



**INITIAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT**

**FOR**

**SHORT LINE SCHOOL**

**WETZEL COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM**

**MAY 2014**

**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION**

## Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction .....	2
Education Performance Audit Team .....	2
School Performance .....	3
Annual Performance Measures For Accountability - Analysis .....	10
Education Performance Audit.....	11
High Quality Standards .....	11
Indicators Of Efficiency.....	14
Building Capacity To Correct Deficiencies.....	15
Identification Of Resource Needs.....	17
Early Detection And Intervention .....	18
Education Performance Audit Summary .....	19

## INTRODUCTION

An announced Education Performance Audit of Short Line School in Wetzel County was conducted March 5, 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 school personnel and school system administrators, observed classrooms, and examined school records.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT TEAM

Office of Education Performance Audits Team Chair – Allen D. Brock, Coordinator

West Virginia Department of Education – Teresa Epperley, Coordinator, Office of Professional Preparation (Certification)

West Virginia Department of Education – Brad Fittro, Coordinator, Office of Professional Preparation (Certification)

West Virginia Department of Education Technology – Lori Whitt, Coordinator, Office of Instructional Technology

## TEAM MEMBERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>School/County</b>
Allen R. Laugh	Elementary School Principal	Creed Collins Elementary School Ritchie County
Thomas N. Wood	General Supervisor	Marshall County

## SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

### 92 WETZEL COUNTY

Dennis Albright, Superintendent

### 204 SHORT LINE SCHOOL – SUPPORT

Teresa Standiford, Principal

Grades PK-08, Enrollment 418 (2<sup>nd</sup> month 2012-2013 enrollment report)

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 Short Line School a Support school. The majority of student groups have not met the annual academic goals in mathematics and reading/language arts; and the school has not reached its goals in attendance or graduation rates, student academic growth, and learning gaps between student groups. The school must show progress in student achievement each year to maintain or improve this designation. A school’s designation is determined once a year based on prior school year data, including WESTEST2 results.

### Designation Status for Short Line School.

Designation:	SUPPORT	Next Year’s Target:	46.265
Index Score:	30.5247	Met at least 50% of targets in Mathematics and Reading:	NO
Index Target:	43.1416	Met Participation Rate Indicator:	YES
Met Index Target:	NO		

### Supporting Data

Proficiency (40% of the index score)	6.98
Achievement Gaps Closed (20% of the index score)	11.15
Observed Growth (15% of the index score)	3.98
Adequate Growth (20% of the index score)	3.50
<u>Attendance Rate (5% of the index score)</u>	<u>4.92</u>
<u>Total Accountability Index (out of 100)</u>	<u>30.52</u>

The West Virginia Accountability Index targets are set for each school to reach progressively higher performance on a defined set of data. Schools have 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 are set with a goal of all elementary and middle schools in West Virginia reaching elementary 74.6679 and middle 65.0053 by 2020. Proficiency targets are set at 75 percent for all students in all subgroups by 2020.

Short Line School did not achieve the Accountability Index Target for the 2013-2014 school year. Considering the achievement target index of 46.265 for 2014 and the proficiency target of 75 percent by 2020, with a current index score of 30.5247, Short Line School has a steep trajectory to achieve both short term and long term targets. A significant gap exists in both the WVAI target and the target of 75 percent proficient by 2020.

**SHORT LINE 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%	84.09%	15.91%	> 95%	65.91%	34.09%
3	Special Education	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
3	Low Socioeconomic Status	> 95%	80.77%	19.23%	> 95%	76.92%	23.08%
3	Total	> 95%	84.09%	15.91%	> 95%	65.91%	34.09%
4	White	> 95%	62.86%	37.14%	> 95%	74.29%	25.71%
4	Special Education	> 95%	88.89%	11.11%	> 95%	77.78%	22.22%
4	Low Socioeconomic Status	> 95%	85.00%	15.00%	> 95%	85.00%	15.00%
4	Total	> 95%	62.86%	37.14%	> 95%	74.29%	25.71%
5	White	95.00%	60.53%	39.47%	95.00%	63.16%	36.84%
5	Special Education	> 95%	70.00%	30.00%	> 95%	90.00%	10.00%
5	Low Socioeconomic Status	90.91%	50.00%	50.00%	90.91%	70.00%	30.00%
5	Total	95.00%	60.53%	39.47%	95.00%	63.16%	36.84%
6	White	91.89%	76.47%	23.53%	91.89%	61.76%	38.24%
6	Special Education	> 95%	>95%	< 5%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
6	Low Socioeconomic Status	86.96%	75.00%	25.00%	86.96%	60.00%	40.00%
6	Total	91.89%	76.47%	23.53%	91.89%	61.76%	38.24%
7	White	> 95%	75.00%	25.00%	> 95%	54.17%	45.83%
7	Special Education	> 95%	83.33%	16.67%	> 95%	>95%	< 5%
7	Low Socioeconomic Status	92.31%	70.83%	29.17%	92.31%	66.67%	33.33%
7	Total	> 95%	75.00%	25.00%	> 95%	54.17%	45.83%
8	White	95.00%	68.42%	31.58%	95.00%	57.89%	42.11%
8	Special Education	> 95%	66.67%	33.33%	> 95%	88.89%	11.11%
8	Low Socioeconomic Status	> 95%	65.00%	35.00%	> 95%	75.00%	25.00%
8	Total	95.00%	68.42%	31.58%	95.00%	57.89%	42.11%

**Attendance Rate = 98.40%**

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.

In mathematics, Grade 5 had the highest level of proficiency with 39.47 percent proficient, followed by Grade 4 with 37.14 percent proficient, Grade 8 with 31.58 percent proficient, Grade 7 with 25.00 percent proficient, Grade 6 with 23.53 percent proficient, and Grade 3 with 15.91 percent proficient. A pattern was not present from one grade level to the next with the individual subgroups; however, the low socioeconomic subgroup scored higher than the total of the individual grade levels in each grade except Grade 4.

In reading/language arts, Grade 7 had the highest level of proficiency with 45.83 percent proficient, followed by Grade 8 with 42.11 percent proficient, Grade 6 with 38.24 percent proficient, Grade 5 with 36.84 percent proficient, Grade 3 with 34.09 percent proficient, and Grade 4 with 25.71 percent proficient. A pattern was not present from one grade level to the next with the individual subgroups; however, the pattern for the low socioeconomic subgroup was opposite of that in mathematics as this subgroup was lower than the individual grade level total in all grades except Grade 6.

## SHORT LINE 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	89 (45%)	69 (35%)	40 (20%)	39.0	27.9%	79 (40%)	70 (36%)	48 (24%)	42.0	37.2%
	County	568 (38%)	481 (32%)	461 (31%)	46.0	35.8%	520 (35%)	459 (31%)	520 (35%)	49.0	45.9%
	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	48.8%
White Sub-Group	School	89 (45%)	69 (35%)	40 (20%)	39.0	27.9%	79 (40%)	70 (36%)	48 (24%)	42.0	37.2%
	County	558 (38%)	473 (32%)	447 (30%)	46.0	35.9%	507 (35%)	452 (31%)	508 (35%)	49.0	46.0%
	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	22 (52%)	15 (36%)	5 (12%)	32.0	16.3%	18 (44%)	16 (39%)	7 (17%)	40.0	8.2%
	County	116 (46%)	85 (34%)	52 (21%)	38.0	11.4%	95 (38%)	89 (35%)	67 (27%)	43.0	11.4%
	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	67 (43%)	54 (35%)	35 (22%)	39.0	30.8%	61 (39%)	54 (35%)	41 (26%)	44.0	44.4%
	County	452 (36%)	396 (32%)	409 (33%)	47.0	40.9%	425 (34%)	370 (30%)	453 (36%)	50.0	53.0%
	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	51 (46%)	36 (33%)	23 (21%)	40.0	27.3%	53 (49%)	33 (30%)	23 (21%)	38.0	27.3%
	County	303 (41%)	238 (32%)	192 (26%)	43.0	23.9%	280 (39%)	208 (29%)	239 (33%)	46.0	33.1%
	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	40.8%
Non-LSES Sub-Group	School	38 (43%)	33 (38%)	17 (19%)	38.0	28.7%	26 (30%)	37 (42%)	25 (28%)	44.0	50.0%
	County	265 (34%)	243 (31%)	269 (35%)	49.0	47.2%	240 (31%)	251 (33%)	281 (36%)	52.0	58.2%
	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	44 (44%)	38 (38%)	17 (17%)	40.0	28.1%	39 (40%)	34 (35%)	25 (26%)	44.0	32.8%
	County	282 (36%)	273 (35%)	224 (29%)	47.0	38.4%	289 (38%)	242 (31%)	239 (31%)	47.0	39.9%
	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	45 (45%)	31 (31%)	23 (23%)	39.0	27.7%	40 (40%)	36 (36%)	23 (23%)	40.0	42.0%
	County	286 (39%)	208 (28%)	237 (32%)	45.0	33.1%	231 (32%)	217 (30%)	281 (39%)	52.0	52.1%
	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 the 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. Short Line School scores showed low growth for the special education subgroup in mathematics, while all other subgroups showed typical growth. All subgroups demonstrated typical growth in reading/language arts.

**Mathematics.** As the chart indicates, the schoolwide percent proficient in mathematics was 27.9 percent. The special education subgroup (16.3 percent) scored 14.5 percent lower than the non-special education subgroup (30.8 percent); the low socioeconomic subgroup (27.3 percent) scored 1.4 percent lower than the non-low socioeconomic subgroup (28.7 percent). Males (28.1 percent) scored 0.4 percent higher proficiency than females (27.7 percent).

**Reading/Language Arts.** Reading/language arts schoolwide percent proficient was 37.2 percent. The special education subgroup (8.2 percent) scored 36.2 percent lower than the non-special education subgroup (44.4 percent); the low socioeconomic subgroup (27.3 percent) scored 22.7 percent lower than the non-low socioeconomic subgroup (50.0 percent). Females (42.0 percent) scored 9.2 percent higher proficiency than males (32.8 percent).

### **ACT EXPLORE Assessment Results**

The ACT EXPLORE Test is designed to assess middle school students' general educational development and their complex, critical thinking skills. The tests cover four curriculum areas: English, mathematics, reading, and science reasoning. In addition, information about students' educational career plans, interests, high school course work plans, and self-identified needs for assistance is gathered and reported.

The purpose of this assessment is to provide career awareness exploration activities. The results are used by students in Grade 8 to develop their individualized plans for Grades 9 and 10. Assessment results assist students, parents, and educators in decision-making about educational career plans, interests, and high school course work plans. ACT EXPLORE scores provide early indicators of whether students are on track for college. When students are not meeting the national benchmarks, teachers can use this information in a timely manner to focus on areas of need.

Benchmarks: English: 13      Reading: 15      Math: 17      Science: 20

<b>ACT EXPLORE RESULTS</b>			
<b>Grade 8</b>			
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
English WV	14.1	14.1	14.3
English Wetzel County	13.6	14.2	14.7
English Short Line School	12.8	13.4	13.9
Mathematics WV	14.8	14.6	14.8
Mathematics Wetzel County	14.3	14.0	14.0
Mathematics Short Line School	13.1	13.5	13.4
Reading WV	14.1	14.0	14.0
Reading Wetzel County	13.7	14.2	14.4
Reading Short Line School	12.7	14.4	14.1
Science WV	15.9	15.8	16.0
Science Wetzel County	15.7	15.6	16.1
Science Short Line School	15.0	14.9	15.7
Composite WV	14.8	14.8	14.9
Composite Wetzel County	14.5	14.6	14.9
Composite Short Line School	13.4	14.1	14.5

Source: [http://wvde.state.wv.us/oa/EXPLORE/EXPLORE\\_index.html](http://wvde.state.wv.us/oa/EXPLORE/EXPLORE_index.html)

The ACT EXPLORE trend data over the past three years indicated increases in English and the composite score. Mathematics and reading showed a slight increase from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012, then a decrease in scores from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. The national benchmark scores are indicated above the chart. The 2012-2013 ACT EXPLORE results showed that Short Line School scored slightly above the benchmark in English, but below the benchmark in mathematics, reading, and science. Students scored lower than the county and State averages in all areas except for the State average in reading.

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

Schoolwide, mathematics scores are the lowest in the last four years. In reading/language arts, the trend is the same; scores are the lowest in the last four years. Mathematics scores have fluctuated approximately 9 percentage points and reading/language arts scores have fluctuated approximately 7.4 percent over the same four years. The low socioeconomic subgroup increased from 2009-2010 to 2011-2012, then declined in 2012-2013; and this decline in 2012-2013 was also the case in reading/language arts. The special education subgroup declined 5.51 percent in mathematics and 4.52 in reading/language arts from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. The State's accountability focus in 2012-2013 moved to growth, and scores indicated that almost all subgroups, with the exception of the special education subgroup in mathematics, demonstrated typical growth.

According to the principal, the following professional development and/or training opportunities were provided to the staff.

1. Leadership Training.
2. Suicide Prevention.
3. Acuity and STAR.
4. TechSteps.
5. Next Generation Standards.
6. WESTEST2 Data Analysis.
7. Star Lab NASA Training/Rocketry/Robotics.
8. Anti-bullying.
9. Professional Teaching Standards.
10. WV Reading Association Standards.
11. Education City.
12. Crisis Prevention Intervention.
13. New Teacher Evaluation System.

Prior to the Education Performance Audit, the OEPA staff provided an in-service to Short Line School staff January 30, 2014, to review the standards in Policy 2320 and prepare staff for the audit.

## **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 education opportunities including reteaching, enrichment, and acceleration. (Policy 2510)**

One Grade 5-6 teacher did not exhibit high expectations for all students. The teacher sat at the teacher's desk the entire 30 minute observation period while students graded their own tests. High quality instruction was not occurring as no critical thinking skills were required and there was no direct instruction or student engagement in learning activities. The assistant principal had written on the lesson plan feedback form that the only materials used in the class were videos and worksheets.

**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)**

Science was not being instructed with 50 percent minimum investigation, hands-on activities and experimentation in all classes. Science instruction mostly involved textbooks and worksheets. 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." The Grade 7-8 teacher stated that science instruction was only between 40-50 percent hands on.

**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)**

One Grade 7-8 reading/language arts teacher was instructing the Grade 7 and the Grade 8 classes with no differentiation in curriculum, content standards and objectives, or consideration for grade level needs. Lesson plans were the same for both classes. The Team could not verify that the Next Generation Standards were being addressed in each individual class.

**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)**

The Team could not verify that all Grade 7 and 8 teachers were conducting writing assignments in classes other than in reading/language arts. During the interview process, teachers in areas other than reading/language arts could not verify that writing was occurring at least one time per week, and three teachers stated that "writing was taken care of in the English classes."

## **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)**

One teacher had incomplete lesson plans with "study hall" and "free day" were written on some days. The plans could not be followed by a substitute teacher to guide classroom instruction. The assistant principal had written comments on this teacher's lesson plan feedback forms indicating that the lessons were weak; however, the teacher had not improved the quality of the plans. Only two weeks of the 22 weeks had dates on the plans; however, the assistant principal had written on the lesson plan feedback form that the plans were up to date.

One Grade 8 reading/language arts teacher's lesson plans were incomplete and could not be followed by a substitute teacher. The information included in the lesson plans was sparse and not thorough enough to teach the entire class period. The teacher had the same two strategies (group work and reading) checked for every day.

One Grade 8 special education teacher was using the general education teacher's lesson plans; however, modifications were not listed for the special education students being served. The Team could not verify that the modifications were listed where a substitute teacher could access them and implement the modifications for daily use.

**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)**

Grades 7 and 8 teachers stated they only reviewed WESTEST2 scores at the beginning of the year. When asked about testing and data analysis, these teachers could not clearly articulate how the data analysis was occurring and what they were doing with the results. The Team could not verify that changes in classroom curriculum delivery were being made based on student needs indicated by data analysis.

## **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)**

Four teachers did not hold the appropriate endorsement for the classes taught.

## **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)**

Due to the high number of deficiencies and the low student performance at Short Line School, the Team determined that the principal needed to receive additional support from the Wetzel County Central Office, RESA 6, the West Virginia Center for Professional Development, and the West Virginia Department of Education. While the Team observed evidence that the principal provided corrective feedback to teachers through notes on lesson plan review sheets and walk-through feedback, teachers did not adjust instruction based on the principal's feedback to improve instruction. The principal must continue to monitor classroom instruction to ensure that all teachers exhibit high expectations for all students and challenge students to produce their highest quality work. The principal must ensure that high quality data analysis drives the curriculum in all classes.

## 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 Short Line School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Wetzel 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 Wetzel 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.**

Student achievement at Short Line School was lower than acceptable. One area that the school must investigate is the amount of time students are in class. The class periods were 40 minutes each. The school has a Career Awareness time and a Learning Skills time that, combined, account for 70 minutes at the end of the day. The school is urged to adjust the time for Career Awareness and Learning Skills classes and increase the time in the core classes. A 40-minute period is considerably less than 40 minutes when beginning class preparation time and wrap-up time.

Grade 3 scores were below all other grades in mathematics and reading/language arts, with the exception being Grade 4 mathematics. Through the interview process, the Team found that a weak and ineffective teacher was in the Grade 3 classroom last school year. The principal and staff believed that this was a major factor in the lower test scores.

The principal had examined each individual student's WESTEST2 scores and compared the 2012-2013 scores to the 2011-2012 scores to assess what percent of students had improved in achievement and what percent had not improved. This analysis was based on raw scores, with Grade 3 having no scores as Grade 2 students did not take the WESTEST2 and Grade 8 students had moved to the high school. The following chart shows the results of this analysis.

	MATHEMATICS		READING/LANGUAGE ARTS	
	Improved	Not improved	Improved	Not Improved
4	47%	53%	53%	43%
5	79%	11%	51%	49%
6	53%	47%	58%	42%
7	76%	24%	56%	44%

## 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 Short Line 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 - Support

The school and students will receive additional support. The majority of services will be led by the local school district, with support from the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) and the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE). The school will complete a targeted strategic plan and will be monitored throughout the year to review progress. The local school system and the local RESA will partner to provide professional development, technical assistance, interventions and develop an improvement plan. The school must show progress in student achievement each year to improve this designation. A school's designation is determined each year based on prior school year data, including WESTEST2 results.

The Team determined that Short Line School and Wetzel County have not demonstrated the capacity to improve student and school performance. The principal and staff must ensure that all students are on task with high quality instruction and that data guides curriculum delivery. The Team recommended the Wetzel County School System, Director of Curriculum, and school administrator engage the Director of Curriculum and the Professional Development Director at RESA 6 in developing the school's capacity to improve the school's achievement.

The school had implemented a variety of programs and practices buildingwide to increase student achievement.

- A. All teachers have a common plan time for professional learning communities.
- B. Vocabulary across the curriculum.
- C. Walk-throughs to determine areas of weakness.
- D. Co-teaching training and implementation.
- E. Number Talks to increase mathematics achievement.
- F. Vertical alignment to assist teachers in curriculum delivery.
- G. After school tutoring for students who need additional assistance.
- H. Summer school for students interested in attending.

- I. Academic Coaches to assist teachers in developing classroom curriculum.
- J. Greater use of data from Acuity, STAR, formal, and informal assessments.
- K. Mathematics and reading programs were being utilized for student needs.
- L. Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) training for 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.**

- 19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** On-line periodical indexes and copying equipment were not provided. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)
- 19.1.7. K classrooms.** The Kindergarten classrooms did not have a sink or hot and cold water. (Did not adversely impact student performance.)
- 19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** The music facility lacked adequate size, did not have adequate storage, and did not have music chairs with folding arms or acoustical treatment. The physical education facility did not have a display case. (May adversely impact program and student performance.)
- 19.1.15. Health service units.** The health services unit did not have curtained or small rooms with cots or a refrigerator with locked storage. (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.**

Short Line School has implemented programs and practices to increase student achievement. The school has WESTEST2, Acuity, and STAR results to indicate the areas of weakness; however, all teachers were not using the results effectively. This, coupled with the relatively short class time, was detrimental to student achievement. Additional professional development in high expectations and data analysis would be beneficial, and the principal must monitor implementation of this professional development. Teachers must examine the areas of weakness on the formal and informal assessments and adjust curriculum delivery to diminish the areas of weakness.

## EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT SUMMARY

Short Line 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 Short Line School in improvement efforts.

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

7.1.2. High expectations.

7.1.4. Instruction.

7.1.5. Instructional strategies.

7.1.6. Instruction in writing.

7.2.3. Lesson plans and principal feedback.

7.2.4. Data analysis.

7.6.2. Licensure.

7.8.1. Leadership.

The Team noted an indicator of efficiency, offered capacity building resources, and noted early detection and intervention concerns.

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 Short Line School and Wetzel 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.