Ascension Parish School System

Donaldsonville, Louisiana

October 24 - 27, 2021

System Accreditation Engagement Review

215358

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 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™

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:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
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:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
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:**	4	**EM:**	4	
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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.										Improving
	EN:	2	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
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:**	3	

Leadership Capacity Standards											Rating
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**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 system.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	2	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**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.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
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:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	3	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	1	**EM:**	2	

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**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:**	2	**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:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	4	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
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:	4	**IM:**	3	**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:**	2	**SU:**	2	**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:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating
3.6	The system provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the system.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	4	
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:**	4	
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:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**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	347.26	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.

Ascension Parish Schools is a high-performing school system ranked fourth in the state in academic achievement. There are over 23,000 students in 31 schools, served by over 3,100 employees. At the conclusion of extensive document reviews and in-depth interviews, the team's review yielded the following themes.

There is a deeply ingrained commitment to the system's purpose statement – "Providing Quality Experiences Every Day." "Excellence. Ascending Together." is their tag line. During interviews with each stakeholder group, the team was told that the ultimate goal is for student success. Registered and trademarked branding is a major part of the system's approach, as they provide web pages, have a social media presence, post billboards around the community, and have videos supporting the theme. Staff told the team, "We are the A-team!" Students expressed school pride, and several cited the mottos when speaking of their schools. Students said that teachers were always helpful, clubs allowed them to express their passion and creativity, the environment is always positive, and teachers are like family who do not demean them for making mistakes. One 4th-grader said, "From the moment I walked into the door, it's been a community. Even the bad kids at the end of the year are better." A middle-schooler said the English teacher's goal was to get them to love English by the end of the year. There was a tremendous sense of community pride as we spoke with external stakeholders, parents, board members, administrators, and teachers. Each person expressed pride in the school system and joy with their associations. Parents and community representatives were convinced that leadership is taking the school in the right direction and have demonstrated their support each time a request for a millage increase has been made. The team heard such terms as student-centered, pro-active, progressive, and caring. The superintendent's overview indicated that community voter approval is over 70% for the school system's millage requests. One parent shared that her child had requested to move to Ascension Parish and has had warm and welcoming experiences. The mayor spoke of students' success after graduating from the system's schools. And the sheriff indicated that the system has been good stewards of the funding allocations.

A strong "culture of family," which promotes collegiality and collaboration, is evident. Teachers said that even with new teachers, no one should feel alone. We have each other's back. The system offers a four-

week professional development session for prospective teachers. During this time, participants observe, co-teach, plan, and teach. If participants remain in the system for two years, the cost is reimbursed. There is an organizational approach to the success of the teaching-learning process from the system level to the school level. Each grade level has a supervisor – primary, elementary, and middle – responsible for ensuring adherence to system and curriculum goals. At the next level are instructional coaches, mentors, masters, and/or buddy teachers who facilitate school-based weekly professional learning communities (PLCs) and provide feedback on instruction, student work, and established goals. The superintendent told the team that the system's executive leadership team meets once a week; the system's leadership team meets five times per annum; the directors have departmental meetings. Principals have level meetings that are held monthly. PLCs convene weekly. The accommodation for singles is to link them with others to discuss failure rates, initiate parental contacts, or focus on reading instructional strategies. Each of these groups provides feedback for assessing the progress of students. The instructional staff indicated that they set goals for each of their observations linked to the PLC discussions. These goals are monitored by the instructional coaches/mentor/master teachers. The feedback consists of altering instructional strategies in response to academic performance levels. The team suggests considering quarterly opportunities for those who are the only subject matter teachers at each school to come together to discuss content and appropriate instructional approaches. This would strengthen the existing structures that support the school's purpose.

A seamless staff supervision and evaluation process is ingrained within the system. There is a process to supervise all staff, instructional and non-instructional. Staff development opportunities are readily available for all staff to participate and gain skills. A prescriptive evaluation process is identified at the system level for all professional staff. These evaluations include growth goals for system-and school-level personnel. The board is responsible for evaluating and overseeing the actions of the superintendent. After the review of the system by the external organization Lean Frog, the superintendent now has direct supervision and evaluation of the executive leadership team. The process now has directors evaluating supervisors, supervisors evaluating principals, principals evaluating teachers, and assistant principals evaluating early childhood. This process is replicated among the child nutrition office, the maintenance office, the transportation office, and the technology office. A National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) rubric is in place for each of these reviews. Staff is trained and certified in its use annually. This process is functionally sound and should be continued.

Data is effectively used to monitor and adjust to meet the needs of learners. Teachers and administrators all say that the system is data-rich, and the evidence presented to the team supports this. Illuminate, an online data-sharing platform, helps schools organize data. A rich set of data points are provided through the use of AIMSweb (Oral Reading Fluency), Google Classroom, Khan Academy, Piazza, IXL for math, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), I Hub, STEM Scopes, and LEP 360. Walk-throughs, benchmarks, and system assessments are examined during instructional leadership team meetings and PLCs. PLCs are strategically organized to address disaggregation of student achievement data to impact student intervention progress towards system/school goals. Commendably, students were able to share with the team how their data were used. Students could tell us how and where achievement data are stored, how they use it to set individual goals, and how they are able to check their progress. All students participate in Tier One curriculum from the Louisiana State Department of Education's approved list. Tiers Two and Three, English Language Learners, and Exceptional Student Services (ESS) small group interventions are provided to students based on data and implemented by designated staff. All levels of data are tracked and monitored throughout the system. Additionally, data have been used for non-instructional decision-making, such as the leasing of the school bus fleet, the securing of technology, and the construction of four new schools.

Structured long-range planning positively impacting resource management is apparent. The public information officer has worked with schools to publish flyers to provide information to the public and to the parents using Peachjar. An assessment of the reduction of paper usage has been noted. The COO indicated that the system has a healthy fund balance reserve, whose revenues have remained solid despite the recent hurricanes, flooding, and pandemic. The technology director has made good use of Ad Valorem taxes, ESSER, and ECI funds to purchase devices for all students, with the intent to expand to pre-k in the next year. Students in grades one through four have Chromebooks, and grades nine through twelve have Windows laptops.

Of note, the system has indicated that one challenge is the retention of staff on the west side of the district. It is important for the system to provide targeted assistance for educational opportunities for students in these schools. Admittedly, these schools are labeled TAP schools and do receive additional funding; however, the retention of teachers and the educational opportunities for students at these schools is challenging. The inclusion of external stakeholders in the approach to this could possibly provide a new dimension for thought and perhaps actions. Some options to be considered could include establishing magnet schools or academies.

Internal and external stakeholder input in the decision-making process was not evident. The superintendent has made great strides in reaching out to the community to share the system's actions. Several external stakeholders and the board members mentioned the efforts that have been made through presentations at the Rotary, town hall meetings, the Access Committee, and the parent advisory group. The use of various social media outlets, newsletters, and web page all serve to effectively communicate to the public. The community members that were interviewed expressed great support for the success of the school system. As the system continues to move forward, it would be essential to have input from these and other stakeholder groups, which would provide an alternative viewpoint that may serve to broaden the perspective of the leadership. External stakeholder groups shared that they had responded to surveys but had not ever seen or heard the results, which may or may not be attributed to memory. When asked, the parents, community, principals, and teachers could not share how they had input in the development of the strategic plan for the system. As the system continues its journey, having discussions with all stakeholders to advance the vision and mission of the system would be an important step.

There is no formal structure to ensure learners have an advocate. The review of evidence and conversations with teachers and students revealed that there is no formal program to ensure that learners develop positive relationships with or have an adult/peer who supports their educational experiences. There are numerous opportunities for students to participate in the arts, organized sports, and various clubs and organizations such as Beta, Robotics, and Student Council; however, when asked, students indicated various teachers that they felt comfortable in approaching for help or to whom they confided. A few students indicated that they would seek the help of the counselor. The system and its students would benefit by examining programs and implementing a quality process to ensure that each student has a peer or an adult to whom they reach out. A well-developed process, implemented at all levels, would strengthen the social-emotional foundation to assist students in excelling academically; serve to address unspoken needs that students bring to the classroom; facilitate their assimilation from one level to the next; and support the PBIS efforts of each school. The greatest benefit for this would be ensuring that no student was left behind and keeping them on the path towards the system's mission -- high-quality education necessary to succeed in an ever-changing world.

Activities that support creativity, innovation, and problem-solving are not strong. Students were asked about their favorite classes and why these were selected. Each student mentioned the opportunities to work in teams, work on projects, have fun, be challenged, and learn. When asked about the use of rubrics, the overwhelming response was in their writing across the curriculum. Inquiry and

project-based learning strategies would increase students' retention, make meaningful life experiences, and expand the transfer of concepts to other areas and at the next level. An added advantage is that it may also provide support for students who are not meeting basic performance levels on state testing. The structure is in place for this to occur through the schools' PLCs. The level supervisors, interventionists, and mentor/master teachers have an ideal arrangement to implement professional development and instructional monitoring to ensure that inquiry-and project-based learning become the norm.

A process through which the system assesses its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning was not provided. Though data-rich, the system, through its own admission, did not have a process by which it assessed its programs or processes. Strategic planning goals have been identified; however, it is unclear how these goals are assessed. Survey results from various sources have been collected, yet results have not been used to effect goals. For example, evidence was provided from principals' meeting evaluations indicating a need for more training on cultural sensitivity; however, there was no evidence indicating that this was done or considered. In keeping with the portion of the mission statement to provide every child a high-quality education, the system should want to determine if it has been successful in meeting this tenet. Using the data that has been collected and strategically analyzed in tandem with the system's mission, vision, and goals may serve as guiding factors.

Throughout the year, but especially at year's end, all programs and processes should be evaluated to determine effectiveness. Forthright discussions around curriculum analysis, instructional practices, organizational improvement, school improvement goals, and student achievement are pieces in the progression of organizational effectiveness. An atmosphere of collegiality among internal stakeholders currently exists; leadership should tap into this climate to involve everyone in the planning, implementation, and analysis of goals and activities. The process should identify whether the current focus should be continued, altered, or discarded for a new focus. These steps ensure the buy-in of stakeholders, commitment to actions, and enhance the existing core beliefs.

The passion of the leadership and the commitment of internal stakeholders is clearly evident within the Ascension Parish School System. The superintendent and leadership have established positive relationships with the community and with each other. During the superintendent's overview, he said, "While we chase perfection, we may find excellence." It is the intent of the team to provide strategies to impact that chase.

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.

cognia

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 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 (Lead Evaluator Only)
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. Mrs. Banks 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 14 years, serving as a team member, a school and systems Lead Evaluator, and is certified as an early learning, global, and corporate Lead Evaluator.
Dr. Shelita Cannon-Hoey, Social Studies Supervisor, Caddo Parish Public Schools	
Amy V. DiCarlo, Director of Elementary Schools, St. Tammany Parish Public School System	
Suzanne Navo, District Grant Writer, East Baton Rouge Parish School System	
Dr. Candace Robertson, Chief School Improvement Officer, St. Helena Parish School District	

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.