



Pike County Public Schools

Zebulon, Georgia

March 22 - 25, 2022

System Accreditation Engagement Review

215082

Table of Contents

Cognia Continuous Improvement System	2
Initiate.....	2
Improve	2
Impact	2
Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review	3
Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results	3
Leadership Capacity Domain	4
Learning Capacity Domain.....	5
Resource Capacity Domain	6
Assurances	7
Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®	7
Insights from the Review	8
Next Steps	12
Team Roster	13
References and Readings	14

Cognia Continuous Improvement System

Cognia defines continuous improvement as "an embedded behavior rooted in an institution's culture that constantly focuses on conditions, processes, and practices to improve teaching and learning." The Cognia Continuous Improvement System (CIS) provides a systemic, fully integrated solution to help institutions map out and navigate a successful improvement journey. In the same manner that educators are expected to understand the unique needs of every learner and tailor the education experience to drive student success, every institution must be empowered to map out and embrace their unique improvement journey. Cognia expects institutions to use the results and the analysis of data from various interwoven components for the implementation of improvement actions to drive education quality and improved student outcomes. While each improvement journey is unique, the journey is driven by key actions.

The findings of the Engagement Review Team are organized by the ratings from the Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic and the Levels of Impact within the i3 Rubric: Initiate, Improve, and Impact.

Initiate

The first phase of the improvement journey is to **Initiate** actions to cause and achieve better results. The elements of the Initiate phase are defined within the Levels of Impact of Engagement and Implementation. Engagement is the level of involvement and frequency of stakeholders in the desired practices, processes, or programs within the institution. Implementation is the process of monitoring and adjusting the administration of the desired practices, processes, or programs for quality and fidelity. Standards identified within Initiate should become the focus of the institution's continuous improvement journey toward the collection, analysis, and use of data to measure the results of engagement and implementation. Enhancing the capacity of the institution in meeting these Standards has the greatest potential impact on improving student performance and organizational effectiveness.

Improve

The second phase of the improvement journey is to gather and evaluate the results of actions to **Improve**. The elements of the **Improve** phase are defined within the Levels of Impact of Results and Sustainability. Results come from the collection, analysis, and use of data and evidence to demonstrate attaining the desired result(s). Sustainability is results achieved consistently to demonstrate growth and improvement over time (a minimum of three years). Standards identified within Improve are those in which the institution is using results to inform their continuous improvement processes and to demonstrate over time the achievement of goals. The institution should continue to analyze and use results to guide improvements in student achievement and organizational effectiveness.

Impact

The third phase of achieving improvement is **Impact**, where desired practices are deeply entrenched. The elements of the **Impact** phase are defined within the Level of Impact of Embeddedness. Embeddedness is the degree to which the desired practices, processes, or programs are deeply ingrained in the culture and operation of the institution. Standards identified within Impact are those in which the institution has demonstrated ongoing growth and improvement over time and has embedded the practices within its culture. Institutions should continue to support and sustain these practices that yield results in improving student achievement and organizational effectiveness.

Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal in leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the Cognia Accreditation Process examines the whole institution—the program, the cultural context, and the community of stakeholders—to determine how well the parts work together to meet the needs of learners. Through the accreditation process, highly skilled and trained Engagement Review Teams gather first-hand evidence and information pertinent to evaluating an institution’s performance against the research-based Cognia Performance Standards. Review teams use these Standards to assess the quality of learning environments to gain valuable insights and target improvements in teaching and learning. Cognia provides Standards that are tailored for all education providers so that the benefits of accreditation are universal across the education community.

Through a comprehensive review of evidence and information, our experts gain a broad understanding of institution quality. Using the Standards, the review team provides valuable feedback to institutions, which helps to focus and guide each institution’s improvement journey. Valuable evidence and information from other stakeholders, including students, also are obtained through interviews, surveys, and additional activities.

Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

The Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic is used by the Engagement Review Team to evaluate the institution's effectiveness based on the Cognia Performance Standards. The diagnostic consists of three components built around each of three Domains: **Leadership Capacity**, **Learning Capacity**, and **Resource Capacity**. Results are reported within four ranges identified by color. The results for the three Domains are presented in the tables that follow.

Color	Rating	Description
Red	Insufficient	Identifies areas with insufficient evidence or evidence that indicated little or no activity leading toward improvement
Yellow	Initiating	Represents areas to enhance and extend current improvement efforts
Green	Improving	Pinpoints quality practices that are improving and meet the Standards
Blue	Impacting	Demonstrates noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact the institution

Under each Standard statement is a row indicating the scores related to the elements of Cognia’s i3 Rubric. The rubric is scored from one (1) to four (4). A score of four on any element indicates high performance, while a score of one or two indicates an element in need of improvement. The following table provides the key to the abbreviations of the elements of the i3 Rubric.

Element	Abbreviation
Engagement	EN
Implementation	IM
Results	RE
Sustainability	SU
Embeddedness	EM

Leadership Capacity Domain

The capacity of leadership to ensure an institution's progress toward its stated objectives is an essential element of organizational effectiveness. An institution's leadership capacity includes the fidelity and commitment to its purpose and direction, the effectiveness of governance and leadership to enable the institution to realize its stated objectives, the ability to engage and involve stakeholders in meaningful and productive ways, and the capacity to implement strategies that improve learner and educator performance.

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The system commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	

1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	4	

Learning Capacity Domain

The impact of teaching and learning on student achievement and success is the primary expectation of every institution. An effective learning culture is characterized by positive and productive teacher/learner relationships, high expectations and standards, a challenging and engaging curriculum, quality instruction and comprehensive support that enable all learners to be successful, and assessment practices (formative and summative) that monitor and measure learner progress and achievement. Moreover, a quality institution evaluates the impact of its learning culture, including all programs and support services, and adjusts accordingly.

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.1	Learners have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities established by the system.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	2	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	3	
2.4	The system has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers that support their educational experiences.										Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	2	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	3	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	3	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	3	

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	3	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	3	
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	

Resource Capacity Domain

The use and distribution of resources support the stated mission of the institution. Institutions ensure that resources are distributed and utilized equitably, so the needs of all learners are adequately and effectively addressed. The utilization of resources includes support for professional learning for all staff. The institution examines the allocation and use of resources to ensure appropriate levels of funding, sustainability, organizational effectiveness, and increased student learning.

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
3.1	The system plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the system's effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	3	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
3.3	The system provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	3	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	3	
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	1	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	1	
3.6	The system provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the system.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	3	

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
3.7	The system demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	3	
3.8	The system allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the system's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4	

Assurances

Assurances are statements that accredited institutions must confirm they are meeting. The Assurance statements are based on the type of institution, and the responses are confirmed by the Accreditation Engagement Review Team. Institutions are expected to meet all Assurances and are expected to correct any deficiencies in unmet Assurances.

Assurances Met		
YES	NO	If No, List Unmet Assurances by Number Below
X		

Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

Cognia will review the results of the Accreditation Engagement Review to make a final determination concerning accreditation status, including the appropriate next steps for your institution in response to these findings. Cognia provides the Index of Education Quality (IEQ) as a holistic measure of overall performance based on a comprehensive set of standards and review criteria. This formative tool for improvement identifies areas of success and areas in need of focus. The IEQ comprises the Standards Diagnostic ratings from the three Domains: Leadership Capacity, Learning Capacity, and Resource Capacity. The IEQ results are reported on a scale of 100 to 400 and provide information about how the institution is performing compared to expected criteria. Institutions should review the IEQ in relation to the findings from the review in the areas of Initiate, Improve, and Impact. An IEQ score below 250 indicates that the institution has several areas within the Initiate level and should focus their improvement efforts on those Standards within that level. An IEQ in the range of 225–300 indicates that the institution has several Standards within the Improve level and is using results to inform continuous improvement and demonstrate sustainability. An IEQ of 275 and above indicates the institution is beginning to reach the Impact level and is engaged in practices that are sustained over time and are becoming ingrained in the culture of the institution.

Below is the average (range) of all Cognia Improvement Network (CIN) institutions evaluated for accreditation in the last five years. The range of the annual CIN IEQ average is presented to enable you to benchmark your results with other institutions in the network.

Institution IEQ	318.71	CIN 5 Year IEQ Range	278.34 – 283.33
------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

Insights from the Review

The Engagement Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the processes, programs, and practices within the institution to arrive at the findings of the team. These findings are organized around themes guided by the evidence, with examples of programs and practices, and suggestions for the institution's continuous improvement efforts. The Insights from the Review narrative should provide contextualized information from the team's deliberations and analysis of the practices, processes, and programs of the institution organized by the levels of Initiate, Improve, and Impact. The narrative also provides the next steps to guide the institution's improvement journey in its efforts to improve the quality of educational opportunities for all learners. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness. The feedback provided in the Accreditation Engagement Review Report will assist the institution in reflecting on its current improvement efforts and to adapt and adjust their plans to continuously strive for improvement.

The Engagement Review Team identified themes from the review that will support the continuous improvement process for Pike County Public Schools. These themes present strengths and opportunities to guide the improvement journey. The identified themes focus on communication, stakeholder engagement, positive culture, leadership and governance, technology, data usage, formal processes, and increased student learning.

The system establishes a culture of care, responsibility, and mutual respect, based on shared values and beliefs, dedicated leadership, and a strong commitment by all stakeholder groups to support a positive learning experience for students. A review of adopted policies and procedures, documents relating to standard operating procedures (SOP), and focus interviews conducted with the school board, superintendent, and system leadership verified a clear identification of and support for the role of the governing board and system leadership. There is an established schedule for a systematic review of policies and procedures that provides for timely handling of revisions and reviews for policies, procedures, and system programs consistent with current state regulations. Board members expressed a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Expectations established by the superintendent and district staff, supported by the policies and procedures approved by the board, foster a supportive culture and establish elevated expectations to best meet the needs of the students served. The overview presentation provided a look at a successful learning institution that has embraced striving to meet the needs of individual students and increase the system graduation rate. Focus interviews with district leadership, school administrators, faculty, parent, and community groups verified knowledge, involvement, and support for the school improvement plans (SIP) and the system's Strategic Plan. All stakeholder groups noted "dedication, mutual respect, and support" between teachers, administration, and students. Students identified an atmosphere of "family," everyone working hard to reach their potential. Multiple focus groups shared mutual respect and support for the identified core values embedded within the institution. The HOPE Survey, which focuses on identifying where learners are based on an assessment of generalized expectancy for achieving goals, provided the team with limited information on student feedback. Parents and community partners described their volunteer roles to support school and system activities, including service on school and district councils and parent organizations. Community and parents focus interviews verified the support of multiple groups such as Pike County Family Connection Collaboration, parent advisory committees, city and county government, economic development, and other local groups which locate and contact agencies to address family needs. Community members described the availability of mental and emotional support services available and supported by the school system, including the use of the system website and school partnerships to provide family services. Students related the expectations for high student achievement

and that teachers and support staff are willing to assist with extra tutorial assistance time as needed. Positive relations are intentional and fostered for all students. Focus student interviews verified a feeling of support, comfort, and security, based on interactions. Focus groups described a process for two-way communication, input of ideas, and concerns. Secondary students described their roles as student representatives in student government. Students indicated participation in the newly organized peer-to-peer assistance student group. Teachers described school leadership teams and opportunities on school committees. Parents verified communication through various digital venues, as well as regularly scheduled newsletters of ongoing events. Parents described the two-way communication with teachers, administrators, the superintendent, and members of the governing board as positive. Evidence provided cited parent input from the 2016-17 Pike County Comprehensive Needs Assessment. While input from parents is being sought, the team did not find an ongoing perception survey of culture and climate reflecting either student or parent input. Parent, teacher, and student Cognia Perception Survey results were not utilized for the review. The system's survey reflection results provided the team with limited acknowledgment of any survey use in decision-making. A clear understanding of the analysis, interpretation, and survey data used to improve the curriculum and organizational effectiveness was not possible due to data evidence limitations. Teacher survey information from My Voice provided more detail than was available for other stakeholder groups. The size of the school system and community stability presents a unique opportunity whereby everyone knows one another. District personnel described efforts to increase dialogue and community engagement, including building awareness and understanding of "Portrait of a Graduate," which resulted in a PowerPoint presentation for parents. Highly functioning governance and leadership allows for effective day-to-day operation within the system and supports financial stability that strengthens the district's vision and mission. The momentum established with clearly defined roles and shared expectations for excellence will propel the system to a greater likelihood of achieving its goals. The team suggests expanding stakeholder involvement through increased, direct participation via advisory groups and committees, as well as increasing parent involvement in "Portrait of a Graduate." A more extensive review of the student HOPE Survey feedback may also be beneficial, specifically in addressing the middle school area of high engagement responses, coupled with feelings of lack of choices or voice. Administering Cognia Perception Surveys may provide more complete, consistent stakeholder perception information for the system. To fully benefit, survey participants need to include teacher, student, and parent groups. A full analysis of the Cognia Perception Survey results will provide valuable information for establishing longitudinal data and for continuous improvement.

The schools demonstrate a commitment to supporting a positive learning experience for students. School improvement plans (SIPs) detailed support for the identified system goals and strategic plan. Focus interviews with school leadership, faculty, students, parents, and community groups to verify support for the institution's purpose and direction. Students related the high student achievement expectations and willingness of teachers and support staff to assist with tutorial time. Positive relations are intentional and fostered for all students. Focus student interviews verified a feeling of support, comfort, and well-being. Focus groups described a process for two-way communication, input of ideas, and concerns. Secondary students described their role in student government and expressed excitement in the peer support team providing support for peers through conversation and referrals to appropriate adults for assistance. Ninth Grade Academy students described proving "notes of kindness" through the HOPE Squad. Documents provided insight into Peer Assisted School Transition (PAST), a project to assist students in transitioning from one school to another, which started this school year. Documents provided the team with extensive system-wide training for staff to support student needs, including Zones of Regulation which provides a curriculum for self-regulation and emotional control, as well as responsible decision-making. The high school identifies students on a "Personal Responsibility and Well-Being List" who may need special attention. Information provided to the team did

not indicate a process for implementation or use of this list. Another project, Caring Adult in the Building (CAB), identifies thirty students pre-selected for services. No implementation or evaluation of this program was available to the team. Elementary teacher and student focus interview groups described a time set aside for meeting individual student needs, including tutorial assistance, gifted services, and social and emotional needs. A flyer seeking mentor volunteers was available for elementary school, but no follow-up on recruitment progress was available to the team. The team did not find a system-wide, fully implemented formal program to provide adult advocates for all students. Documentation provides multiple professional development opportunities offered to assist teachers and staff in addressing student needs. The team found limited evidence of full implementation of advocacy processes and found a lack of evaluation of the effectiveness of training provided. Secondary students were positive about the peer-to-peer activities but did not offer information relating to a specific adult advocacy program. The team suggests a review of the efforts in place to address student support, including the various professional learning programs used to support teachers and staff. Determination of what programs and processes are in place across the system, including the development of data collection and analysis to evaluate progress and effectiveness, will provide valuable tools for a formalized system-wide adult advocate program and strengthen identified system goals and organizational effectiveness.

The system’s professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality and ensure staff has the knowledge and skills to improve student performance.

Evidence provided documents an extensive process for professional learning communities (PLCs) organization and development. Focus interviews with school leadership, teachers and staff, and district personnel verified the extensive work to establish PLCs at all school levels to support the system’s Strategic Plan and The Authentic Intellectual Works Institute model. The system follows The Authentic Intellectual Works Institute model, based upon the construction of knowledge, disciplined inquiry, value beyond schools, and practices embedded within the school culture. This model includes the development of relationships, parental involvement, and support and how specific learning affects beyond school. The process incorporates the professional learning process and instructional design. To that end, the system believes that “freedom lives in choice and opportunities,” with core values indicated by relationships, ownership, and innovation. All are based upon the competencies of creativity, collaboration, thinking critically, acting responsibly, and communicating clearly. Teachers at the primary and elementary levels described the PLC process as meetings based on grade and special purpose, providing support for collegiality and collaboration, lesson planning, incorporation of state standards, development of teaching strategies, formative and summative assessment planning, and peer to peer support. Teachers at both elementary and primary indicate that PLC groups are highly functioning with “designated anchors” tied to state standards and unit design. Both middle and high school teachers describe PLCs as “more like department meetings.” Middle school staff did indicate the development of common assessments. Part of the issue at secondary schools may stem from “singleton” teachers of subjects which may limit aspects of collaboration. Documentation of the Strategic Plan, SIPs, and specific plans offered as samples of planned professional development verify the recognition of planned professional learning to support teacher knowledge and ensure the skills are provided to support and improve student performance. The team did not identify a specific system-wide plan that provides a guide for professional development, nor did the team identify processes to support the identification or use of program evaluation. Elementary teachers indicated that peer-to-peer observations have been utilized for at least four years and provide staunch support. Orientation for inexperienced staff and follow-up support is provided. Experienced staff participates in mentoring based upon identified needs from the supervision and evaluation process. The team suggests the examination of compiling a professional development plan for the system that ties together the programs and processes already in place to support the professional learning expectations. Organizing all materials and information into a system plan will enable future staff and leadership access to a central location for all things professional

learning-related. It will allow for an analysis of which processes and programs are currently evaluated for effectiveness, implementation of necessary evaluation tools, collection of data for analysis to determine if duplicate efforts exist, and a determination of return on investment of resources.

The system lacks fully implementing a system-wide, formalized process for monitoring and assessing the organizational effectiveness of all programs. A review of documents, handbooks, and focus group interviews verified the use of multiple data sources available and utilized by school staff in programs and processes. The leadership and faculty focus group interviews described the use of PLC meetings and protocols for instructional plan adjustment. Teacher focus groups at the lower level described formative and summative assessment reviews during PLC meetings with plans for instructional adjustments for the following school year. Secondary teachers discussed end-of-unit progress during PLC meetings. Instructional coaches, district staff, and teachers meet regularly to discuss necessary adjustments, with each school site determining the process and timeline. The team did find evidence in the Consolidated LEA Plan that addressed the impact of adjustments for program evaluation or increased student performance for specific student groups. The team identified formal processes that support the use of data and data analysis on a regular basis and lead to adjustments in specific programs or processes monitored by federal or state regulations. Examples of quarterly reviews scheduled for each school site to support the assurance process were available, with feedback information provided for one school site. A Post Planning Data Review and Coming Year Action Plan provided a screenshot of tools provided by the district but lacked evidence to verify the use of this process or its' effectiveness. Instructional coaches described data analysis and processes for curriculum adjustments. District leaders provided samples of instructional decisions, using data analysis to compare instructional materials for reading/literacy and mathematics. Knowledge of available data information and usage was evident at school sites. Decisions are data-based regarding individual student progress, placement, and programs. The team reviewed grading procedures in the student and faculty handbook. While evidence provided verifies that monitoring and assessing effectiveness occurs, it was difficult for the team to validate clear system-wide coordination in monitoring and evaluation for determining the success of system programs and processes to verify the effectiveness of progress in the identified system goals. The team suggests examination of data analyzed for specific results for measuring and monitoring growth and prioritizing data analysis for specific results. Communicating such information to stakeholders is vital to understanding. Defined processes that include data analyzed from multiple sources and assignment of tasks for monitoring and evaluation allow all to see and compare the results. These processes also provide extensive data for establishing longitudinal data and identification of trends. The system may benefit from the examination of the programs and processes in use with an eye to determine/verify the return/benefit gained from each program or process maximizes student growth.

The school system incorporates limited digital resources/technology into teaching and learning to improve student performance, enhance organizational effectiveness, and support the strategic plan. Budget information reflects long-range planning and use of resources in support of the institution's purpose and direction. The SIPs provide documentation of the importance and value of technology to support the achievement of long-range goals. Teacher and administrative focus groups verified professional development opportunities to support digital learning as a part of the instructional program. Interviews with district technology personnel verified that implementation of plans to develop infrastructure to support fully implementing student-centered use of digital devices for learning is underway, with only completion of district-wide WIFI awaiting finalization. Replacement provisions for devices have allowed new upgrades. The digital capability has allowed various support departments to streamline services to support teachers, thus improving student learning and organizational effectiveness. The current Technology Plan is vague and provides only general references to classroom use of technology and staff training opportunities. The team did identify limited evidence referencing professional learning to assist teachers in incorporating technology into learner classroom activities.

There was no specific evidence of a system-wide plan for incorporating digital learning into learning activities, nor did the team identify a process for evaluating technology training provided to teachers and other staff, not to evaluate the effectiveness of devices and/or programs. Student interviews verified the use of digital devices as a part of student learning, but the team did not find evidence that this use is consistently incorporated by teachers across subjects and/or grade levels. Student focus interviews verified that most learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use the information for learning in some of their classes. Less verified learner use of digital tools/technology was to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works, communicate and/or work collaboratively. By using technology in the classroom, both teachers and students can develop skills essential for the 21st-century and be successful in a global economy/workplace. As the system completes the identified infrastructure upgrades, the team encourages the school system to examine methods to fully support a learner environment rich in student applications of digital/technology. Students can gain the skills they will need to be successful in the future. Modern learning is about collaborating with others, solving complex problems, critical thinking, developing different forms of communication and leadership skills, and improving motivation and productivity. What is more, technology can help develop practical skills, including creating presentations, learning to differentiate dependable from unreliable sources on the Internet, maintaining proper online etiquette, and authoring emails. These are important skills that should be developed in the classrooms to support identified goals, enhance student-centered teaching and learning, enhance organizational effectiveness, and support student success.

The school system embodies a long history of passion and dedication for inspiring students to become independent thinkers, with identified core values and a sense of responsibility to succeed in the 21st-century. The institution should continue to consider all avenues that may increase the participation of all external stakeholder groups to enhance the system's journey of continuous improvement and to enhance learning for all students. The incorporation of long-range planning to align resources most effectively for support of identified needs is crucial. Clear identification and communication of system-wide formal processes established to monitor and evaluate programs and organizational effectiveness will continue to enhance the improvement journey's success. It is essential for the system to examine the Standards' Diagnostic Results, which references the Cognia Domains of Leadership, Learning, and Resources and relates directly to system performance based upon Cognia's i3 Rubric. Information about how the system performs compared to Cognia expectations is defined in the Index of Quality Assurance (IEQ). Standards' results, IEQ examination, and careful review of the Insights narrative will support the continued development and full implementation of the continuous improvement process.

Next Steps

Upon receiving the Accreditation Engagement Review Report, the institution is encouraged to implement the following steps:

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.
- Develop plans to address the areas for improvement identified by the Engagement Review Team.
- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.
- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.
- Continue the improvement journey.

Team Roster

The Engagement Review Teams are comprised of professionals with varied backgrounds and expertise. To provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes, all Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members are required to complete Cognia training. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography (Lead Evaluator Only)
Virginia Massey, Lead Evaluator	Virginia J. Massey has extensive classroom and administrative experience, having worked for 33+ years in the Hillsborough School District in Florida. Ms. Massey holds degrees in social science from Florida State University (FSU) and the University of South Florida (USF). Additional course work at USF completed her qualifications in educational leadership certification. Ms. Massey served as a classroom teacher, assistant principal, middle school principal, and high school principal. Her professional experiences include serving as site coordinator for the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) project and as a member of the State Advisory Committee for the Vocational Teacher Certification project at FSU. Ms. Massey was fortunate to serve as a presenter for multiple SREB conferences, as well as for the Florida State Conference on Career Development. She served as a facilitator for Florida State Conferences for Teachers as Advisors. Following her retirement, she served as a mentor for teachers seeking alternative certifications. Ms. Massey’s affiliation with Cognia provided extensive opportunities for professional growth and development as a team member for many school reviews. Ms. Massey leads engagement reviews and conducts readiness reviews for schools, systems, and early childhood education throughout the United States and globally. She currently serves as a Lead Evaluator Mentor for Cognia.
Susan Bennett, Principal Calhoun Early Learning Center, Leader Development Specialist	
Denise Finley, K-8 Curriculum Support Specialist and MTSS/RTI Coordinator	
Scott Fretz, Gifted Lead Coordinator and Teacher	

References and Readings

- AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/continuous-improvement-and-accountability/>.
- Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention program*. New York: Routledge.
- Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/what-continuously-improving-system-looks/>.
- Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/CISWhitePaper.pdf>.
- Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/savvy-school-change-leader/>.
- Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing*. New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education*. San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation_continuous-improvement_2013.05.pdf.
- Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Teachers College.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory*. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

