



Canyons School District

Sandy, Utah

October 16-19, 2021

System Accreditation Engagement Review

227390

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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

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

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating	
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	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:	4	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.										Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	2	

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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	2	
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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	4	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	4	
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:	4	IM:	4	RE:	1	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:	3	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.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	3	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	320.65	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.

Canyons School District is the newest school system in Utah. It was established twelve years ago, serves over 34,000 students in twenty-nine elementary, eight middle, five high schools, and six specialty schools. This is a growing system and anticipates it will be expected to house Afghanistan refugees in the future. In its infancy, there are a number of positive things occurring; the Engagement Review Team (team) was told that Canyons considers itself a lighthouse district. The following insights are meant to provide support for the positive initiatives and offer suggestions for refining other practices.

There is a solid approach to prepare students for college and career readiness. In keeping with its mission to graduate college and career ready citizens, the system provides countless opportunities for students to be exposed to and learn about college and career options throughout each grade level. Partnerships with the University of Utah, Utah Valley University, Luther College – Iowa, Iowa State University, and Southern Virginia University offer opportunities for students, as well as teachers. Students were able to articulate opportunities that they had for dual enrollment courses, career days, career and technology education clusters to work-based experiences. Recognizing that all students may not attend postsecondary institutions immediately, there is a focus on careers. The Canyons Technical Education Center offers students an opportunity to enroll in programs such as Construction Management, Cybersecurity, Digital Media, Business Leadership, Medical Innovation Pathway, Engineering Pathway and Welding. System's evidence indicated that students participated in college nights, career scavenger hunts and college carnivals. In accordance with the state-mandated Plan for College and Career Readiness, beginning at grade seven, students meet with counselors in small groups to discuss such things as their four-year plans, their career goals as well as scholarships and financial needs and opportunities. The system sponsors Biz Town, where students come and participate with jobs, "class cash" and bill paying. There are some elementary and middle schools that invite high schoolers to participate by dressing as certain characters and presenting the viewpoint of those individuals to the students in the lower grades. This approach is encouraged to continue and expand.

The system's administration has durable leadership development practices within the community and in schools. A committed superintendent is in his second year of service. The board and community have expressed great confidence in his ability to build bridges. Each group spoke of the community outreach that has occurred since his appointment. Interviews indicated that he has met with focus groups throughout the community, hosted meetings with employees, and administered surveys. During the overview he said, "Make the plan a stewardship of our community." The board indicated that information flows freely and one of their strengths is working with the public – "we're more open as a board. The public has an opportunity to address during board meetings." Building-level leadership teams have been established and partnerships with colleges allow teachers to pursue higher degrees. There is

an extensive onboarding process that has now moved from busy work to a functional, effective process according to staff. Teachers are paid for attendance/participation. The system has an alternative route to licensure (ARL) to address the teacher shortage. Building level staff have multiple opportunities for leadership roles within the school. Community members may participate in Leadership Canyons, where they can learn about schools and how they can be supported. The education foundation works in tandem with schools to support activities that may not be funded through normal channels. One such example was the partnership with Xfinity to assist with internet connectivity during the pandemic. Other avenues for leadership include the principal's advisory, peer leadership teams, school community councils, student advisory councils, parent teacher organizations, and peer court. These organizations may also assume a role of providing input in plan development. These leadership opportunities speak well of the shared leadership approach and as it continues will serve the system well.

Robust support systems for teaching and learning are deeply embedded. As the team conducted interviews with internal stakeholders, the term *support* was a constant. The board members said, "We have an active, educated board who come to meetings prepared." Board members also believe that the staff is loyal, trustworthy, and committed to students, who are "the foundation of what we do." Teachers said having coaches was challenging initially, but now that trust has been established it really works. In addition to the support of the instructional coaches, teachers are appreciative of the curriculum maps, the technology and the collegiality of the IPLCs (Instructional Professional Learning Communities). District level staff shared with the team that this is a systems-oriented place, and we are here to support the schools. One principal said that having an instructional coach made him a better instructional leader. Evidence showed that instructional coaches are an integral part of each school's operations. Another principal indicated that some teachers came to Canyons School District because of the support they received through the induction, mentoring and coaching process. PEAKS (Providing Educators Access to Knowledge) was created for new teachers. Students told the team that teachers "keep us on track" and that teachers make school fun and challenging.

Early release or late start time for IPLCs is a norm at the elementary and middle school levels. To have this replicated at the high school level would ensure a cohesive, systemic approach for all IPLCs. Providing opportunities for colleagues to meet and discuss curriculum, review student work, and share instructional strategies provides a rich depth of collaboration which serves to support academic achievement. As one teacher put it, "There is no substitute for talking shop with someone who teaches what you teach." Each school has a student support team which focuses on targeted interventions and discussion of specific skill development based on data. Examples of some data points used include DIBELS results, ACT, pre-ACT, reading inventories, and math inventories.

Students are currently provided access to psychologist/social workers at each school. Social and emotional support is provided through Second Steps for students in kindergarten through grade eight although this has not been fully implemented system wide.

Strong Branding with Commitment and Support is evident. Canyons has increased its tax base and elevated teacher compensation to second in the state in an effort to attract and retain qualified teachers. A recruitment campaign was launched with the tag line "CSD is the place to be." Videos have been produced, featuring staff to recruit. These include *Finding the Perfect Fit*, *Why Choose Canyons*, *This is Us*, and *Iowa Connect*. The team encourages the continued presence on social media, the system's web page, newsletters that are published weekly, and podcasts available to inform the public. The Office of Public Communications published a Digital Communication Strategy, which is available for school personnel and the general public. This document speaks to the history of Canyons and its digital presence.

A fully developed data-aligned strategic plan is in progress. The system's evidence, the overview and the superintendent's interview support that the system is in the process of developing a strategic plan. By their own admission, this is an area that will require focus in the near future. Board members, parents and principals indicated that they had not had input in the initial strategic planning process. The board did indicate that the initial plans had been shared. Consideration should be given to inclusion of the stakeholders' perspective in the development of the plan; these viewpoints would add dimension to the process. Each stakeholder group expressed support for the system and are vested in seeing it be successful. The system has identified four areas of focus, facilitated by Education Elements. These committees are innovation, whole child, education equity, and portrait of a graduate. Currently, the system is reliant on the board's tenets, which include student achievement, innovation, customer service, community engagement, and fiscal accountability. The goals of this plan should encompass each of these, with deep data analysis driving the prioritization of the goals. The wealth of data that exists within the system and the relationship that leadership has cultivated within the community places them in an ideal spot to devise a data-aligned plan which would assist the district in achieving high expectations and leadership development opportunities.

A system's strategic plan should serve as a guide for actions in support of the vision and mission, moving towards a school system as opposed to a system of schools. Going forward, the system should continue to participate in strategic planning sessions to review where the system is currently and where it sees itself moving in the next five years. Input from all stakeholders, deep analysis of various data, and consideration of the overall system's mission and vision should all contribute to the development of measurable goals. The use of measurable goals serves to inform the system if it is on track, if goals have been accomplished, should be modified, or may be deleted. The strategic planning goals should be clearly Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART), with baseline data and intermittent benchmarks to determine progress towards the system's goals/purposes. It is suggested that the critical initiatives identified within the four focus areas be considered as an umbrella for potential measurable goals.

A process to continually assess programs and practices was not evident at the system level.

Once the system develops a comprehensive strategic plan, it is suggested that a process be implemented to evaluate its progress towards meeting those goals. As with student academic achievement, there is great benefit in setting benchmarks to determine progress and a summative process to identify goals that should be maintained, modified, or satisfied or eliminated. School level principals shared that they work with coaches to analyze goals that have been established at the school level. An implementation advisory committee was established to provide an opportunity to discuss initiatives; and a leadership implementation team shares these initiatives with their colleagues. The team suggests that the system expands the focus of the existing committee members to devise a workable process through which system goals are assessed.

Triumvirates were scheduled to meet three times a year at each school level – elementary, middle, high – to discuss student academic performance data, the impact of MTSS and the TSSP. This is a robust process that could be reinstated and replicated at the system level once the strategic plan has been developed. It is important for the system to determine if actions and the allocation of resources provides a firm return on investment.

A developing data analysis process and platform exists. There is a wonderful, district-developed data dashboard, which houses a substantial number of data points regarding student achievement, discipline, teacher observations, and professional development for teachers. This instrument has great merit in laying a foundation for the improvement of student academic achievement. Longitudinal data can be accessed through this platform; trends should be noted and plans developed to address the

indicators. When fully developed, the data dashboard could be expanded to provide specific skill-based interventions. Interviews indicated that survey results could be found within the dashboard. It is important to note here that survey results, once compiled and analyzed would be sources of information to guide strategic planning and assess stakeholder satisfaction. The full development of this platform including training for all staff in data analysis and the use of the platform is encouraged.

One emerging focus of the system is to expand opportunities to ensure equity. The system has stated that one of its greatest challenges has been the social and political dividers in the community. To address some of these issues, the leadership has commendably implemented processes to solicit public engagement and support with “tremendous input.” The stakeholder interviewees told the team that Canyons is an affluent system; however, there do exist pockets of low-socioeconomic populations. Opportunities are not available at all schools. AVID is only offered at three of the middle schools in the district and the International Baccalaureate is only offered at one school. As the system continues its pursuit of equity, it may be helpful if it defines what equity means for their purposes and to discuss what it would look like when implemented. There has been a step towards the beginning of the conversation of equity with the Education Equity Analysis. The approach towards an equitable system is not an easy one nor is it a single shot. All leaders must commit to a lengthy process of developing a working definition of equity, answering hard questions, reflective analysis, and comprehensive data review. Integrated into the strategic planning process, all levels of those impacted must be represented and engaged in a substantial conversation, implementation and evaluation.

Creative, innovative, and collaborative problem-solving instructional techniques are not systemic. Students shared that they write across the curriculum and often use rubrics. When asked for other instances when rubrics were used, very few opportunities were shared. Students said that they enjoyed being challenged and liked working in groups. The IPLCs provide teachers with feedback on alternative instructional strategies to work with students who may not be meeting standard during the review period. Ensuring a common, protected time with specific goals for IPLC meetings would enhance the functions at all levels. It is suggested that consideration be given to expanding instruction to include project- or inquiry-based instructional strategies, where students would have real world, hands-on experiences which would increase the likelihood that students will retain concepts and transfer skills. This work could be accomplished through the existing IPLCs and through planned, school-wide professional development.

The functions of the Canyons school system are many. The leadership is strong and well-respected within the community. All stakeholders are supportive and proud of the progress that has been made since the creation of the system. The students have great school pride and believe that they are supported by all adults. The staff is committed to the success of the system and the children it serves. It is the team’s hope that the insights provided within this report would serve as a springboard to “helping learners of all ages to be prepared for meaningful life opportunities.”

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 professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members complete Cognia training and elect certification to provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography (Lead Evaluator Only)
Mrs. Carmen Pough Banks Lead Evaluator	Carmen Pough Banks is an educator who has taught on the secondary and post-secondary levels and is retired from the SC Department of Education. Carmen has served as a secondary teacher, as well as a post-secondary adjunct professor. Mrs. Banks has a master's degree in education, has strong curriculum development experience and is noted for her successful work with adult learners. As a career educator and seasoned presenter, she continues to provide staff development and coaching for selected schools in the southeast. Her experiences have included developing and monitoring a system of external review audits for schools designated as below average; monitoring statewide teams; performing on-site visits and reviews of schools designated as unsatisfactory; conducting training for teams performing external and internal audits using three focus areas (leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction and professional development); and working with federal and state legislation and translating this into operational procedures. She has been an accreditation specialist for Cognia (formerly AdvancED) for thirteen years, serving as a team member, a school and systems lead evaluator and is additionally certified as an early learning, global, and corporate lead evaluator.
Mrs. Heather Goodwin, Associate Lead Evaluator, Southwest Regional Director - Cognia	
Dr. Mark Ernst, Assistant Superintendent – Teaching and Learning	
Mr. Eric Ferrin, Data and Assessment Coordinator	
Dr. Edy McGee, Retired District Administrator	

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.

