

# Doddridge County Schools

Administration  
Janice M. Michels, Superintendent  
Richard L. Oyler, General Director  
John C. Wolfe, Director of Finance  
Diana L. Knight, Director of Attendance  
Alvin D. Ross, Director of Support Services



Board Members  
Denver L. Burnside, President  
William J. Curran, Vice President  
Roger L. Bell  
Ralph F. Sandora Jr.  
Michael W. Swiger

**MOVING FROM GOOD TO GREAT  
FOR OUR STUDENTS, STAFF, AND COMMUNITY!**

April 9, 2010

Jan Stanley, State Title 1 Director  
West Virginia Department of Education  
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East  
Building 6, Room 330  
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Dear Ms. Stanley,

Doddridge County Schools intends to apply for funding through the Title 1 1003(g) School Improvement Grants. With this funding it is our plan to serve Doddridge County Elementary School, a school identified as a Tier I school, using the Transformation Model.

Enclosed you will find our school needs assessment, data analysis and determination of root causes, the district capacity index, and the preliminary budget. If you need additional information, please feel free to contact Rick Oyler or me at 304-873-2300.

Sincerely,

Janice M. Michels, Superintendent

## Title I, Part A 1003 (g) School Improvement Grant Application

Doddridge County Elementary School- Doddridge County, WV

### NEEDS ASSESSMENT

#### OVERVIEW OF AYP DATA

**SPRING 2009 WESTEST2, 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade** – 63% of All students scored at **Below Mastery in Mathematics**. 76% of the **Special needs** students scored at **Below Mastery in Mathematics**. 68% of the **Economic Disadvantaged** students scored at **Below Mastery in Mathematics**. The state projection for Third Grade in Math was 58.9%; therefore, none of the subgroups met AYP in Mathematics. For Third Grade in **R/LA**, 58% of All students scored at **Below Mastery in R/LA**. 86% of the **Special Needs** students scored at **Below Mastery in R/LA**. 63% of the **Economic Disadvantaged** students scored at **Below Mastery in R/LA**. The state projection for Third Grade in R/LA was 61.4%; therefore, none of the subgroups met AYP in Mathematics. 57% of all students met the state requirement in Reading and 43% the requirement in Writing

**2009 WESTEST2, 4<sup>th</sup> Grade** – 44% of all students scored at **Below Mastery in Mathematics** compared to 40% of the same group scoring below mastery in 2008 – not making AYP for either year, and there was an increase in the number not making AYP from 2008 to 2009. 82% of the **Special Needs** students scored at **Below Mastery in Mathematics** compared to 54% of the same group scoring below mastery in 2008 –not making AYP for either year, and there was an increase in the number not making AYP from 2008 to 2009. 56% of the **Economic Disadvantaged** students scored at **Below Mastery in Mathematics** compared to 50% of the same group scoring below mastery in 2008 – not making AYP for either year. 2009. For the Fourth Grade in **R/LA** in 2009, 61% of All students scored at **Below Mastery in R/LA** compared to 37% of the same group scoring below mastery in 2008.– not making AYP for either year. 86% of the **Special Needs** students scored at **Below Mastery in R/LA** compared to 67% of the same group scoring below mastery in 2008 –not making AYP for either year. 69% of the **Economic Disadvantaged** students scored at **Below Mastery in R/LA** compared to 43% of the same group scoring below mastery in 2008—not making AYP for either year. The school is on improvement status and the sanctions applied are School Choice and Supplemental Education Services.

#### EXTERNAL TREND DATA

The Doddridge County poverty rate is 60.45% and the Doddridge County Elementary School poverty rate is 65.87%, thus designating the school as a high poverty school by the WVDE. The 2000 Census indicates a Mobility rate of 5.8% for Doddridge County, which does not seem to have a major impact upon students. With only one elementary school in the county, there is no moving from school to school, but there is limited movement to and from adjoining counties. School Readiness Indicators are in place, and there are three pre-K Centers (collaborative

w/Head Start) and a total of 58 enrollees. Transition Programs are in place at each programmatic level and for students entering school. Teachers document student information in portfolios and pass them to the next level.

69.4% of the females in the county have a high school or above education; 10.2% of that population has a Bachelor's Degree or higher. In 2008-09, 84 students graduated from the county high school, with a graduation rate of 84.85%. 75% of the county population is between 18 and 60 years old. 61.8% of county students qualified for free/reduced meals. The 2000 Census says the unemployment rate for those between 20-64 years of age was 15%. Substance abuse is a problem in the county. The county has several community resources to assist families, and they are: FRN, ABE, Summit Center, Human Services and Resources, County Health Department, Starting Points, Opportunity Council, Agriculture Extension Programs, County Library, Parent Resource Center, Energy Express, and Doddridge County Youth League. Every available means to get the word concerning the access for the preceding resources to families is consistently used.

#### **STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA**

The following data will provide the percentage of students at or above each performance level on state assessments in R/LA and Math by grade and subgroup: **Math 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade - All Subgroup** – 37% of DCES students were at/above mastery. Statewide – 66%. **Students w/Disabilities Subgroup** - DCES was 17% at/above mastery. **Econ. Disadvantaged Subgroup** – DCES was 39% at/above mastery. **R/LA 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade – All Subgroup** – DCES was at 43% at/above mastery. Statewide – 65%. **Students w/Disabilities Subgroup** – DCES was at 14% at/above mastery. **Econ. Disadvantaged Subgroup** – DCES was at 14% at/above mastery.

**Math 4<sup>th</sup> Grade – All Subgroup** – DCES was at 59% at/above mastery. Statewide – 64%. **Students w/Disabilities Subgroup** – DCES was at 18% at/above mastery. **Econ. Disadvantaged Subgroup** – DCES was at 44% at/above mastery. **R/LA 4<sup>th</sup> Grade – All Subgroup** – DCES 39% at/above mastery level. Statewide – 64%. **Students w/Disabilities Subgroup** – DCES was at 14% at/above mastery level. **Econ. Disadvantaged Subgroup** – DCES was at 31% at at/or above mastery level.

**Average Scale Scores: Grade 3 – Math** – All=540; SE=514; SES=534. **In R/LA** – All=402; SE=377; SES=398. **Grade 4 – Math** – All=570; SE=532; SES=557. **In R/LA** – All=411; SE=364; SES=400.

No LEP Students attend DCES. Acuity, Writing Roadmap, and the 4SQ Writing Program are being used by both 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Grades and Tech Steps is used by the whole school. The school has a stationary computer lab with 28 stations and a mobile computer lab with 24 stations. A gap in achievement between male and female students is reflected on WESTEST2.

For 2008-2009, failures in Math per grade: 1<sup>st</sup> Grade=1; 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade=3; 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade=2; 4<sup>th</sup> Grade=4. Failures in R/LA per grade: 1<sup>st</sup> Grade=2; 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade=2; 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade=0; 4<sup>th</sup> Grade=1.

**Grade Distribution by Grade and Teacher:** 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher #1 – A’s=40%; B’s=4%; C’s=0%; D’s=1%. Teacher #2 – A’s=18%; B’s=29%; C’s=7%; D’s=1%. Teacher #3 – A’s=22%; B’s=15%; C’s=6%; D’s=1%. Teacher #4 – A’s=10%; B’s=13%; C’s=10%; D’s=6%; F’s=1%

2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Teacher #1 – A’s=21%; B’s=18%; C’s=22%; D’s=1%; F’s=1%. Teacher #2 – A’s=27%; B’s=13%; C’s=11%; D’s=4%; F’s=1%. Teacher #3 – A’s=11%; B’s=22%; C’s=16%; D’s=8%; F’s=4%. Teacher #4 – A’s=43%; B’s=12%.

3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Teacher #1 – A’s=20%; B’s=9%; C’s=6%; D’s=5%; F’s=1%; Teacher #2 – A’s=17%; B’s=17%; C’s=8%. Teacher #3 – A’s=20%; B’s=24%; C’s=4%. Teacher #4 – A’s=24%; B’s=17%; C’s=6%; D’s=2%; F’s=1%.

4<sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher #1 – A’s=26%; B’s=19%; C’s=21%; D’s=4%; F’s=1%. Teacher #2 – A’s=33%; B’s=23%; C’s=11%; D’s=3%; F’s=2%. Teacher #3 – A’s=22%; B’s=38%; C’s=16%; D’s=1%. Teacher #4 – A’s=22%; B’s=17%; C’s=16%; D’s=10%; F’s=2%.

There is a category titled “other” that is not included in the Grade Distribution Report.

#### **OTHER STUDENT OUTCOME DATA**

The daily average attendance rate of 2008-2009 was 97.33%, and 2.7% are 80% or less, six students received at least one out-of-school suspension, there were 460 students enrolled in the school Pre-K thru 4<sup>th</sup> Grade, and there was a promotion rate of 97% and a retention rate of 3%. Also in 2008-2009, more than 250 discipline referrals were made by teachers to the principal; and 13% of those referrals were made by only four teachers.

#### **ANALYSIS OF CULTURE, CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES**

The conclusions from the on-site diagnostic review of Doddridge County Elementary on January 28, 2010 reflect that the on-site team believes that DCES is a school that has the opportunity to effectively prepare its young learners as a result of the talented and varying experience levels within the faculty. The overall climate of the building is unified about what is important here and how can “we” make it better. Celebrating the things that are done well by both the students and the faculty should be addressed by the school leadership team. The culture of the building appears to be on the right track.

The faculty and administration is in the beginning of determining the how “we” are going to do business around here and how “we” can best use the talents of all to effect an environment of student learning and achievement above all else. This effort will demand changes in instruction and instructional design which must occur to engender student involvement and increase the students own aspirations for their future.

The faculty seems to be willing to admit that change must occur in their work and be willing to do so to improve their professional practice. This attitude of improvement must be

cultivated through genuine discussions and involvement of the staff around setting goals and then determining as a group how those goals will be accomplished. Openness to change and improvement must be the central feature of the staff and administration.

Establishing a knowledge base for RTI practices and fostering collaboration through both the culture and effective procedures at the school are at the forefront of this “to do” list. It is the team’s opinion that the talent among faculty and administration exists to effect positive change for students, let the five-year plan become the guiding document of school improvement and structure the team and content within that plan to affect the improvement process.

## **ROOT CAUSES**

### **Administrators and teachers**

- First year for principal, who is working hard to gain support of school staff
- First year for Dean of Students, who is new to the position
- Expectations for achievement are somewhat mixed within the faculty
- Faculty needs to define core beliefs and values for school
- Faculty must describe actions that reinforce new beliefs and actions that do not reinforce those beliefs
- A collaborative vision should be developed followed by actions and steps for achievement
- Celebrations and recognitions that place academics at the forefront of the school should be developed
- Scheduling issues that hinder quality common planning time and PLC operations must be addressed
- The RTI initiative is struggling for traction at DCES

### **Curriculum and resources**

- RTI professional development needs to be reviewed for all faculty and assistance given to grades three and four to support implementation
- More job-embedded professional development around RTI practices and implementation models should occur
- Sustained professional development for Saxon-Phonics is needed
- There is not a consistent walk through protocol in place that gives teacher feedback
- Professional development focusing on instructional strategies , standards based instruction and use of technology to deliver instruction has been limited
- All faculty groups have not always looked at data analysis, trend data, individual group data and individual student weaknesses for driving instruction
- Using data for collaboration purposes has been limited

- Interruptions to instructional time have occurred frequently and often

#### **Master schedule, classroom schedules and classroom management/discipline**

- Time currently built into the schedule allows collaboration only on a limited basis
- Learning targets for each of the deconstructed CSO's have not been identified
- Consistent procedures for delivering content, engaging students in the learning process, determining rigor, and involving students as individuals and teams to examine content are not in place
- Formative assessment is not consistently used
- Classroom guidance is not a consistent part of the schedule
- The school is overcrowded
- Instances of student disruptive behaviors are sometimes high

#### **Students and Parental Involvement**

- The new PBS Program (SOAR) needs to address consistency within the programs reward system
- Student support services and methods for addressing any gaps to student support services need to be reviewed
- Celebrations for student success, including academic achievement are rare
- Student leadership should be examined
- Poverty is a serious issue for students and parents
- Many students struggle with learning
- There are not many challenges for achieving students
- To staff, parental involvement is seen as acceptable but improving.

## District Capacity Index

Each LEA must complete a self analysis of the capacity it has to assist the low performing schools in the implementation of the selected intervention. This will be determined utilizing a scale of 1-3 ranking from poor (1), satisfactory (2) and commendable (3) for the following criteria:

Criteria	Poor 1 point	Satisfactory 2 points	Commendable 3 points	Points Earned
LEA governance	State takeover district	Limited SEA intervention	No SEA intervention	<b>2</b>
Title I audit reports	Findings in areas requiring a repayment of funds	Findings in areas noted-repayment of funds not required	No findings in the fiscal area	<b>3</b>
LEA overall achievement ranking	Bottom (5% = 3 districts)	Middle (70% = 38 districts)	Top (25% = 14 districts)	<b>2</b>
Approval of the district strategic plan by the SEA (entire plan, not just the Title I section)	Not approved by the SEA	Approved by the SEA with revisions	Approved by the SEA without revisions	<b>2</b>
Percentage of Title I schools that met AYP in the last testing cycle	0-50% of the Title I schools met AYP.	51-75% of the Title I schools met AYP.	76-100% of the Title I schools met AYP.	Doddridge is a small county (3 schools) 2 are identified Title 1 <b>1</b>
Development of schools as professional learning communities	The school has not yet begun to address the practice of a PLC or an effort has been made to address the practice of PLCs, but has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.	A critical mass of staff has begun to engage in PLC practice. Members are being asked to modify their thinking as well as their traditional practice. Structural changes are being met to support the transition.	The practice of PLCs is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of the staff. It is deeply internalized and staff would resist attempts to abandon the practice.	<b>2</b>
Identification of district leadership team and assignment of responsibilities	No district leadership team nor identified person assigned for monitoring implementation	Lacks specific identification of personnel for the district leadership team and for monitoring implementation.	A specific district leadership team is identified and one or more persons are assigned for monitoring implementation.	<b>3</b>

Criteria	Poor 1 point	Satisfactory 2 points	Commendable 3 points	Points Earned
School Leadership Team	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level, but little evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been met.	School leadership team members are identified on the district and school level and include a wide range of stakeholders (e.g., parents; representatives of institutions of higher education; representatives of RESA or representatives of outside consultant groups) Evidence is produced to document whether the requirements of NCLB Sections 1116 and 1117 have been exceeded.	3
			Total Points	18

Districts must obtain a score of 20 out of 24 possible points to demonstrate capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention/activities in each identified school.

**Attach documentation or evidence for the above information.**

**Within the past two years the following school improvement activities have been initiated at Doddridge County Elementary and Doddridge County Middle Schools.**

**DCMS**

- **Change of Principal Ship.**
- **Development of a new Master Schedule to reflect Tierd Instruction, and PLC's. allowing additional instruction time for Reading and Math.**
- **Hiring of two separate outside consultants. Maria Busick and Dan Zirkle.**
- **Book studies.**
- **Professional development with a focus on, differentiation, Tierd Instruction Model, bench marking / progress monitoring and using achievement data to drive instruction. Also, training in Acuity, Writing Roadmap, and Tech Steps.**
- **Employment of a Technology Integration Specialist.**
- **Employment of a RTI Interventionist.**
- **Improved parental involvement.**
- **Increased enrollments in after school programs.**

- **Activities to improve school climate.**
- **Consultants from the SEA and RESA VII. Kenny Moles, Darlene Crane.**
- **Principal Walkthroughs ( on average 40 per month)**

### **DCES**

- **Change of Principal Ship.**
- **Development of a new Master Schedule to reflect Tired instruction, and time for grade level planning meetings and allowing more instructional time for Reading and Math.**
- **Provided for outside consultants, SEA, Phyllis Veith, Kenny Moles, RESA VII, Darlene Crane.**
- **Book Studies.**
- **Provided professional development with a focus on, differentiation, Tired Instruction Model, bench marking/progress monitoring and using achievement data to drive instruction. Also, training in Acuity and Writing Roadmap.**
- **Employment of a TSI Integration Specialist.**
- **Employment of a RTI Interventionist.**
- **School Cultural Survey.**
- **Improved parent involvement and school climate.**
- **Increased enrollment in after school programs.**
- **Principal Walkthroughs. ( on average 40 per month)**