Farmington Public School District

Farmington, Michigan

cognia™

Table of Contents

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.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
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:**	2	**EM:**	3	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	1	**EM:**	2	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
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:	4	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	1	**EM:**	2	

cognia™

Leadership Capacity Standards											Rating
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**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.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
2.4	The system has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers that support their educational experiences.										Initiating
	EN:	2	**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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	4	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Initiating
	EN:	2	**IM:**	1	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	1	**EM:**	2	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	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.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
3.3	The system provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
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:**	3	**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.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**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:**	3	**SU:**	2	**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.

COGNIA logo

| Institution IEQ | 314.84 | CIN 5 Year IEQ Range | 278.34 – 283.33 |

Insights from the Review

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

The Engagement Review Team (team) identified four themes aligned to the continuous improvement process at the Farmington Public School System. These themes present both strengths and opportunities to guide the system's improvement journey. The team identified themes around culture, long-range planning, curriculum, and continuous improvement. The team reviewed evidence provided by the system and remotely interviewed stakeholders to develop this report.

Stakeholders demonstrate a shared commitment to a culture focused on excellence, diversity, equity, and inclusion that is clearly aligned to the purpose statements. Interviews with representatives from all stakeholder groups confirmed that the initiatives related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) align to the changing needs of students in the system and to the priorities identified by the community. The team found intentional programs designed to create environments that are reflective, inclusive, and welcoming to the diverse population the system serves. System leaders focused on the development of a "common language" regarding DEI to promote a deeper understanding of the initiatives to ensure continuity and alignment of programs and services. The system conducted an Equity Audit to identify opportunities for improvement. Leaders use the information from the audit to inform decisions about programs and services to ensure all decisions align with the purpose statements and key improvement priorities. The comprehensive governing board policies ensure compliance with laws and regulations. The board reviewed all policies within the past four years to streamline them. In addition, board guidelines include protocols to regularly review, and revise policies as needed. The board employs legal counsel to guide adherence to applicable laws. A code of ethics that includes principles of conduct and ethical standards guide board decisions. A board member commented that "it is our role to make sure all decisions align to the vision of the system." The board demonstrates a clear focus on moving the system forward and is committed to amplifying the voice of the constituents they serve.

Initiatives with a focus on DEI remain at the forefront of decision-making in the system. Leaders at all levels demonstrated a strong commitment to special education, English Language Learners (ELL), and the homeless population. The system implements processes to identify and meet the specialized needs of students. A wide range of diversified programs meet the specialized needs of students, serving students from an inclusion model to the multi-handicapped in self-contained classes. The referral process includes specific protocols to inform decisions about providing specialized services for students. The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) plays an integral part in the referral process which

includes an array of interventions prior to identification of a student for special services. The MTSS protocols are system-wide ensuring consistency and transparency. Teachers provide struggling students with tiered interventions to determine if additional support or programs are needed. The system provides students and teachers with support to identify and meet the needs of a wide range of students served in the special education program. The ELL program uses the WIDA Model to identify students for whom English is not a native language. The Newcomers Center gives ELL students an opportunity to transition to a school in a safe and nurturing environment. Instruction in English, mathematics, science, and social studies provides ELL students a foundation on which to enter a traditional school. The homeless department identifies students who meet the identified criteria and provides a network of support for the students and their families. A leader reported, "the intense focus of all these programs is to break down silos and provide experiences that maximize the potential of each student." School leaders ensure the education and career planning program implemented across the system has an intentional focus on preparing students to achieve at their highest potential. Students described opportunities to explore careers and educational opportunities through specific programs and as part of the curriculum.

Leaders implemented restorative justice initiatives throughout the system. Listening circles afford students a non-threatening way to resolve conflicts and give an opportunity for a "mental health check-in." Teachers participate in culturally responsive training with professional learning offered to support the effective implementation of the restorative justice program. A social, emotional, and learning (SEL) focus throughout the system drives many programs. An SEL Activities Guide for teachers includes specific activities to address the social and emotional needs of students. System and school leaders developed a Positive Culture Handbook to give teachers an additional layer of support for programs targeted at diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) framework encourages responsible behavior and sound decision-making among students. The PBIS initiative, implemented system-wide, resulted in a decline in the number of disciplinary infractions and suspensions. Although interviews with leaders and teachers highlighted the importance of positive relationships with students, the team found limited evidence of formal structures to ensure students develop relationships with an adult to support their educational experiences. Part of the DEI goal is to gather voice from all stakeholders, however, parents reported communication is inconsistent and sometimes limits opportunities for all stakeholders to embrace initiatives. The team noted gaps in communication between the schools and the system. Students and parents shared a lack of understanding of some programs occurring because of limited communication. Some parents commented that inequality existed among schools, with one parent stating "what neighborhood you live in should not determine access to equitable programs for students." The team encourages system leaders to use the data from the Equity Audit to align initiatives with the priorities for diversity, equity, and inclusion. The team suggests leaders communicate the results of audits related to improvement efforts to parents and community members which may help build trust for the system's leadership. Leaders are encouraged to evaluate all programs and services through the lens of the DEI goals to ensure strategies meet the goals and result in growth and improvement. To focus on the goal of positive relationships, the system may want to identify, implement, monitor, and evaluate a formal structure to ensure all students have an adult advocate. The team suggests the structure include a designated time to meet, activities, and resources to support the program. Leaders should continue to maintain a focus on reviewing programs and services for alignment with the DEI goals. The team encourages the system to expand professional learning opportunities around the DEI initiatives. Including protocols to evaluate these professional learning activities may help system leaders target areas in need of improvement in the implementation of the DEI strategies.

Long-range strategic planning about facilities, fiscal decisions, and the allocation of human, material, and physical resources align with the purpose statements. The system's successful bond referendums reflect evidence of careful long-range planning. The passage of the last two bond

referendums reveals the community's commitment to the system. The intentional and thoughtful preparation for the referendum included data regarding the need for the bond passage, documented information about necessary facility upgrades and renovations, additional capital resources, and orchestrated communication strategies to ensure the community was well informed about the system's goals and priorities. The plan put before the voters included evidence of responsible and thorough facilities planning. A board member reported that the bond referendum focused on equity to ensure students had equitable facilities across the system. The board and system leaders demonstrate fiscally responsible decision-making. Financial projections rely on a three-year forecast in all budget decisions. Leaders stated the system maintains an 8-12% fund balance to ensure unexpected expenditures do not interfere with budgeted items. The fiscal planning process includes the revisiting and reallocation of resources based on real-time needs. For example, when the system's technology needed additional resources to support online learning, funds were dedicated to ensuring all students had the resources needed to continue their respective education paths. In addition, the expansion of the DEI initiatives required additional staff to provide support for teachers and students. Funds aligned to these programs and services provided an additional layer of support to ensure the effective implementation of the strategies.

The investment in the Canvas learning management system indicates the system's focus on providing digital platforms to improve operational effectiveness. Although the team reviewed evidence of extensive training in the use of the Canvas platform, parents commented that they found it difficult to understand and navigate and frequently did not use the resource because of frustration with it. The allocation of human resources aligns to the system's key improvement priorities. The additional staff to support special education, ELL, and the homeless populations allows targeted programs to serve the needs of these diverse populations. In addition, leaders added staff positions to support the programs and services specifically aligned to the DEI initiatives. A formalized staff induction process makes sure new staff are provided information about system goals, programs, and services. Time and resources are dedicated to supporting the induction program. A mentor assigned to each new teacher provides additional support. Although the mentoring program includes specific guidelines, limited evidence indicated mentors participate in training to ensure the program is implemented with quality and fidelity. The team noted that the allocations dedicated to the induction and mentoring programs are included in budget planning. Clearly defined hiring practices ensure adequate staff is recruited and retained. Leaders stated recruitment of quality teachers to the system requires an intentional focus on using best practices and timely resources. The team encourages system leaders to develop evaluation protocols to ensure the number of teachers is adequate to meet the desired student-teacher ratio. As new district staff are added to support and develop programs, maintaining a focus on ensuring adequate teachers can support the programs may result in continued growth and improvement in achieving the goals of excellence, diversity, equity, and inclusion. The team suggests the technology staff evaluate the effectiveness of all digital tools and platforms and streamlines platforms as needed based on the data from the evaluations. Leaders may want to evaluate the effectiveness of stakeholder communication strategies related to the use of Canvas to improve parental understanding of how to access and use the platform efficiently. The team encourages the system to continue the use of digital platforms and to collect, analyze, and use data related to them to monitor and adjust the programs in response to the data. Leaders are encouraged to continue to monitor demographic shifts in the population to ensure appropriate staff and resources are allocated to align with the key improvement priorities of the system.

System leaders adopted a curriculum based on high expectations that align to standards and best practices. Courses for Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Career Technical Education (CTE), and special education provide a wide range of programs for students with varied interests, goals, and learning needs. The Atlas Rubicon used system-wide includes a strong curriculum mapping process. The team found an intentional focus on identifying power standards and

aligning instructional practices to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity. The curriculum aligns to Michigan state standards and in addition to AP, IB, and CTE, aligns to other curriculum frameworks that are based on high expectations and best practices. For example, the science curriculum aligns with Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Instructional leaders reported the "emphasis on authentic" tasks and higher-level thinking and problem-solving are at the forefront of curriculum and instruction decisions. Leaders commented that high expectations are expected in every class regardless of the level of the course. Teachers use strategies including graphic organizers to ensure students understand the sequencing of skills to increase understanding and connections. The system implemented a K-12 social emotional learning curriculum that is integrated into the instructional program to align with the DEI goals in the purpose statements. In addition, a comprehensive K-12 career curriculum ensures students have multiple opportunities to explore areas of career interest. The team found a chart that outlined all career activities in the curriculum. The team reviewed the draft of the new Curriculum Framework which includes guidelines for curriculum selection, instructional models, a balanced assessment system, and processes to communicate with all stakeholder groups about the curriculum.

The Professional Learning Community (PLC) framework promotes collaboration among teachers to improve learner performance. The PLC structure includes protocols to monitor the curriculum and to revise it as needed in response to student performance data. A review of PLC information indicates instructional teachers adjust instructional practice based on student learning data. Student performance data from the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment informs decisions about curriculum revision and instructional practices. Teachers and instructional leaders monitor student growth and improvement using the MAP data. The system's curriculum revision committees use current summative and formative data to inform decision-making. Although the team found evidence that progress has begun in the development of common grading practices, interviews with parents and teachers indicated inconsistencies exist. Parents commented the lack of common grading policies to measure attainment of content knowledge was an area of concern. Students verified that grading practices vary between classes and courses. The team encourages the system to establish formalized processes to consistently monitor and adjust the curriculum to ensure the quality of implementation. The use of longitudinal data to guide curricular revision with a focus on demographic shifts and student learning needs may ensure the curriculum continues to align to the DEI goals and key strategic priorities. The team suggests the system establish and monitor the implementation of common grading practices across all schools and subjects. The team further encourages the system to identify communication strategies about the common grading practices to ensure all stakeholders are informed about the grading protocols. The improved communication may positively impact parent and community perception of equity in grading practices. Leaders are encouraged to identify classroom observation tools and strategies to monitor student engagement related to creativity, innovation, and inquiry-based instruction. The data from the observations could be used to inform professional learning opportunities. The team encourages leaders to fully implement the protocols and practices included in the new Curriculum Framework. Evaluation processes that include the collection, analysis, and use of data regarding the framework may provide direction as the system continues to monitor growth and improvement in student learning.

The system's intentional focus on aligning programs and services with the key strategic priorities ensures continuous improvement guides decision-making. The strategic planning process includes opportunities for representatives from all stakeholder groups to participate. The team reviewed a video produced to encourage stakeholders to participate in committees to develop the strategic plan. The plan includes key priorities, activities, and measures to monitor the goals. System leaders identified Action Teams to identify initiatives aligned to the key improvement goals. Leaders established eight committees to guide the continuous improvement process. Students serve on six of the eight committees to ensure student voices are heard in the process. A leader commented that the teams

should be led "by those closest to the work." As a result of this philosophy, teachers join cabinet leaders in leadership roles in the improvement process. System leaders and teachers intentionally align all improvement initiatives with the DEI priorities in the purpose statements. The team found a Data Dashboard which included data from academic performance, behavior, demographics, special education, and perception. Although the dashboard provides a platform for data collection over time, limited longitudinal data are included to show growth and improvement.

The system reorganized the central office positions to align the leadership positions with the key strategic priorities. Job descriptions and expectations for cabinet members intentionally include expectations for oversight of the improvement priorities. The system's structure provides multiple layers of support for all programs and services. A student roundtable that meets with system leadership allows students to give insight and direction from their lens as the system implements improvement initiatives. Leaders collect, analyze, and use stakeholder feedback data to develop, review, and revise improvement actions. Although leaders regularly administer stakeholder surveys, some parents reported the results of the surveys are inconsistently communicated to external stakeholders. A leader commented that "learner outcomes are at the center of all continuous improvement." Building leaders provide monthly reports to system leaders as a part of the quality assurance process used by the system to monitor schools. The team encourages leaders to evaluate stakeholder engagement strategies to ensure the processes are inclusive and provide all groups with opportunities to share perception data. Additionally, the team suggests the system identify ways to encourage two-way communication with parents. Streamlining communication processes to ensure the messages about continuous improvement are clear and consistent may provide greater transparency about programs and services. The team encourages leaders to identify, implement, and evaluate protocols to analyze trend and comparison data about continuous improvement initiatives to provide a systematic overview of the system's growth and improvement over time and progress toward achieving the goals in the strategic and improvement plans.

In conclusion, the themes identified by the team should be considered along with the rest of the findings from the review as a part of the system's continuous improvement process. They provide next steps to guide the improvement journey to improve quality and opportunity for all learners. Leaders are encouraged to refer to the key concepts in the Cognia Performance Standards to guide improvement. In addition to the ratings for each Standard, ratings for each key concept should be reviewed.

Next Steps

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

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

Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Holly Wingard, Lead Evaluator	Holly Wingard, a lead evaluator for Cognia, currently chairs teams throughout the United States and the Middle East. Though retired from Spartanburg School District Three in South Carolina, she remains active, serving as a consultant for systems preparing for Engagement Reviews and as a facilitator for systems in the development of strategic plans. Ms. Wingard worked in both a large urban school district and a small rural system. She worked as a teacher, counselor, and gifted and talented coordinator. During her 34 years in education, she also worked with the accountability department and served on administrative teams. Ms. Wingard earned a Bachelor of Arts in sociology from the University of Georgia and a Master of Education in student personnel from the University of South Carolina. Her masters plus thirty includes courses taken from the University of South Carolina, Converse College, and The Citadel in counseling, administration, and teacher evaluation. Ms. Wingard served on Diagnostic Review Teams in South Carolina and led monitoring reviews. She is also a Cognia Improvement Consultant for North Carolina.
Kraig Howell	Kraig Howell currently serves a dual role for Alcovy High School, in Newton County, serving as part-time administrator and part-time special education teacher. Throughout his 15 years in education, Mr. Howell has served as a behavior specialist, PBIS district coordinator, special education coordinator, RtI/SST coordinator, assistant principal, and GNETS assistant director. Mr. Howell received his Bachelor of Arts from Emory University, a Masters of Arts in teaching from Piedmont College, a certification in Educational Leadership from Georgia State University, and an Educational Specialist from the University of Georgia.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Cathi Stojikov	Cathi Stojkov has been serving Brightmont Academy since 2013, starting in the role of campus director, and now, as the VP of talent management/HR. In her current role, she recruits, develops, and coaches the teaching staff in five states including fourteen campuses. She began her professional career in business management and found her true passion in curricula and education over twenty years ago. Mrs. Stojkov's experience includes administration and teaching in a variety of online, blended, and traditional learning environments from secondary to college classrooms. Mrs. Stojkov holds a B.A. in history and a B.A. in social sciences from Eastern Michigan University and an M.Ed. in technology and learning design focused on performance from Wayne State University. She also holds a Michigan Secondary Professional teaching certification.
Jennifer Hammond	Dr. Jennifer Hammond serves as the director of academic services and talent management for the Muskegon Public Schools. She has experience as a large, suburban high school principal, an assistant principal, and middle school and high school mathematics teacher. To ensure high quality leadership throughout the State of Michigan, Dr. Hammond served on the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals Board of Directors and President of the MASSP. She was selected by Governor Snyder to participate in the Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness and was tasked with developing a State-wide Educator Evaluation system.
Simon Huang	Mr. Simon C. Huang joined Ronald Reagan Secondary School in 2016, and serves as the assistant registrar/student service director. As the assistant registrar/student service director, Mr. Huang organizes and directs clerical and functional operations in the Registration Office, within their area of specialization (i.e. graduation and transcripts, enrollment reporting and student relations, petitions, and appeals), providing critical support to students, faculty, staff, and third-party agencies and address questions or concerns with a solution-based approach. The assistant registrar is expected to handle multiple responsibilities, solve complex problems, and ensure that systems and processes meet service expectations. Mr. Huang has earned his Master's in Computer Science from the University of Northern Virginia. Prior to joining Ronald Reagan Secondary School, Mr. Huang had more than five years of working experience as a database administrator with political several IT companies.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Gretchen Yeager	Gretchen Yeager joined Champions, a brand of KinderCare Education in 2006, and serves as the director of quality and accreditation leading the organization's quality initiatives and partnerships. She oversees Champions program improvement at 500+ school age programs nationally with a focus on fidelity of implementation, quality measures, and all accreditation functions. Yeager's professional career spans over 35 years in the fields of early education and business, impacting key education initiatives and quality at the local, state, and national levels. Her experience includes teacher, director, education specialist, district manager, vice president. In her current role, she led the strategy and design of a national quality improvement system and served as vice chair and treasurer of the National AfterSchool Association. Yeager earned an ECE degree at New York Institute of Technology, New York, and Leadership Development master certification through the Center for Creative Leadership, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

References and Readings

AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/continuousimprovement-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 http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/what-continuously-improving-system-looks-like.

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 http://www.advanc-ed.org/sites/default/files/CISWhitePaper.pdf.

Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/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.