



SECOND FOLLOW-UP EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

TUCKER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL

TUCKER COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

APRIL 2012

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Tucker County High School in Tucker County was conducted May 6, 2010.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Tucker County High School was conducted May 21, 2011. The purpose of the follow-up was to verify correction of the findings 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.” Two of the 12 High Quality Standards cited during the May 6, 2010, audit had not been corrected and the State Board issued the school Temporary Accreditation status and a January 15, 2012, Date Certain to correct the remaining findings.

A Second Follow-up Education Performance Audit at Tucker County High School occurred February 28, 2012, to check if the remaining deficiencies (7.1.2. High expectations and 7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback) had been corrected.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

84 TUCKER COUNTY

Richard H. Hicks, Superintendent

501 TUCKER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL – Passed

David Dilly, Principal

Grades 09 - 12

Enrollment 384 (2nd month 2007-2008 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2007-2008

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
Mathematics								
All	84	87	85	97.70	71.42	Yes	Yes	✓
White	83	86	84	97.67	71.08	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	37	39	38	97.43	62.16	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	84	87	85	97.70	83.33	Yes	Yes	✓
White	83	86	84	97.67	83.13	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	37	39	38	97.43	75.67	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

**Passed
Graduation Rate = 94.1%**

84 TUCKER COUNTY
 Richard H. Hicks, Superintendent
501 TUCKER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL – Passed
 David Dilly, Principal
 Grades 09 - 12
 Enrollment 374 (2nd month 2008-2009 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2008-2009

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
Mathematics								
All	91	96	93	96.87	57.30	Yes	Yes	✓
White	90	95	92	96.84	56.81	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	46	48	46	95.83	51.11	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	91	96	93	96.87	33.70	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	90	95	92	96.84	34.09	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Low SES	46	48	46	95.83	28.88	NA	NA	NA
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year
 * -- 0 students in subgroup
 ** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Graduation Rate = 92.3%

84 TUCKER COUNTY
 Richard H. Hicks, Superintendent
501 TUCKER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL – Passed
 David Dilly, Principal
 Grades 09 - 12
 Enrollment 351 (2nd month 2009-2010 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2009-2010

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
Mathematics								
All	77	80	78	97.50	45.33	Yes	Yes	✓
White	76	79	77	97.46	44.59	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	43	45	44	97.77	38.09	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	77	80	78	97.50	22.66	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	76	79	77	97.46	22.97	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	43	45	44	97.77	21.42	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed

Graduation Rate = 94.7%

84 TUCKER COUNTY
 Richard H. Hicks, Superintendent
501 TUCKER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL – Needs Improvement
 James E. Hamric, Principal
 Grades 09 - 12
 Enrollment 318 (2nd month 2010-2011 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2010-2011

Group	Number Enrolled for FAY	Number Enrolled on Test Week	Number Tested	Participation Rate	Percent Proficient	Met Part. Rate Standard	Met Assessment Standard	Met Subgroup Standard
Mathematics								
All	75	77	76	98.70	37.33	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	75	77	76	98.70	37.33	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	43	45	44	97.77	25.58	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	75	77	76	98.70	29.33	Yes	No	✗
White	75	77	76	98.70	29.33	Yes	No	✗
Black	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Spec. Ed.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	43	45	44	97.77	20.93	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

**Passed
 Graduation Rate = 84.2%**

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Met Standard.

5.1.1. Achievement.

Tucker County High School achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the all students (AS) and the racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups in reading/language arts only by application of the confidence interval. It is further noted that the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup with the number (N) less than 50, scored far below the State's percent proficient level in reading/language arts. The county curriculum staff and school staff are urged to address these subgroups in the county and school Five-Year Strategic Plans and apply interventions to improve achievement of all students.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Information by Class indicated scores below mastery and novice in both mathematics and reading: Grade 11 – 42.70 percent in mathematics and 66.29 percent in reading. These scores have implication for the Five-Year Strategic Plan and school improvement.

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

1. Response to Intervention (RTI).
2. TechSteps.
3. National Writing Project.
4. Odyssey.
5. Support for Teaching Algebra and Algebra Support.
6. West Virginia Advanced Placement Fall Workshop.
7. West Virginia Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

MET STANDARD. Tucker County High School achieved AYP in the all students (AS) and the racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups in reading/language arts by application of the confidence interval. It was reported by the administration and staff that Tucker County High School has had 14 principals in the past 13 years, and this alone was extremely detrimental to the learning process. The new principal had implemented quality programs and practices to improve student success. According to all teachers interviewed, the principal had greatly improved the learning environment and student discipline incidents had declined by half from the previous year. Students and staff overwhelmingly reported that the atmosphere was more conducive to learning.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

MET STANDARD. This is the 1st year that Tucker County High School failed to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) in one or more subgroups designated in 5.1.1. Achievement. Tucker County High School failed to

achieve AYP in the all students (AS) and the racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups in reading/language arts. Tucker County High School achieved AYP in the AS and W subgroups in mathematics only by application of the confidence interval.

Changes in the percent proficient on the WESTEST2 from the 2009-2010 school year to the 2010-2011 school year showed substantial decreases in the percent of all subgroups proficient in mathematics and an increase in reading/language arts, except for the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup which declined in the percent proficient.

Mathematics: AS (-8.00 percent), W (-7.26 percent), and SES (-12.51 percent)

Reading/language arts: AS (+6.67 percent), W (+6.36 percent), and SES (-.51 percent).

EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT

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 educational opportunities including enrichment and acceleration. (Policy 2510)

Students in physical education were permitted to not participate in the physical education activities. The Team observed several students sitting on the bleachers while the remainder of the class was participating. One student sitting on the bleachers was not taking the class for credit and the teacher stated that he had no idea why the student was there in the first place.

Five teachers did not challenge students with higher level thinking skills. Basic questioning, answering, and recall were predominant instructional practices in these classes.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. The Team observed all students actively participating in the physical education classes in high quality activities.

It remained evident that rigor was still lacking in most of the English and mathematics classes. While the overall school atmosphere was improved and some improvements were made in the level of instruction, a lack of challenging curriculum remained. The principal indicated that while improvements had been made, staff development was being implemented to address areas identified in the deficiency and that extensive work was being done to continue this progress.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. All staff exhibited high expectations for all students. The staff received extensive training in higher order thinking skills, the Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI), Bloom's Taxonomy, varied instructional strategies, and high expectations. The principal and assistant principal were monitoring the progress made in these areas and reported that all staff members were providing high quality, interesting instruction. An IPI session held 04/04/11 showed 12.5 percent student disengagement and another IPI session held 09/21/11 showed 0 percent disengagement. This increase in engagement showed that the staff development implementation had been effective.

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 90 percent of the teachers had inadequate lesson plans that could not be followed by a substitute teacher. Approximately 80 percent of the teachers did not have lesson plans before April 2010. They reported that the former principal did not check lesson plans and did not require them. Special education teachers did not write plans in advance; they were journaling instead of planning.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. The principal had done extensive work on lesson planning. While the quality of lesson plans had improved, many lesson plans still needed more information and were weak. These lesson plans did not have enough material that would enable a substitute teacher to instruct the class. The principal had made quality comments on lesson plans and was continuing to guide teachers to improve lesson plans. Also, not all of the special education lesson plans had modifications for individual students.

NEW ISSUE: At least half of the teachers who taught multiple sections of the same class were keeping these classes on the same pace and not allowing for individual class differences or changes in the school schedule.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. All lesson plans checked by the Team were complete and thorough and could be followed by a substitute teacher. Each department was using a lesson plan template that was modified to meet the needs of the teacher of that subject.

All teachers who were teaching multiple sections of the same class showed evidence of variations for each class to allow for differences in pacing.

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 Tucker County High School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Tucker 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 Tucker 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 of the school was removed from the position three weeks before the arrival of the OEPA team. A director from the central office had been placed at the school and was effective at attempting to get things back in order. The Team believed that the school had been under ineffective guidance and had developed poor educational effectiveness. The high number and quality of the deficiencies found at the school were of great concern to the Team; however, the Team believed that the central office had taken a proactive approach to correcting the issues with the support given by the high quality acting principal and contracted service of Phillip Brown, a consultant in school improvement. Tucker County central office is advised that thorough and ongoing assistance will be necessary when the new principal is in place to ensure delivery of high quality and effective educational activities.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The new principal was making significant improvements. The principal and new assistant principal were knowledgeable of the school's needs and were providing high caliber leadership. Teachers and students reported that they felt safe and secure and the school environment was more positive than at any time in memory. The principal will need to continue to work on the rigor of student instruction in the core subject areas.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

All original deficiencies found at Tucker County High School had been corrected. The principal and teachers indicated that improvements in teaching had been made and that improvements in student achievement were expected in the spring WESTEST2.

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 Tucker County 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.**

The Team had strong questions as to the capacity of Tucker County High School and Tucker County to correct the deficiencies found at the school. The superintendent must ensure that the incoming principal has the capability to guide the school in the proper direction and provide high quality, research based staff development to enable teachers to deliver the required curriculum to increase student achievement.

The Team strongly recommended that the Tucker County School System Superintendent and the school administrator contact Mr. Charles Heinlein, Executive Director, Office of Organizational Effectiveness & Leadership, at 304-558-3199 to arrange a School Support System for correcting the deficiencies and improving student and school performance.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The Team believed that the new principal and assistant principal have the ability to continue to develop the capacity to lead the school in correcting all findings identified in this report.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The principal and assistant principal showed the capacity to correct the deficiencies found in the original Education Performance Audit. High quality staff development in high expectations and rigor and relevance had been implemented and the staff reported that student achievement in classes was increasing.

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 well landscaped, suitable for special instructional needs, and did not provide sufficient on-site, solid surface parking for staff, visitors, and individuals with disabilities.
- 19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** Copying equipment was not provided.
- 19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The music facility did not have music chairs with folding arms or acoustical treatment. The physical education facility did not have a drinking fountain, provisions for two or more teaching stations, a display case, instructional technology equipment, a data projector, or a 50 inch screen monitor.
- 19.1.11. Grades 6-12 science facilities.** All science classrooms were not located with easy access to outdoor activities and isolated to keep odors from the

remainder of the building. The following equipment and materials were not provided in all science classrooms: Sink, hot and cold water, gas, AC and DC current, compressed air, ventilation fume hood, demo table, sufficient laboratory workspace, fire extinguisher, blanket, emergency showers, first aid kit, chairs/tables, darkening provisions, and main gas shut-off.

- 19.1.12. Grades 7-12 auditorium/stage.** The auditorium was not located to have convenient access to language arts and music instructional areas and close to seating. Broadcasting capabilities were not provided.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

- 19.1.1. The school site was well landscaped, suitable for special instructional needs, and sufficient on-site, solid surface parking for staff, visitors, and individuals with disabilities was provided.
- 19.1.5. Copying equipment was provided.
- 19.1.10. The physical education facility had a drinking fountain, provisions for two or more teaching stations, instructional technology equipment, and a data projector.
- 19.1.11. The previous administrator had indicated that the science classes were not located with easy access to outdoor activities and isolated to keep odors from the remainder of the building. The current principal stated that he believed that the outside doors were in “close proximity” to the classes and that the odors were not an issue. All science facilities now had a ventilation fume hood, demo table, sufficient laboratory workspace, a fire extinguisher, blanket, emergency showers, first aid kit, and chairs/tables.

The facility issues that remained were: The music facility did not have music chairs with folding arms or acoustical treatment; the physical education facility did not have a display case or a 50 inch screen monitor; the science facilities did not have a sink, hot and cold water, gas AC and DC current, compressed air, darkening provisions, and main gas shut-off; the auditorium was not located to have convenient access to language arts and music instructional areas and close to seating and did not have broadcasting capabilities.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

- 19.1.10. The physical education facility had a display case.**
- 19.1.11. The science facilities had a sink, hot and cold water, and AC and DC current.**

All other facility resource needs remained as previously identified.

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.

It is strongly recommended that Tucker County High School pursue assistance from the Tucker County central office, RESA 7, the West Virginia Center for Professional Development, and the West Virginia Department of Education to increase student achievement in all areas. Given the high number and quality of deficiencies found at the school, it is imperative that programs and practices be implemented immediately in order to address these issues.

The School Support System presented under the Capacity Building Section will be an invaluable resource in guiding school improvement.

FOLLOW-UP TEAM SUMMARY

Tucker County High School had received assistance from the Tucker County Central Office, RESA 7, the West Virginia Center for Professional Development, and the West Virginia Department of Education. RESA 7 provided extensive assistance. The new administration was providing high quality leadership; however, the Team recommended that the principal continue to elicit assistance from the various agencies to aid in school improvement.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP TEAM SUMMARY

The school administrators continued to seek assistance from the Tucker County Central Office, RESA 7, and the West Virginia Department of Education. Through staff development in the areas of high expectations, time on task, and varied instructional strategies, the staff reported that student achievement in classes was increasing, and student discipline issues were dramatically decreasing.

SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

School	Accreditation Status	Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards	Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement	Date Certain
84-501 Tucker County High	Full Accreditation			

Education Performance Audit Summary

The remaining deficiencies (7.1.2. High expectations and 7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback) had been corrected. The Office of Education Performance Audits recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education upgrade the status of Tucker County High School from Temporary Accreditation status to Full Accreditation status.