Lakeland High School

Rathdrum, Idaho

cognia™

Table of Contents

cognia™

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 administrations 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 institution commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
1.3	The institution engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.										Improving
	EN:	2	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	2	
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:**	4	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	2	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution's purpose and direction.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
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:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	

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 institution.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.4	The institution has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers who support their educational experiences.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	3	
2.6	The institution implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the institution's learning expectations.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	3	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.12	The institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**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 institution plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the institution's effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
3.2	The institution's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
3.3	The institution 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:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualifie3d personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
3.6	The institution provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the institution.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
3.7	The institution demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the institution's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
3.8	The institution allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the institution's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	

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	333.00	**CIN 5 Year IEQ Range**	**278.34 – 283.33**

cognia™

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.

Given the COVID pandemic, this review was facilitated remotely. The team organized and engaged to provide the most personal experience possible for the team members and the institution. The Engagement Review Team identified several themes that represent the strengths and opportunities for improvement to help guide Lakeland High School to grow in their continuous improvement journey.

Leadership has developed a clear and consistent cultural message of high expectations, post-secondary opportunities, and mutual respect. Survey data and interviews illustrate multiple opportunities for stakeholders to develop leadership skills and involvement in the school. The school follows the slogan of "We are one." The development of the SALT (Student Athletic Leadership Team) program has enhanced the involvement of students in leadership roles. The school also has a program called Principal Assistant. It is a program where a person is groomed into the principalship. It pays a teacher salary and duties are to assist the principal in all capacities. There is a strong mentorship/coaching program.

Student, parent, and staff interviews demonstrate a deep commitment to respect and high expectations for learning. The school leadership identified a need for a career counselor. They put an emphasis in this area and hired an outstanding career counselor. Fifty-one percent (51%) of last year's seniors earned a scholarship to further their education. The school works closely with KTEC (Kootenai Technical Education Center). Fifty-two (52) students earned associate degrees while still in high school last school year. Interviews with students and survey data indicates that the students feel they have an adult in the school they can talk to and get support. This is one area that might be enhanced by adding an advisory period for staff/student support and relationship building.

Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet learners' needs and is consistently and clearly communicated. The Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) is based on survey data and academic norms student expectations for learning. Students are given teacher generated surveys at the end of each course to give feedback to the instructor. In examination of school documents, there is a distinction of curriculum offered. The distinction of the curriculum is core, honors, dual credit, and AP (Advanced Placement). The school uses the MTSS (Multi-Tiered Support System) to keep track of struggling students both academically and social emotionally. There are multiple modalities to keep appropriate stakeholders informed about student learning progress. These include ways such as blogs, web pages, Skyward (School Information System), conferences, emails, and phone calls. In interviews with parents and students, all participants indicated they checked on progress regularly.

The staff engage in high levels of collaboration that includes quality professional development activities. The building configuration is conducive to informal collaboration. Departments are clustered together. District and school professional development days are scheduled on a calendar. There are regularly scheduled department and staff meeting that are conducted for input and collaboration. Staff interviews indicated the leadership style is one of team manager, not team boss. Pre-COVID-19, the staff engaged in learning walks. This is where a department visits another school for the day. In addition, there is a formal mentoring program that includes coaching. The procedures are spelled out in the district handbook. In student interviews, it was indicated that one area for improvement is in conformity in using Google classroom. Perhaps a professional development activity on using Google classroom would alleviate this problem.

The district and school are committed to long-range, strategic planning and the allocation of resources aligned to identified needs. In interviews, parents stated they were asked to participate in long-range, strategic planning on bond levy issues and identified needs of the school/district. The district web page has the long-range strategic plan included. The plan includes the facilities, population demographics, technology plans, and fiscal planning. The technology plan addresses technology replacement and training. In interviews with staff and students, it was indicated that there is sufficient technology. The population of the school district is expanding. Keeping the dialogue of facility needs transparent and in the fore front is paramount with the increase of student population.

The governing body adheres to a code of ethics and has adopted policies to support learning and organizational effectiveness. In examination of documents, there is a code of ethics listed in board policy. The board uses ISBA (Idaho School Boards Association) policies and procedures. They are current in the adoption as they become available. The board also attends ISBA conferences and trainings. The team recommends continued adherence to the code of ethics and attendance at training.

Lakeland High School is to be congratulated on the work that has been done. Using this report as a roadmap for school improvement is a catalyst for propelling improvement and growth for the school and all learners.

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 comprise professionals with varied backgrounds and professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members complete Cognia training and eleot 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
Jerry Nelsen Lead Evaluator	Jerry Nelsen is a retired secondary school administrator with 34 years in the educational field. He received his master's degree in education administration from the University of Idaho. Mr. Nelsen has experience as a teacher, vice principal, activities director, principal, interim superintendent, and school trustee. He has served on numerous engagement reviews. For the last eight years, he has served as Cognia lead evaluator.
Eric Forsgren	Eric Forsgren began his education career in 1998 at Skyview High School in Nampa, Idaho, where he taught physical education and Spanish. He also coached Jr. High basketball, was the head track and field coach for both boys and girls, and coached varsity football. He later served as a vice principal at Skyview. Currently, he is in his 7th year as principal at Melba High School. He graduated from Melba High in 1991 and earned an A.A. from Rick's College, his B.A. from Brigham Young University, and his M.A. in educational leadership from the University of Idaho.
Phil Kemink	Phil Kemink has been in education for over twenty years. He spent most of his time as a student in biology, chemistry, education, and educational leadership. He has taught students in grades 6-12, in both the United States of America and Costa Rica. For the last fifteen years, he has served in an administrative role as a principal in a small rural Idaho secondary school. While in his current position, he has served on numerous accreditation review teams throughout North Idaho. While living in Costa Rica, he helped prepare a pre-K through 12 school system for a SACS review. He has also been the president of the Idaho Region One Secondary Principal Association. He now represents Idaho Region 1, at the Idaho Association of School Administrator meetings.
David Miles II	David Miles II joined the education profession in 2002 and now serves as principal of Sandpoint High School. A University of Idaho graduate, David taught for ten (10) years at Sandpoint High School before spending six (6) years as principal as Boundary County Middle School.

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. (