementary/middle school no longer has the largest academic achievement gaps.

### Designation Status for Ridgedale Elementary School.

Designation:	FOCUS	Next Year's Target:	46.6751
Index Score:	37.6123	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	NO
Index Target:	42.0096	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

### Supporting Data

Proficiency (40% of the index score)	8.61
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	7.89
Observed Growth (15% of the index score)	9.69
Adequate Growth (20% of the index score)	6.50
<u>Attendance Rate (5% of the index score)</u>	<u>4.93</u>
Total Accountability Index (out of 100)	37.61

The West Virginia Accountability Index targets were set for each school to reach progressively higher performance on a defined set of data. Schools had 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 elementary schools in West Virginia reaching 74.6679 by 2020. Proficiency targets were set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

Ridgedale Elementary School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2012-2013 school year. When considering the index target of 46.68 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 37.61, Ridgedale Elementary School has a steep trajectory to achieve both the short term and long term targets. A significant gap exists between current performance of each subgroup and the target of 75 percent.

- Ridgedale Elementary earned 37.61 of the 100 points possible for the West Virginia Accountability Index (WVAI) for the 2012-2013 school year. (The target was 42.01 for 2013 and is 46.68 for 2014.)
- More than 50 percent of the subgroups at Ridgedale Elementary did not meet the targets in mathematics and reading.
- Ridgedale Elementary acquired 8.61 points of the 40 points possible for proficiency.
- Ridgedale Elementary acquired 7.89 points of the 20 points possible for closing the achievement gap.
- Ridgedale Elementary acquired 9.69 points of the 15 points possible for observed growth.
- Ridgedale Elementary acquired 6.50 points of the 20 points possible for adequate growth as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.
- Ridgedale Elementary acquired 4.93 points of the 5 points possible for attendance as indicated by the 2013 WVAI.

**RIDGEDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
Grade-Level Proficiency Data  
School Year 2013**

Grade-Level and Subgroup		Mathematics			Reading/Language Arts		
Grade	Group	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient	Participation	Non-Proficient	Proficient
3	White	> 95%	63.64%	36.36%	> 95%	70.91%	29.09%
3	Black	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
3	Indian	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
3	Multiracial	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
3	Special Education	93.75%	86.67%	13.33%	93.75%	93.33%	6.67%
3	Low Socioeconomic Status	> 95%	89.47%	10.53%	> 95%	94.74%	5.26%
3	Total	> 95%	63.79%	36.21%	> 95%	72.41%	27.59%
4	White	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%
4	Black	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%
4	Hispanic	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
4	Multiracial	> 95%	50.00%	50.00%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
4	Special Education	90.00%	> 95%	< 5%	90.00%	> 95%	< 5%
4	Low Socioeconomic Status	93.75%	63.33%	36.67%	93.75%	76.67%	23.33%
4	Total	> 95%	50.70%	49.30%	> 95%	67.61%	32.39%
5	White	> 95%	60.34%	39.66%	> 95%	75.86%	24.14%
5	Hispanic	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
5	Special Education	> 95%	80.00%	20.00%	> 95%	> 95%	< 5%
5	Low Socioeconomic Status	> 95%	61.90%	38.10%	> 95%	85.71%	14.29%
5	Total	> 95%	61.02%	38.98%	> 95%	76.27%	23.73%

**Attendance Rate = 98.60%**

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

### **Mathematics.**

- Grade 4 students with a proficiency rate of 49.30 outperformed Grade 3 students (36.21 percent proficient) and Grade 5 students (38.98 percent proficient).
- Grades 3 and 4 black students were less than 5 percent proficient.
- Grade 3 Indian students were more than 95 percent proficient.
- Grade 4 Hispanic students with a proficiency rate of more than 95 percent outperformed Grade 5 Hispanic students (less than 5 percent proficient).
- Grade 4 multiracial students with a proficiency rate of 50 percent proficient outperformed Grade 3 (less than 5 percent proficient).
- Grade 5 special education students with a proficiency rate of 20 percent proficient outperformed Grade 3 (13.33 percent proficient) and Grade 4 (less than 5 percent proficient).
- Grade 5 low socioeconomic students with a proficiency rate of 38.10 percent proficient outperformed Grade 3 low socioeconomic students (10.53 percent proficient) and Grade 4 low socioeconomic students (36.67 percent proficient).

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

- Grade 4 students with a proficiency rate of 32.39 percent outperformed Grade 3 (27.59 percent proficient) and Grade 5 (23.73 percent proficient).
- Grade 4 black students with a proficiency rate of 50 percent proficient outperformed Grade 3 black students (less than 5 percent proficient).
- Grade 3 Indian students were less than 5 percent proficient.
- Grade 4 and Grade 5 Hispanic students were less than 5 percent proficient.
- Grade 3 and Grade 4 multiracial students were less than 5 percent proficient.
- Grade 3 special education students with a proficiency rate of 6.67 percent proficient outperformed Grade 4 (less than 5 percent proficient) and Grade 5 (less than 5 percent proficient).
- Grade 4 low socioeconomic status students with a proficiency rate 23.33 percent proficient outperformed Grade 3 low socioeconomic status students (5.26 percent proficient) and Grade 5 low socioeconomic students (14.29 percent proficient).

**RIDGEDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**  
**Growth Model School Level Summary**  
**Results by Sub-Group**

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

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	45 (35%)	35 (28%)	47 (37%)	51.0	42.0%	49 (39%)	37 (29%)	41 (32%)	53.0	28.5%
	County	1,741 (31%)	1,708 (31%)	2,138 (38%)	54.0	55.0%	1,804 (33%)	1,726 (31%)	2,017 (36%)	52.0	55.2%
	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	43 (36%)	33 (27%)	45 (37%)	51.0	42.4%	45 (37%)	37 (31%)	39 (32%)	53.0	29.3%
	County	1,533 (31%)	1,517 (31%)	1,897 (38%)	54.0	55.5%	1,593 (32%)	1,549 (32%)	1,770 (36%)	52.0	55.2%
	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	*	*	*	38.0	13.9%	*	*	*	64.0	5.6%
	County	316 (39%)	265 (33%)	226 (28%)	45.0	13.3%	310 (39%)	234 (30%)	246 (31%)	46.0	10.4%
	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	38 (35%)	28 (26%)	43 (39%)	54.0	48.4%	43 (39%)	34 (31%)	32 (29%)	51.0	33.8%
	County	1,425 (30%)	1,443 (30%)	1,912 (40%)	56.0	62.3%	1,494 (31%)	1,492 (31%)	1,771 (37%)	53.0	63.0%
	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	18 (35%)	15 (29%)	19 (37%)	54.0	30.6%	23 (44%)	13 (25%)	16 (31%)	43.0	16.7%
	County	695 (37%)	564 (30%)	641 (34%)	49.0	35.1%	687 (37%)	582 (31%)	601 (32%)	48.0	34.9%
	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	27 (36%)	20 (27%)	28 (37%)	48.0	48.8%	26 (35%)	24 (32%)	25 (33%)	54.0	35.5%
	County	1,046 (28%)	1,144 (31%)	1,497 (41%)	56.0	65.7%	1,117 (30%)	1,144 (31%)	1,416 (39%)	54.0	66.2%
	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	17 (28%)	21 (35%)	22 (37%)	53.0	38.5%	23 (38%)	20 (33%)	17 (28%)	49.0	16.5%
	County	945 (33%)	854 (30%)	1,039 (37%)	52.0	53.0%	1,005 (36%)	854 (30%)	958 (34%)	50.0	46.6%
	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	28 (42%)	14 (21%)	25 (37%)	47.0	45.1%	26 (39%)	17 (25%)	24 (36%)	57.0	39.2%
	County	796 (29%)	854 (31%)	1,099 (40%)	56.0	57.0%	799 (29%)	872 (32%)	1,059 (39%)	55.0	64.1%
	State	24,052 (33%)	22,817 (32%)	25,442 (35%)	51.0	45.9%	22,999 (32%)	22,817 (32%)	26,180 (36%)	52.0	56.9%

**\*Note:** Schools are those schools that have at least a 4th grade.

\*Denotes cell size <20.

The Growth Model School Level Summary Results by Sub-Group chart identifies the percent proficient in each subgroup compared to the county and State averages. In addition, subgroup growth is examined and determined to be low (red cells), typical (yellow cells), or high growth (green cells) based on previous performance. This chart does not include Grade 3. It only includes the scores of students who previously participated in WESTEST2 assessment.

### **Mathematics.**

- All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in mathematics.
- 42 percent of all students were proficient in mathematics as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- Non-special education students (48.4 percent proficient) outperformed special education students (13.9 percent proficient), which indicated a 34.5 percent gap (less than 20 students in this subgroup).
- Non-low socioeconomic students (48.8 percent proficient) outperformed low socioeconomic students (30.6 percent proficient), which indicated an 18.2 percent gap.
- Female students (45.1 percent proficient) outperformed male students (38.5 percent proficient), which indicated a gap of 6.6 percent.

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

- All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts.
- 28.5 percent of all students were proficient in reading/language arts as indicated by the 2013 WESTEST2 data.
- Non-special education students (33.8 percent proficient) outperformed special education students (5.6 percent proficient) which indicated a 28.2 percent gap (less than 20 students in this subgroup).
- Non-low socioeconomic students (35.5 percent proficient) outperformed low socioeconomic students (16.7 percent proficient) which indicated an 18.8 percent gap.
- Female students (39.2 percent proficient) outperformed male students (16.5 percent proficient) which indicated a gap of 22.7 percent.

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

Analysis of the data indicated all Ridgedale Elementary School's subgroups demonstrated typical growth. Closer analysis of the median percentile scores revealed most subgroups were performing in the low end of the typical growth scale, particularly in reading/language arts. Substantial gaps existed between males and females in reading/language arts, and the reading/language arts scores were significantly lower than the math scores. The data indicated a need to provide additional support to the special education subgroup in mathematics and reading/language arts, and a need to provide support to the staff in reading/language arts instruction.

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

1. Social Studies Textbook.
2. Cyber Safety.
3. Dr. Tish Howard Project Based Learning.
4. Confidentiality and Evaluations.
5. Unpacking the Standards.
6. Professional Learning Community Development.
7. Leader in Me.
8. Computer Resources.
9. Committee Meeting, Special Education, Teacher Goals.
10. Samsung Tablet Training.
11. Online Writing Training.
12. Dr. Tish Howard Need by Name.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

### COMMENDATIONS

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

**7.1.3. Learning environment.** The Team found the school created a positive learning environment through nurturing students, inviting and supportive staff, and a clean facility. Students experienced positive interactions with all staff members, including the custodian and the cooks. Students at Ridgedale Elementary School were generally happy to be in their school environment. The staff received professional development entitled, Leader in Me, which provided a schoolwide framework that supported classroom management, positive behavior incentives, and protected instructional time. A positive culture existed at the school which supported an environment conducive to learning for students.

**7.1.7. Library/educational technology access and technology application.** The Team commended the art teacher on integrating technology in art classes. A parent donated a 3-D printer to the school, and the art teacher prepared Grades 4 and 5 to do 3-D scratch programming. Also, the art teacher created an art blog of student work at <http://createdexploreimagine.blogspot.com>.

## HIGH QUALITY STANDARDS

**Necessary to Improve Performance and Progress.**

### 7.1. CURRICULUM.

**7.1.4. Instruction. Instruction is consistent with the programmatic definitions in West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510, *Assuring the Quality of Education: Regulations for Education Programs* (hereinafter Policy 2510). (Policy 2510)**

The Team could not verify through lesson plan reviews or observations that science instruction was delivered in an inquiry based, investigative, hands-on manner in most classrooms. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2520.3 – 21<sup>st</sup> Century Science K-8 Content Standards and Objectives for West Virginia Schools, states, “Students will engage in active inquiries, investigations, and hands-on activities for a minimum of 50 percent of the instructional time to develop conceptual understanding and research/laboratory skills.”

### 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)**

The Team concluded that the associate principal reviewed lesson plans on a regular basis with few comments. Three sets of lesson plans were vague or incomplete, and did not contain associate principal comments or feedback to improve instruction. Administrators lacked a sense of urgency in providing lesson planning support to beginning teachers as exhibited by the lack of constructive feedback in plans. In consideration of the low achievement results, the associate principal needed to expand lesson plan reviews and include constructive feedback targeting ineffective or inappropriate strategies being implemented with supportive suggestions to strengthen instruction to better meet students’ needs.

### 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 three teachers. The following issues were identified:

One teacher did not have a content exam listed in the West Virginia Department of Education electronic file.

One teacher did not have the special education credentials required for all courses.

One teacher did not have appropriate credentials or content exam for content areas and was not Highly Qualified.

### **Recommendation**

**7.1.2. High expectations.** The Team observed classrooms and interviewed staff and determined the principal (second year at this school) and most teachers demonstrated high expectations for the school. The principal displayed a wealth of knowledge regarding student achievement levels and used this information to develop a vision for the school. He prioritized a professional development plan for the staff and used walkthrough forms to focus on the foundational shifts of management, objectives, teaching, engagement, and learning (MOTEL). However, observations and teacher interviews revealed areas of low expectations. One teacher lacked classroom management skills and made comments to students such as, "I'm tired of everyone getting off task." "There is no excuse for that." "I am not happy about that." Students were following directions but seemed unsure of the expectations. The teacher demonstrated frustration throughout the observation. Writing instruction was not included in this teacher's lesson plans for the current school year. Two students with limited English proficiency were engaged in a computer activity in one classroom and were not involved with the class or the teacher during the Team's observation. Additionally, a second Team member visited the room in the afternoon and found students completing the same assignment of searching for vocabulary words on the Internet. Also, the itinerant English Second Language (ESL) teacher left another limited English proficiency student unattended for several minutes while playing a game in a small room off from the library. The Team recommended administrators spend more time in the few classrooms that exhibited low expectations and review the Individual Instructional plans of English Second Language (ESL) students with teachers to assure the students' needs are being met.

## 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.

**None Identified.**

## 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 Ridgedale Elementary School in achieving capacity, the following resources are recommended.

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

### **Building Capacity – Focus**

A Focus Assistance Support Team (FAST) will be comprised of members from the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE), the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) and the local education agency (LEA). The Team will work closely to assist the school in implementing the West Virginia School Improvement Framework. This will ensure the efforts are aligned and focused to support appropriate interventions to improve student sub group achievement and graduation rates.

The Ridgedale Elementary School's master schedule provided additional staff planning daily for one full hour before students report to class. One day per week, the principal required teachers to utilize this time to meet with grade level teams to analyze data and plan instruction. The Team observed one group of teachers meeting the day of the audit while the Team observed other teachers in the hallways discussing general/personal information. This time could be better utilized to build capacity for the school through structured professional learning community meetings or vertical team meetings. Teacher interviews revealed preschool and Kindergarten teachers were not included in schoolwide activities, such as development of the strategic plan. The preschool and Kindergarten teachers were not aware of the school goals and action steps to achieve

the goals. The Team recommended members of the leadership team utilize the hour provided at the beginning of the day to share information about the development of the strategic plan and to provide opportunities for input from all teachers.

## 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.**

**19.1.3. Teachers' workroom.** Teachers' work area was not adequate and did not provide access to communication technology. (May adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.7. K classrooms.** Kindergarten classroom areas were not adequate in size. (May adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The art area was not adequate in size and did not contain a ceramic kiln. (May adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.14. Food service.** A teachers' dining area of adequate size was not provided. (Did not adversely impact program delivery and student performance.)

**19.1.15. Health service units.** The health service unit did not have a curtain or small room with cots. (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 2013-2014 “5-17 Percent Needy Report” indicated 33.84 percent of the students at Ridgedale Elementary School were economically disadvantaged. This, coupled with the Focus school designation, expedites the need to assure school staff provides quality core instruction and intervention to students needing targeted or intensive support. The Team was impressed with the principal’s decision to focus heavily on incorporating the Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives while also using data to group students for intervention. One teacher had a great system for tracking the standards taught and standards students mastered; this process could be implemented by all teachers. The Team also noted the intervention process utilized by the Grade 4 team could be a model for the other grade level teams. Professional learning community meetings should be held more regularly, given the hour available each morning, for vertical teaming, creating formative assessments, and analyzing student work. Professional learning community meetings could provide an opportunity for teachers to set goals around specific areas of instruction they need to strengthen, while also establishing short term goals for student achievement.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

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

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

7.1.4. Instruction.

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.

7.6.2. Licensure.

The Team presented two commendations (7.1.3. Learning environment and 7.1.7. Library/education technology access and technology application) and one recommendation (7.1.2. High expectations), offered capacity building resources, and noted an early detection and intervention concern.

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

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

Based upon the results of the Education Performance Audit, the Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education direct Ridgedale Elementary School and Monongalia 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.