October 21-24, 2018

AdvancED® Engagement Review Report

AdvancED® Performance Accreditation

Results for:
Fayette County School System
210 Stonewall Avenue West
Fayetteville, Georgia 30214

Table of Contents

Introduction

AdvancED Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal to leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the 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 AdvancED 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 AdvancED Performance Standards. Using these Standards, Engagement Review Teams assess the quality of learning environments to gain valuable insights and target improvements in teaching and learning. AdvancED 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.

AdvancED Standards Diagnostic Results

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

Color	Rating	Description
Red	Needs Improvement	Identifies key areas that need more focused improvement efforts
Yellow	Emerging	Represents areas to enhance and extend current improvement efforts
Green	Meets Expectations	Pinpoints quality practices that meet the Standards
Blue	Exceeds Expectations	Demonstrates noteworthy practices producing clear results that exceed expectations

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.	Meets Expectations
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.	Meets Expectations
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.	Exceeds Expectations
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.	Exceeds Expectations
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.	Exceeds Expectations
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.	Exceeds Expectations
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.	Meets Expectations
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.	Emerging
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.	Emerging
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.	Emerging
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for its institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.	Meets Expectations

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.	Exceeds Expectations
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.	Emerging
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs and skills needed for success.	Meets Expectations
2.4	The system has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers that support their educational experiences.	Emerging
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.	Exceeds Expectations
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.	Exceeds Expectations

Learning Capacity Standards		Rating
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.	Meets Expectations
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational future and career planning.	Meets Expectations
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.	Exceeds Expectations
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.	Meets Expectations
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to demonstrable improvement of student learning.	Exceeds Expectations
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.	Emerging

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.	Meets Expectations
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.	Emerging
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.	Meets Expectations
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.	Meets Expectations
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.	Meets Expectations
3.6	The system provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the system.	Meets Expectations
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.	Exceeds Expectations
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.	Exceeds Expectations

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® (eleot®) Results

The AdvancED eProve™ Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® (eleot®) is a learner-centric classroom observation tool that comprises 28 items organized in seven environments aligned with the AdvancED Standards. Classroom observations are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes. Trained and certified observers take into account the level of embeddedness, quality, and complexity of application or implementation; number of students engaged and frequency of application. Results from the eleot are reported on a scale of one to four based on the students' engagement in and reaction to the learning environment. In addition to the results from the review, the AdvancED Improvement Network (AIN) results are reported to benchmark your results against the network averages. The eleot provides useful, relevant, structured, and quantifiable data on the extent to which students are engaged in activities and/or demonstrate knowledge, attitudes, and/or dispositions that are conducive to effective learning.

The insights eleot data provide are an invaluable source of information for continuous improvement planning efforts. Although averages by eleot Learning Environment are helpful to gauge quality at a higher, more impressionistic level, the average rating for each item is more fine-grained, specific and actionable. Institutions should identify the five to seven items with the lowest ratings and examine patterns in those ratings within and across environments to identify areas for improvement. Similarly, identifying the five to seven items with the highest ratings also will assist in identifying strengths within and across eleot Learning Environments. Examining the eleot data in conjunction with other institution data will provide valuable feedback on areas of strength or improvement in institution's learning environments.

eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot® Observations	**80**	
Environments	**Rating**	**AIN**
Equitable Learning Environment	2.96	2.86
Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs	2.73	1.89
Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support	3.23	3.74
Learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner	3.46	3.77
Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions and dispositions	2.40	2.06
High Expectations Environment	2.92	3.02
Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher	3.00	3.17
Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable	3.15	3.14
Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work	2.51	2.83
Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing)	3.04	3.06
Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning	2.93	2.89
Supportive Learning Environment	3.32	3.61
Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful	3.29	3.66

eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot® Observations	**80**	
Environments	**Rating**	**AIN**
Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback)	3.13	3.49
Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks	3.40	3.66
Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher	3.44	3.66
Active Learning Environment	3.03	3.08
Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate	3.15	3.34
Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences	2.88	2.80
Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities	3.24	3.43
Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments	2.85	2.74
Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment	2.65	3.14
Learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored	2.62	3.20
Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work	2.99	3.37
Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content	2.84	3.37
Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed	2.13	2.63
Well-Managed Learning Environment	3.49	3.58
Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other	3.62	3.86
Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others	3.60	3.83
Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another	3.30	3.09
Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions	3.45	3.54
Digital Learning Environment	1.88	1.50
Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning	2.05	1.60
Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning	1.88	1.46
Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning	1.62	1.46

Assurances

Assurances are statements 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	**X**	Unmet	
Unmet Assurances			

AdvancED Continuous Improvement System

AdvancED 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 AdvancED 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. AdvancED 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 will be organized by the Levels of Impact within i3: Initiate, Improve and Impact. The organization of the findings is based upon the ratings from the Standards Diagnostic and the i3 Levels of 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 stakeholders are engaged in the desired practices, processes, or programs within the institution. Implementation is the degree to which the desired practices, processes, or programs are monitored and adjusted for quality and fidelity of implementation. Standards identified within Initiate should become the focus of the institution's continuous improvement journey to move toward the collection, analysis and use of data to measure the results of engagement and implementation. A focus on enhancing the capacity of the institution in meeting the identified 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 represents 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 (minimum of three years). Standards identified within Improve are those in which the institution is using results to inform their continuous improvement processes and using results over time to demonstrate 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 the culture of the institution. Institutions should continue to support and sustain these practices that are yielding results in improving student achievement and organizational effectiveness.

Findings

The findings in this report represent the degree to which the Accreditation Standards are effectively implemented in support of the learning environment and the mission of the institution. Standards which are identified in the **Initiate** phase of practice are considered Priorities for Improvement that must be addressed by the institution to retain accreditation. Standards which are identified in the **Improve** phase of practice are considered Opportunities for Improvement that the institution should consider. Standards which are identified in the **Impact** phase of practice are considered Effective Practices within the institution.

I3 Rubric Levels	STANDARDS
Initiate Priorities for Improvement	Standard 1.10 Standard 2.4 Standard 3.2
Improve Opportunities for Improvement	Standards 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 Standards 2.2, 2.12 Standards 3.4, 3.5
Impact Effective Practices	Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.11 Standards 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11 Standards 3.1, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8

Accreditation Recommendation and Index of Education Quality® (IEQ®)

The Engagement Review Team recommends to the AdvancED Global Commission that the institution earns the distinction of accreditation for a five-year term. AdvancED will review the results of the Engagement Review to make a final determination, including the appropriate next steps for the institution in response to these findings.

AdvancED provides the Index of Education Quality® (IEQ®) as a holistic measure of overall performance based on a comprehensive set of standards and review criteria. A formative tool for improvement, it identifies areas of success as well as areas in need of focus. The IEQ is comprised of the Standards Diagnostic ratings from the three Domains: 1) Leadership Capacity; 2) Learning Capacity; and 3) Resource Capacity. The IEQ results are reported on a scale of 100 to 400 and provides 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 the Initiate 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 AIN institutions evaluated for accreditation in the last five years. The range of the annual AIN IEQ average is presented to enable you to benchmark your results with other institutions in the network.

Institution IEQ	330.81	AIN 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, examples of programs and practices and provide direction for the institution's continuous improvement efforts. The Insights from the Review narrative should provide contextualized information from the team deliberations and provide information about the team's analysis of the practices, processes, and programs of the institution from the levels of Initiate, Improve, and Impact. The Insights from the Review narrative should provide next steps to guide the improvement journey of the institution in its efforts to improve the quality of educational opportunities for all learners. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness. The feedback provided in the Accreditation Engagement Review Report will assist the institution in reflecting on its current improvement efforts and to adapt and adjust their plans to continuously strive for improvement.

The Engagement Review Team identified several themes from the review that support the continuous improvement process for the Fayette County School System. These themes present strengths, opportunities and guidance to assist the school system in its improvement journey.

Culture of Excellence: Leadership personnel and the governing board structure established a culture of excellence by holding the system accountable to all stakeholders and dedicating the system to continuous improvement. The Fayette County School System has long history of accountability and collaboration with the many communities that make up the county school system. Evidence of this accountability and the excellence can be seen in Exemplary Board recognitions from the Georgia School Board Association awarded in 2015, 2016 and 2018. Interviews with board members illustrated how the board provides strong leadership and allows daily operations of the school system to remain firmly within the roles and responsibilities of the superintendent and his team. The superintendent expressed that the governing board is a highly functional, award winning body that provides stable leadership to the system and has a clear understanding of its roles and responsibilities.

Building leadership, including principals from around the system, stated that policy designed to promote system effectiveness is the focus of the governing board. Leadership roles, relationships and responsibilities are clearly defined, based on a review of the system policy manual and interviews of leadership teams at individual schools. Operational policies and the continuous improvement process implemented by the county system promotes practices that support teaching and learning. Based on a review of the system strategic plan and the most recent plan update, as well as interviews of executive cabinet leaders, standard operating procedures and the allocation of resources are well managed and reported in a very organized manner to the governing board.

Curriculum and Academic Standards: An accompanying theme, which runs parallel to the governing structure and provides guidance to building leadership, is the organized curriculum and high academic standards that the system adheres to and strongly encourages within all its buildings. Based on 80 classroom observations, using the eleot® tool, the engagement team observed meaningful and equal access to resources, technology and academic support. High engagement of learners and rigorous coursework were observed across the eight elementary, middle and high schools visited. A review of curriculum documents, interviews with teachers, and principal interviews in building and at the county offices allowed the engagement team to determine that high expectation for all learners is part of system values and is practiced throughout each school. The continuous improvement process is focused on aligning the system's curriculum with state standards and best practices described in district artifacts and individual School Quality Factors (SQF) documents. Fayette County School System has had five different schools awarded the National Blue Ribbon and many more recognized as Georgia Schools of Excellence.

During classroom visits conducted by the engagement team, teachers provided specific lesson plans, which detailed learning standards, goals, objectives and activities for the week. Organized lesson plans are standard operating procedures for each school in the district and are available for school personnel when visiting a

classroom. High academic standards were identified by parents and students throughout the system. Parents stated that their children enjoy school. According to one parent, "My son enjoys going to school. Every year his teacher engages him in a way that he looks forward to." Another parent stated, "Most of us moved here for that reason (high standards and high expectations) …We moved from Texas for these schools."

Meeting Special Needs: Programs and services were identified that focus on meeting the special needs of students during interviews with staff. Teachers report that the allocation of resources are significant, which was reiterated by executive cabinet members in the areas of technology, operations and student services. Performance data, generated from Response to Intervention (RTI) initiatives, are used to determine interventions. The use of both formative and summative data presented in lesson plans, as well as instructional activities that provide accommodated curriculum change based on student developed goals designed to measure progress, were witnessed in classrooms visited by the engagement team. One teacher stated that data drive the RTI process.

Collaborative and Professional Learning: A range of collaborative and professional learning structures are valued and exist throughout the Fayette County School System; however, it was evident to the engagement team and acknowledged by system leadership that organized teacher collaboration and professional learning communities are not systemic across all schools, especially in the acknowledged form of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Professional Learning Community structures are embedded in the culture of some schools but not all, and data, to show that collaborative learning communities produce demonstrated improvements and growth in student learning, were not systemically collected and analyzed. Interviews with the executive cabinet at the system level indicated plans to provide support to those schools that have not implemented Professional Learning Communities. The Fayette County Strategic Improvement Plan states a need to craft a comprehensive Professional Learning Plan that is aligned to district strategic plan/AdvancED improvement priorities. The SQF report stated that four of the five high schools have a PLC period to support implementation of highly effective instruction/assessment/grading practices. Interviews with the executive cabinet and central office personnel revealed that four of the high schools have built in Professional Learning time, structured within a calendar, and each Wednesday Professional Learning Day has different topics/focus at the school/district level.

Interviews with school leaders revealed that a Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) study provided analysis and recommendation in the following areas: 1) PLCs and common planning, 2) 9th grade transition (study skills) for 100 students, and 3) Career, Technical & Agricultural Education Pathways. The Sandy Creek High School SREB Report (March, 2017) mentions that PLC's lack specific and targeted agendas, lack training in collaborative protocols to improve instruction, and do not have a campus-wide structured classroom management plan, resulting in inconsistencies to manage student behavior which could impact student performance. According to the Superintendent's Interview, "PLC's are not as tight as we want; we need to improve." Interviews with leaders from McIntosh High School revealed that the school has PLCs but not at the desired level. Four years ago the other high schools moved from a six to seven period day to be able to plan collaboratively. Since collaboration is isolated in pockets at McIntosh High School, the school intends to move to a seven period day as the other high schools have done to have a greater opportunity to develop an effective formalized structure.

Student Achievement: A range of programs and initiatives were implemented by system leadership and building principals to foster student achievement, creativity/innovation, and academic support; however, data are not always systemically collected and analyzed to determine success or to show growth over time. There are many programs and initiatives relatively new to the system, which are at various points of sustainability and with varying levels of data indicating success and/or successful implementation. The Center of innovation, Project Lead the Way, a new International Baccalaureate Diploma Program, various new career pathways such as the Digital Media/Animation Career Pathway, and the Community for Creativity are examples of academic/career program initiatives that have recently been or are about to be implemented in Fayette County schools. Although anecdotal data is available, longitudinal data based on three or more years is not always available.

Two very important student support and intervention initiatives, at relatively different points of implementation, are Response to Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). The Fayette County Strategic Plan outlines certain RTI practices, which were implemented in elementary schools recently. Teachers at

Oak Grove Elementary School report that RTI is intentional, and that a RTI committee meets once a month. A review of a visioning document, which points out steps that will be taken at county system high schools, shows the beginning stages to implement RTI strategies. Interviews with executive cabinet members indicate a need for the system to develop a systematic approach to monitoring and evaluating student progress. The Superintendent interview revealed that he had looked at the RTI process, determined that it was not implemented the same way throughout the system, and decided a need in approach needed to be examined. In response to the analysis of this concern, the school board approved and funded seven instructional coaches to cover 14 elementary schools in the system. In the area of PBIS, interviews with the system Executive Cabinet and building level principals indicated a three-cohort approach to PBIS Implementation across all schools in the system. The last cohort of system schools is in the planning stage of PBIS implementation to occur during the next school term. Consequently, system-wide data on PBIS strategies cannot be fully and systemically analyzed until all schools implement these strategies.

A review of the Fayette County Strategic Plan reveals many of these initiatives, some with action steps listed and few with performance measure targets identified. Collecting data, which is obviously being done in most cases, is not enough. Targets of performance measures must be set with timelines established for review, re-evaluation, and adjustment. Determining the desired results before and during any implementation of an initiative would be a prudent step and assist in measuring any acknowledged success.

Integrated Technology: The integrated technology in the system, known as the "Connected Classroom" initiative, is a value held high by the Fayette County School System. However, the system must continue to collect and analyze data to determine the impact of the Connected Classroom on teaching and learning, as well as to establish effectiveness over time to determine if the desired results of the Connected Classroom initiative is meeting the stated goals. The Fayette County School System recognizes that it must monitor and systematize the implementation of the initiative. The engagement team found that the Fayette County Strategic Improvement Plan identifies many performance objectives and performance measures for technology. These areas include developing leadership capacity to build efficacy in the effective use of digital resources, identifying a structured and responsive system of digital support for system and school-based personnel, providing digital applications that are representative of each level of the Substitution Augmentation Modification Redefinition (SAMR) rubric, and providing training for parents and teachers on the use of various digital platforms (e.g., Blackboard). The Connected Classroom initiative is intended to address these areas and is in the first year of full implementation. According to the Executive Summary written for AdvancED, all students are provided with their own assigned Chromebook, and the school system has been planning and moving toward establishing Connected Classrooms for the past three years, providing teachers and students with the latest in interactive and computing technology, and affording opportunities to obtain, create, collaborate and share knowledge.

Observation data (eleot®) compiled by the engagement team reveal there is room for improvement in the areas of digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, create original works for learning, and work and communicate collaboratively. Observational data reveal that Connected Classroom implementation is not systemic. An interview conducted with the director of technology revealed that Fayette County Schools partnered with the company, Think Circa, to conduct a longitudinal study to determine impact of technology. Given the newness of the Connected Classroom initiative, three years of data have not yet been collected. Interviews with executive cabinet members, along with building principals interviewed during visits to various schools, revealed that Instructional coaches and Digital Learning Specialists are conducting classrooms observations and monitoring technology use; however, there was only anecdotal evidence shared with the engagement team, which showed how data might be used to change practice and ensure systemic use of resources in the future. According to one building principal, "Teacher training is occurring concurrent with the rollout."

The Fayette County School System engages in an effective continuous improvement process, demonstrates a genuine commitment toward challenging students with equitable opportunities for all, and ensures alignment of long range planning and resource management to the system's key priorities. Building on the system's strong foundation of effective operational practices and supporting a highly efficacious system dedicated to student learning, a focus on stakeholder engagement, systemic professional collaboration, and sustainable digital technology initiatives and practices will enhance a culture of challenge, support and success for 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 Priorities for Improvement identified by the Engagement Review Team.
- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.
- Celebrate the successes noted in the report
- Continue the improvement journey

Team Roster

The Engagement Review Teams are comprised of professionals with varied backgrounds and professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members complete AdvancED training and eleot certification to provide knowledge and understanding of the AdvancED tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Dr. W. Darrell Barringer, Lead Evaluator	Dr. Barringer's educational career spans 43+ years. On June 30th, 2012, he retired from Lexington School District One in Lexington, SC after working there for 34 years. During that time, he served as an elementary principal for 29 years and had the privilege of opening two new schools. He taught grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, served as an Assistant Principal in addition to the Principal role. He served with SACS (AdvancED) since 1983 having chaired teams in Egypt, Thailand, India, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Jordan, Bahrain, Costa Rica, Japan, Guyana, Guatemala and Nicaragua, as well as in the U.S. His service has included schools, systems, digital learning institutions, corporations and Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools. Dr. Barringer's BA is in Biblical Education from Columbia International University, and his MEd (Elementary Ed), his EdS (Administration) and PhD (Elementary Ed) are from the University of South Carolina. Dr. Barringer joined the AdvancED family officially on July 1st of 2012 as Director for AdvancED South Carolina. Effective February 1, 2017, Dr. Barringer was named Vice President, Volunteer Services for AdvancED.
Mr. Travis C. Nesmith, Associate Lead Evaluator	Mr. Travis Nesmith is the Executive Director of Curriculum and Technology for the Effingham County School System, a 12,000 student district in southeast, Georgia. He began his career in Effingham County School System as a high school business teacher, a position he held for four years. Between 2000 and 2008, Mr. Nesmith worked at the Central Office in various positions as the Technology Specialist, Professional Learning Coordinator and System Testing Coordinator. In 2008, he returned to a school-level position as the Instructional Supervisor at South Effingham High School. After four years, he moved to Effingham College and Career as the Career, Technical, and Agriculture Education Coordinator and Director of High School Programs for the Effingham County College and Career Academy. In 2015, Mr. Nesmith moved to his current position at the Effingham County Central Office. He received a B.S.A., M.Ed., and Ed.S. degrees from Georgia Southern University. Mr. Nesmith as served on several AdvancED Engagement Reviews and AdvancED STEM Certification visits.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Mr. Michael Bugenski	Mike Bugenski is a Lead Evaluator with AdvancED and is a former teacher, central office administrator, ESA administrator, adjunct university professor and the former AdvancED State Director in Michigan. He worked for four Educational Service Agencies in Michigan as a strategic planning consultant and instructional coach to schools. He served as the Associate Director for the Michigan School Administrator Association and directed a state-wide professional development program training prospective superintendents and principals across Michigan. He is completing his 50th year as an educator with degrees from Michigan State University and Eastern Michigan University. He lead reviews for AdvancED in the Middle East, Europe and 17 states in the U.S.
Dr. Lori James	Lori James is the Assistant Superintendent of Operations for the Clinch County School System. After receiving a Bachelor in Business Administration from the University of Georgia, she worked in the private sector before returning to her hometown to teach American Literature and Accounting at her alma mater. She earned secondary teaching certification, a Masters in School Counseling, and a Specialist and Doctorate in Educational Leadership from Valdosta State University. During her 20 years of service to the Clinch County School System, she was a teacher, counselor and director before moving into her current position. Her areas of responsibility include finance, facilities, transportation, technology, Title I, teacher/leader certification, policies, student services and various other daily operations.
Dr. Amy Chafin	Dr. Amy Chafin is a Director of Curriculum and Instruction for Buford City Schools in Buford, Georgia. In that position, she supervises all aspects of curriculum and instruction, K-12, including continuous school improvement, assessment, gifted services, career and technical education, and professional learning. Dr. Chafin holds an Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from Valdosta State University. She also has an Ed.S. in Educational Leadership and a MS degree in Secondary Education/English. Dr. Chafin has experience as a curriculum director, assessment director, school improvement specialist and high school and middle school teacher. Her work, “Using Mathematics Curriculum Based Measurement to Predict Student Performance on the Third Grade Georgia Mathematics Criterion Referenced Competency Test” was published in the National Teacher Education Journal in 2015. Dr. Chafin has previously served on AdvancED Engagement Reviews and is on the AdvancED Leadership Team for Buford City Schools.
Dr. David A. Wilson	Dr. David Wilson retired from full-time practice in 2011 from Bremen Community High School District 228. During his tenure at District 228, Dr. Wilson held the positions of associate and assistant principal at various high schools before becoming Principal at Oak Forest High School for eight years. Prior to 1995, Dr. Wilson worked as a principal, as well as in other various administrative positions for a special education cooperative in the Chicago south suburban area. During the 2000s, Dr. Wilson was an Adjunct Professor at Governors State University and Concordia University. While teaching for both universities, Dr. Wilson worked with graduate level students pursuing advanced degrees in education. Since his retirement, Dr. Wilson served as an Interim Principal at four different Catholic Elementary Schools in Chicago and Northwest Indiana. Dr. Wilson began his involvement with AdvancED in 2008. Currently, Dr. Wilson serves as an Illinois Field Consultant leading Engagement Review teams, special reviews, and readiness school visits in Illinois and throughout the United States Midwest. Dr. Wilson holds an Ed. D. from Loyola University in Chicago, a M.S.W. degree from the University of Illinois at Chicago, and a B.S. degree from Illinois State University. Dr. Wilson also attended certification programs at Northern Illinois University and Governors State University.

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.

advanc-ed.org

Toll Free: 888.41EDNOW (888.413.3669) Global: +1 678.392.2285, ext. 6963

9115 Westside Parkway, Alpharetta, GA 30009

About AdvancED

AdvancED is a non-profit, non-partisan organization serving the largest community of education professionals in the world. Founded on more than 100 years of work in continuous improvement, AdvancED combines the knowledge and expertise of a research institute, the skills of a management consulting firm and the passion of a grassroots movement for educational change to empower Pre-K-12 schools and school systems to ensure that all learners realize their full potential.