



**Office of Education
Performance Audits**

FINAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

FOR

MARTIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

WOOD COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

AUGUST 2009

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The West Virginia Office of Education Performance Audits conducted an Education Performance Audit of Martin Elementary School in Wood County on April 24, 2008.

A Follow-up Education Performance Audit of Martin Elementary School in Wood County was conducted May 14, 2009. 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.”

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

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

96 WOOD COUNTY

William A. Niday, Superintendent

238 MARTIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Passed

Ronda Lemon, Principal

Grades K - 06

Enrollment 300 (2nd month 2005-2006 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2005-2006

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	138	161	159	98.75	72.99	Yes	Yes	✓
White	133	156	154	98.71	72.72	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	84	99	98	98.98	63.85	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	30	35	34	97.14	41.37	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	138	161	159	98.75	67.88	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	133	156	154	98.71	67.42	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	84	99	98	98.98	60.24	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	30	35	34	97.14	27.58	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Attendance Rate = 97.4%

96 WOOD COUNTY
William A. Niday, Superintendent
238 MARTIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Needs Improvement
Ronda Lemon, Principal
Grades K - 06
Enrollment 307 (2nd month 2006-2007 enrollment report)

WESTEST 2006-2007

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	156	172	171	99.41	74.19	Yes	Yes	✓
White	153	169	168	99.40	74.34	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	106	120	120	100.00	66.03	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	40	43	42	97.67	28.20	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	156	172	171	99.41	68.38	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	153	169	168	99.40	68.42	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	106	120	120	100.00	59.43	Yes	No	✗
Spec. Ed.	40	43	42	97.67	25.64	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Attendance Rate = 97.2%

96 WOOD COUNTY
William A. Niday, Superintendent
238 MARTIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Passed
Ronda Lemon, Principal
Grades K - 06
Enrollment 317 (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	158	175	174	99.42	73.88	Yes	Yes	✓
White	153	169	168	99.40	73.68	Yes	Yes	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	107	118	117	99.15	66.98	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Spec. Ed.	39	41	40	97.56	26.31	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reading/Language Arts								
All	158	175	174	99.42	70.70	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
White	153	169	168	99.40	69.73	Yes	Confidence Interval	✓
Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Low SES	107	118	117	99.15	65.09	Yes	Safe Harbors	✓
Spec. Ed.	39	41	40	97.56	21.05	NA	NA	NA
LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

FAY -- Full Academic Year

* -- 0 students in subgroup

** -- Less than 10 students in subgroup

Passed
Attendance Rate = 96.7%

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Met Standard.

5.1.1. Achievement.

Martin Elementary School was 1st year out on adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the economically disadvantaged students (SES) subgroup in reading/language arts.

Martin Elementary School achieved AYP in the SES subgroup in mathematics and 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 special education (SE) subgroup with the number (N) less than 50, declined from the 2005-2006 school year to the 2006-2007 school year in both mathematics and reading/language arts. The county curriculum staff and school staff are urged to address these subgroups in the county and school Five-Year Strategic Plan and apply interventions to improve achievement of all students.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Information by Class indicated scores below mastery in both mathematics and reading: Grade 3 – 30.95 percent in mathematics and 38.11 percent in reading; Grade 4 – 26.32 percent in reading; Grade 5 – 36.11 percent in mathematics and 33.33 percent in reading; Grade 6 – 28.21 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. Literacy Centers K-06.
2. Developing Integrated Units.
3. West Virginia State Reading and Mathematics Conferences.
4. Differentiated Instruction.
5. Communicating with Parents.
6. Grade Level Collaboration.
7. National Reading Conference.
8. Guided Reading Workshop.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

MET STANDARD. Martin Elementary School achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the economically disadvantaged (SES) subgroup in mathematics and the all student and the racial/ethnicity white (W) subgroups in reading/language arts by application of the confidence interval and the SES subgroup in reading/language arts by safe harbors. There was a decrease in the percent of students scoring at proficient in the

SES and special education (SE) subgroups in mathematics and the special education (SP) subgroup in reading/language arts.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Information by Class indicated scores below mastery in both mathematics and reading: Grade 3 – 35.72 percent in mathematics and 47.62 percent in reading/language arts; Grade 4 – 24.00 percent in reading/language arts; Grade 5 – 23.81 percent in reading/language arts. The Grade 3 score in reading/language arts with only 52.38 percent of the students scoring at mastery was particularly alarming.

The faculty had been involved in reviewing and revising the Five-Year Strategic Plan. The plan had additional action steps and strategies to improve instruction and student achievement.

Additional professional development and/or training opportunities were provided the staff as reported by the principal.

- 1. West Virginia 21st Century content standards and objectives (CSOs) Training.**
- 2. Representative Attendance at the West Virginia Reading Association Conference.**
- 3. Early Childhood Workshop – Ready, Set, Go.**
- 4. Representative Attendance at the West Virginia Research Symposium.**
- 5. Learning Centers and Decluttering Your Room – Debbie Dillard Associates.**
- 6. Special K (Kindergarten) Book Study.**
- 7. Differentiated Instruction.**
- 8. “The Power of Reading” Accelerated Reader Conference Teaming.**
- 9. Standards Based Math.**
- 10. Electronic Whiteboard.**
- 11. Odyssey Computer Program.**

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)**

Two special education students were in the care of an aide for “free time” from 10:25 a.m. to 10:50 a.m. These students were watching a movie, “The Charlie Brown Great Pumpkin.” The Team could not verify that this was not a regular occurrence.

One teacher placed a Kindergarten student in the hallway for disciplinary reasons and stated that this was done on a regular basis. The student was unsupervised.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. All teachers had been instructed to supervise students at all times. The teacher and aide cited above were no longer at Martin Elementary School. The Team did not observe students in the hallways for disciplinary reasons.

The school policy does not permit teachers to exclude students from class into the hallways without supervision. Interviews with teachers confirmed this was not a common occurrence. The principal monitored the hallways during class with security cameras from the office to ensure students were not unsupervised in the hallways. The teacher cited retired and was no longer a member of the staff.

- 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)**

While the Team observed excellent collaboration between general, special education, and Title I educators throughout the building, one mathematics teacher did not vary instruction for the duration of the observation. The Title I teacher joined the class and continued the same lecture already in progress. This was also observed in a different grade level mathematics class. One additional teacher also did not vary instruction.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed lesson plans, interviewed the principal and teachers, and observed classroom instruction to verify teachers were varying instruction with different instructional strategies. The staff had additional professional development on using varying, differentiated instructional strategies.

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)

Feedback was not provided on lesson plans. At least 40 percent of the plans observed were minimal, redundant, and incomplete. The principal must make corrective action comments to strengthen lesson plans.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. The principal provided the Team copies of lesson plan reviews covering the school year to date. These reviews showed all teachers except two had received at least three lesson plan reviews throughout this year. If the lesson plans were reviewed and commented upon each quarter as reported by the principal, the reviews were not distributed to teachers each quarter. Interviews with teachers did not confirm these reviews had taken place. Teachers reported they had only received copies of the lesson plan reviews the evening before or the morning of the follow-up audit review. Teachers were unaware of the lesson plan reviews until that time when they reported finding the lesson plan reviews in their mailboxes.

Lesson plans randomly reviewed in classrooms by the Team were found to be complete enough for a substitute teacher to be able to follow and carry on meaningful instruction.

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)

One Grade 2 teacher stated that she did not have copies of DIBELS reports. The Team saw this as extremely detrimental in the process of increasing student achievement. All teachers must be provided the necessary data to develop a roadmap to improve the student achievement gap.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The principal reported that teachers have the information on their computers and were to run their own DIBELS reports. All teachers except the one cited herein were running their DIBELS reports last year. All teachers were running the DIBELS reports this year (2008-2009).

7.5. Administrative Practices and School-Community Relations

7.5.1. Parents and the community are provided information. Staff members provide parents and the community with understandable information and techniques for helping students learn.

One teacher still had the pink eligibility meeting forms for special education (parent copy) in the student file and had not mailed this to the parents. This teacher also had disclosure forms with a blanket date of 2007-2008 with no specific date that the files were accessed. Another teacher had disclosure forms that were unsigned. One special education teacher had six parent copies of eligibility meeting notifications in files that had not been delivered.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. Two of the teachers cited were not available for interview by the follow-up Team as they were not at school on the day of the review. Special education teachers interviewed told the Team they could communicate better with most parents of the special education students with personal notes rather than the formal forms. They used the personal notes to get parents to the meetings and asked the parents to sign the formal forms while they were at school. The school had a special education compliance review on February 26, 2009, and did not have any compliance findings or recommendations.

7.6. Personnel

7.6.3. Evaluation. The county board adopts and implements an evaluation policy for professional and service personnel that is in accordance with W.Va. Code, West Virginia Board of Education policy, and county policy. (W.Va. Code §18A-2-12; Policy 5310; Policy 5314)

No teacher observations and evaluations were presented for Team review. Teacher interviews indicated that no official observations had been conducted this school year.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

COMPLIANCE. The Team reviewed teacher observations completed by the principal this year and found them in compliance with requirements of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5310 and the Wood County Board of Education policy on personnel evaluations. Staff members interviewed confirmed the principal reviewed the observations with them.

7.6.4. Teacher and principal internship. The county board develops and implements a beginning teacher internship program and a beginning principal internship program that conform with W.Va. Code and West Virginia Board of Education policies. (W.Va. Code §18A-3-2b and 2d; Policy 5899; Policy 5900)

The school librarian had a mentor assigned; however, they did not meet on a regular basis.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. Martin Elementary School had one beginning teacher this year eligible for a mentor. The mentor had been assigned and met regularly with the beginning teacher. The professional support team (comprised of the school principal as chair, a member of the county professional staff development council, and an experienced classroom teacher at the school who teaches the same or similar subject and grade level as the beginning teacher {the mentor teacher if possible}) had not been formed and had not met monthly to discuss the performance of the beginning teacher as required by West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5900 and the Wood County Board of Education policy on beginning teacher mentoring program.

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

7.7.1. School rules, procedures, and expectations. School rules, procedures, and expectations are written; clearly communicated to students, parents, and staff; and enforced. (Policy 2510; Policy 4373)

Teachers reported that discipline was not consistently applied. Teachers stated that behavior disorder students sent to the office for disciplinary reasons were given treats to improve behavior. This was seen as more of a reward for students than disciplinary action. Classes had individual discipline procedures and there was no schoolwide procedures reported by the teachers.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. Interviews with the principal indicated only a few students had been sent to the office this year for disciplinary purposes. WVEIS discipline records showed nine different students had been sent to the principal a total of 33 times (one student had 15 of these 33 visits to the

principal's office) this year. The principal reported that she tried to treat all students fairly. Interviews with teachers found no change in the teachers' attitudes that disciplinary action by the principal was ineffective. The principal reported a schoolwide system for discipline was in place – the Three “A’s” – Academics, Attendance, and Attitude. Students were rewarded on Friday of each week with a special program for students who qualify. Interviews with teachers indicated they did not think the school had a schoolwide disciplinary program as each teacher was responsible for setting the student discipline policy and procedures for the classroom. There was an agreed upon set of rules for the hallways and other places outside the classrooms. This issue did not appear to be resolved.

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 nature and number of deficiencies identified at Martin Elementary School, the Team determined that technical assistance from the central office administration, the West Virginia Department of Education, and RESA V be provided to assist the principal in management and leadership.

The high number of deficiencies and the strong nature of the deficiencies were indicative of a school that was not operating smoothly. The principal must actively seek assistance to develop a cooperative atmosphere and ensure that all staff are providing high quality instruction.

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

NONCOMPLIANCE. The principal reported that the elementary school director was always available to offer advice and assistance and visited the school on occasions and reviewed the school operations with the principal. The principal had been assigned two other in-county elementary principals to serve as a support team and offer suggestions on ways to improve the school's operations. The principal attended the Center for Professional Development (CPD) Evaluation Leadership Training during the summer of 2008. RESA V provided professional development on differentiated instruction by Larry Lezotte and will provide the 4-Day Quality Learning Workshop with David Langford in August 2009. A RESA V staff member provided DIBELS training. The uncooperative attitude appeared to remain between the staff of the school and the principal and may be having a negative effect on instruction and student achievement.

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 Martin Elementary School in providing a thorough and efficient system of education. Wood 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 Wood 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 become more active in monitoring programs and practices in the building. Low quality lesson plans and nonexistent teacher observations and evaluations are directly related to the principal's supervision. It is also imperative that the principal mend the perception that some students are receiving preferential treatment when they are sent to the office. If the administration does not take a more active and aggressive role in monitoring the school, student achievement may continue to be an issue.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The principal's activity in monitoring lesson plans and instruction with classroom walkthroughs and the personnel evaluation process did not appear to be effective in improving instruction and student achievement. The low achievement scores of the Grade 3 class in mathematics and reading/language arts on the WESTEST may be indicative of uncooperativeness of staff and lack of effective monitoring by the principal. The school did not have a cohesive staff/principal relationship that was conducive to developing a smoothly operating, high achieving school climate that will inspire student learning and academic achievement.

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 Martin 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.**

The above listed offices at the West Virginia Department of Education are recommended to assist the principal in correcting the deficiencies in this report. Also, the Wood County central office, RESA V, and the West Virginia Center for Professional Development should be approached for assistance.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

The principal attended the 21st Century Leadership Academy and the Evaluation Leadership Institute provided by the West Virginia Center for Professional Development and several administrator professional development training sessions offered by RESA V. The Wood County central office provided assistance to the principal through the director of elementary education and provided a support team consisting of two other county elementary principals to offer assistance and advice to the principal.

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 playgrounds/recreational areas were not well equipped and appropriate for the age level.
- 19.1.5. Library/media and technology center.** Newspapers and recordings were not available.
- 19.1.10. Specialized instructional areas.** Acoustical treatment was not available in the music facilities.

FOLLOW-UP CONCLUSION

No Change.

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.

Martin Elementary School is likely to maintain the course of its performance levels if it does not receive continuous and sustained technical assistance from State education agencies. The administration must actively monitor the various aspects of the school and ensure that high quality, research based programs and practices are employed in all classrooms to close the achievement gap.

FOLLOW-UP TEAM SUMMARY

Assistance with operating Martin Elementary School had been provided to the principal by the West Virginia Center for Professional Development, RESA V, and the central office staff of Wood County Schools. Staff development on effective, varied classroom teaching strategies had been provided the Martin Elementary School staff. The achievement gap, especially at the Grade 3 level, had widened considerably between the 2007 and 2008 WESTEST. The administration had not been highly effective in monitoring the classroom instruction with lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs.

SCHOOL ACCREDITATION STATUS

School	Accreditation Status	Education Performance Audit High Quality Standards	Annual Performance Measures Needing Improvement	Date Certain
96-238 Martin Elementary	Temporary Accreditation	7.2.3; 7.6.4; 7.7.1; 7.8.1		November 1, 2009

Education Performance Audit Summary

Pursuant to W.Va. Code §18-2E-5, the Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA) recommends that the West Virginia Board of Education issue Martin Elementary School Temporary Accreditation status with an November 1, 2009 Date Certain to correct the remaining findings.

The OEPA will conduct another follow-up review after November 1, 2009 to determine that improvement efforts have been sustained and the remaining standards have been corrected.