



Monroe County Schools

Forsyth, Georgia

January 30 – February 2, 2022

System Accreditation Engagement Review

215081

Table of Contents

- Cognia Continuous Improvement System 2**
 - Initiate..... 2
 - Improve 2
 - Impact 2
- Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review..... 3**
- Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results 3**
 - Leadership Capacity Domain 4
 - Learning Capacity Domain..... 5
 - Resource Capacity Domain 6
- Assurances 7**
- Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality® 7**
- Insights from the Review 8**
- Next Steps 11**
- Team Roster 12**
- References and Readings..... 13**

Cognia Continuous Improvement System

Cognia defines continuous improvement as "an embedded behavior rooted in an institution's culture that constantly focuses on conditions, processes, and practices to improve teaching and learning." The Cognia Continuous Improvement System (CIS) provides a systemic, fully integrated solution to help institutions map out and navigate a successful improvement journey. In the same manner that educators are expected to understand the unique needs of every learner and tailor the education experience to drive student success, every institution must be empowered to map out and embrace their unique improvement journey. Cognia expects institutions to use the results and the analysis of data from various interwoven components for the implementation of improvement actions to drive education quality and improved student outcomes. While each improvement journey is unique, the journey is driven by key actions. The findings of the Engagement Review Team are organized by the ratings from the Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic and the Levels of Impact within the i3 Rubric: Initiate, Improve, and Impact.

Initiate

The first phase of the improvement journey is to **Initiate** actions to cause and achieve better results. The elements of the Initiate phase are defined within the Levels of Impact of Engagement and Implementation. Engagement is the level of involvement and frequency of stakeholders in the desired practices, processes, or programs within the institution. Implementation is the process of monitoring and adjusting the administration of the desired practices, processes, or programs for quality and fidelity. Standards identified within Initiate should become the focus of the institution's continuous improvement journey toward the collection, analysis, and use of data to measure the results of engagement and implementation. Enhancing the capacity of the institution in meeting these Standards has the greatest potential impact on improving student performance and organizational effectiveness.

Improve

The second phase of the improvement journey is to gather and evaluate the results of actions to **Improve**. The elements of the **Improve** phase are defined within the Levels of Impact of Results and Sustainability. Results come from the collection, analysis, and use of data and evidence to demonstrate attaining the desired result(s). Sustainability is results achieved consistently to demonstrate growth and improvement over time (a minimum of three years). Standards identified within Improve are those in which the institution is using results to inform their continuous improvement processes and to demonstrate over time the achievement of goals. The institution should continue to analyze and use results to guide improvements in student achievement and organizational effectiveness.

Impact

The third phase of achieving improvement is **Impact**, where desired practices are deeply entrenched. The elements of the **Impact** phase are defined within the Level of Impact of Embeddedness. Embeddedness is the degree to which the desired practices, processes, or programs are deeply ingrained in the culture and operation of the institution. Standards identified within Impact are those in which the institution has demonstrated ongoing growth and improvement over time and has embedded the practices within its culture. Institutions should continue to support and sustain these practices that yield results in improving student achievement and organizational effectiveness.

Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal in leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the Cognia Accreditation Process examines the whole institution—the program, the cultural context, and the community of stakeholders—to determine how well the parts work together to meet the needs of learners. Through the accreditation process, highly skilled and trained Engagement Review Teams gather first-hand evidence and information pertinent to evaluating an institution’s performance against the research based Cognia Performance Standards. Review teams use these Standards to assess the quality of learning environments to gain valuable insights and target improvements in teaching and learning. Cognia provides Standards that are tailored for all education providers so that the benefits of accreditation are universal across the education community.

Through a comprehensive review of evidence and information, our experts gain a broad understanding of institution quality. Using the Standards, the review team provides valuable feedback to institutions, which helps to focus and guide each institution’s improvement journey. Valuable evidence and information from other stakeholders, including students, also are obtained through interviews, surveys, and additional activities.

Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

Color	Rating	Description
Red	Insufficient	Identifies areas with insufficient evidence or evidence that indicated little or no activity leading toward improvement
Yellow	Initiating	Represents areas to enhance and extend current improvement efforts
Green	Improving	Pinpoints quality practices that are improving and meet the Standards
Blue	Impacting	Demonstrates noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact the institution

Under each Standard statement is a row indicating the scores related to the elements of Cognia’s i3 Rubric. The rubric is scored from one (1) to four (4). A score of four on any element indicates high performance, while a score of one or two indicates an element in need of improvement. The following table provides the key to the abbreviations of the elements of the i3 Rubric.

Element	Abbreviation
Engagement	EN
Implementation	IM
Results	RE
Sustainability	SU
Embeddedness	EM

Leadership Capacity Domain

The capacity of leadership to ensure an institution's progress toward its stated objectives is an essential element of organizational effectiveness. An institution's leadership capacity includes the fidelity and commitment to its purpose and direction, the effectiveness of governance and leadership to enable the institution to realize its stated objectives, the ability to engage and involve stakeholders in meaningful and productive ways, and the capacity to implement strategies that improve learner and educator performance.

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The system commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	

Learning Capacity Domain

The impact of teaching and learning on student achievement and success is the primary expectation of every institution. An effective learning culture is characterized by positive and productive teacher/learner relationships, high expectations and standards, a challenging and engaging curriculum, quality instruction and comprehensive support that enable all learners to be successful, and assessment practices (formative and summative) that monitor and measure learner progress and achievement. Moreover, a quality institution evaluates the impact of its learning culture, including all programs and support services, and adjusts accordingly.

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.1	Learners have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities established by the system.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.4	The system has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers that support their educational experiences.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	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:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	4	

Resource Capacity Domain

The use and distribution of resources support the stated mission of the institution. Institutions ensure that resources are distributed and utilized equitably, so the needs of all learners are adequately and effectively addressed. The utilization of resources includes support for professional learning for all staff. The institution examines the allocation and use of resources to ensure appropriate levels of funding, sustainability, organizational effectiveness, and increased student learning.

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
3.1	The system plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the system's effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.3	The system provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	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:	4	EM:	4	
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4	
3.6	The system provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the system.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.7	The system demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	3	

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	

Assurances

Assurances are statements that accredited institutions must confirm they are meeting. The Assurance statements are based on the type of institution, and the responses are confirmed by the Accreditation Engagement Review Team. Institutions are expected to meet all Assurances and are expected to correct any deficiencies in unmet Assurances.

Assurances Met		
YES	NO	If No, List Unmet Assurances by Number Below
X		

Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

Cognia will review the results of the Accreditation Engagement Review to make a final determination concerning accreditation status, including the appropriate next steps for your institution in response to these findings. Cognia provides the Index of Education Quality (IEQ) as a holistic measure of overall performance based on a comprehensive set of standards and review criteria. This formative tool for improvement identifies areas of success and areas in need of focus. The IEQ comprises the Standards Diagnostic ratings from the three Domains: Leadership Capacity, Learning Capacity, and Resource Capacity. The IEQ results are reported on a scale of 100 to 400 and provide information about how the institution is performing compared to expected criteria. Institutions should review the IEQ in relation to the findings from the review in the areas of Initiate, Improve, and Impact. An IEQ score below 250 indicates that the institution has several areas within the Initiate level and should focus their improvement efforts on those Standards within that level. An IEQ in the range of 225–300 indicates that the institution has several Standards within the Improve level and is using results to inform continuous improvement and demonstrate sustainability. An IEQ of 275 and above indicates the institution is beginning to reach the Impact level and is engaged in practices that are sustained over time and are becoming ingrained in the culture of the institution.

Below is the average (range) of all Cognia Improvement Network (CIN) institutions evaluated for accreditation in the last five years. The range of the annual CIN IEQ average is presented to enable you to benchmark your results with other institutions in the network.

Institution IEQ	372.90	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 its plans to continuously strive for improvement.

The Accreditation Engagement Review Team (team) identified several themes from the review that support the continuous improvement process for Monroe County Schools. These themes present strengths and opportunities to guide the improvement journey.

Monroe County Schools (MCS) engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence of growth, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice, through collaboration and collegiality. The team learned of the MCS planning processes and priorities that focus on four strategic objectives: attaining high student achievement and success; developing organizational effectiveness; ensuring student and stakeholder engagement and loyalty; and ensuring high-quality professional learning. The four strategic objectives are a part of every board meeting where discussions, reporting, and accountability measures are enacted. School personnel routinely share current data to inform the board of successes and challenges, enabling them to make effective and supportive decisions. In addition, the board has developed its own priorities for increasing the level of safety and improving the perception of safety, training parents and school stakeholders, increasing student use of technology during classroom instruction, and closing the gap among subgroups. This added tier of focus creates two-way accountability within the continuous improvement process. At the core of any successful improvement process, it is essential to build mechanisms for multiple layers of professional learning and professional learning structures that promote collaboration and collegiality among the internal and external stakeholders. MCS leadership has over time mastered this process to establish multiple advisory committees, including the Executive Cabinet, Instructional Cabinet, School Leadership Teams at each school, and the Superintendent's Parent and Community Advisory Council to facilitate a network for conversing, managing, monitoring, and adjusting goals to maintain continuous improvement and organizational effectiveness. In support of Strategic Objective IV of the MCS Continuous Improvement Plan, MCS plans and delivers professional learning for all levels of employees to meet their personal professional learning goals. Data are collected and analyzed from staff surveys, elect and focus walk-throughs, and ongoing data team meetings across the system. Data team meetings are regularly held to review formative and summative data from district common assessments. Action steps are created based on achievement data and professional learning surveys. While the system has multiple data sources, MCS might consider refining the current walk-through observation process to include targeted topics that support specific learning objectives. This type of intentional observation data, when collected and analyzed over time rather than short-term, can be used to establish sustainability and guide future professional learning topics. For example, discovering practices that have perhaps changed during remote learning can be a viable practice for closing gaps post-

pandemic, thus ensuring the system’s dual motto - “Committed to Excellence” and “Ensuring Student Success.”

The system implements a quality assurance process that continuously assesses its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

The superintendent’s Overview of Improvement Journey, the Executive Summary, examination of multiple artifacts, and interview responses informed the team of the “Plan, Do, Check, Act” continuous improvement process used by MCS’s leadership, board, and employees to provide and protect quality assurance within and across all system entities. This model is a living process that requires ongoing examination, communication, collaboration, and adjusting to the continuous improvement plan and system practices being implemented and adjusted at every school and within all departments. An important part of this process is the inclusion of the board to support the process with any necessary policies and funding. This model is not a top-down leadership protocol; rather, it is inclusive of all stakeholders and is dependent on monitoring, evaluating, and adjusting at the system level, based on individual school practices and outcomes. It requires two-way communication and collaboration that leads to feedback and eventual adjustments in classrooms and departments. MCS has in place multiple sources to routinely gather people, ideas, feedback, and implementation data through data team meetings, department and cabinet meetings at the central office and every school, and survey data to make the process a living and viable source of quality assurance. Survey data and school and system interviews indicated a desire to improve two-way external stakeholder engagement, particularly in parents’ understanding of the programs and practices available to all students and how those align with increased student learning and readiness for their next steps. However, when interviewing parents, there was a small percentage of parent participation and those parents seemed not to have a clear understanding of their work on the Superintendent’s Parent Advisory Council. The system has hired a communications person to aid in this effort. Brainstorming how this transition can lead to desired engagement results and researching best practices in parent engagement might be beneficial. When parents and their students do something together, there could be enhanced results. Once the system has identified what desired parent participation would resemble, perhaps considering a student-led conference model might be adapted to achieve the MCS desired results.

Monroe County Schools is a highly-functioning, successful organization with a rich history of achievement. As the system enters current and post-pandemic long-range planning, quality assurance is a treasure to be preserved and protected. The team heard of predicted changes that were worthy of team consideration. Throughout the review, team deliberations included discussions of next steps to preserve what has been accomplished, but equally important, encouraging future planning efforts to be examined through a futuristic lens of possibilities to maintain and increase the alignment and momentum of the outstanding continuous improvement process that currently exists.

Future thoughts and considerations could address predicted conditions for the district to approach, asking what needs to be defined, added, deleted, or considered to achieve even better results in student learning and organizational effectiveness. The changing demographic conditions and current/future growth in population can bring on necessary new construction, programs, hiring in a diminished hiring pool, busing, etc. Would the addition of a strategic plan support these future needs? There has been a recent shift from being an agricultural community to manufacturing and beyond – what impact will that have on course offerings, partnerships, internships, etc.? Expanding the level of meaningful external stakeholder engagement – defining that need and how to address it can guide the work of the communications coordinator. Are programs and processes such as STAR, Scorecard, and the universal screening tools meeting future needs, or would some programs add a deeper understanding of those evaluative processes? Would closing any identified gaps that have resulted from changes created by the shift in instructional practices in remote learning cause the instructional practices and performance

evaluation processes to be examined and enhanced? Undoubtedly, MCS has a history of success and can approach any future needs with intentional examination and possible considerations, looking beyond the current conditions to project into the future.

MCS has an opportunity to enhance current staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness. All MCS personnel have an annual performance evaluation and consultation, including non-teaching staff for whom internally designed evaluation tools have been developed. All employees set professional goals to document their professional growth. Qualified department and school-based personnel conduct these evaluations. In addition to annual evaluations and the use of those data points, the system incorporates a walk-through protocol and classroom observations using the eProve™ Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® (eleot®). Use of the state Teacher Keys, Leader Keys, and Counselor Keys data was not found to be systemically used for feedback. The system might consider the use of other data as well including feedback data from professional learning surveys, targeted walk-throughs focused on best practices, and feedback on the personal goals set by the internal stakeholders.

Continuing to develop learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills through creativity, collaboration, and problem-solving learning activities can impact learner outcomes for future success. Internal stakeholders consistently confirmed the value that MCS places on learners and the dedication of staff to support student success. When asked to share how they serve students, teachers, and parents, they spoke of the impact that the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program has had over many years for building responsible and responsive learners. MCS's successful implementation of this program has grown to make MCS a model PBIS district where others come to observe the program in operation. In addition to PBIS, MCS has established numerous support systems and practices to foster the necessary attitudes, beliefs, and skills for student success, including the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). Artifacts and interviews informed the team of established weekly and monthly meetings to address students' needs, including the accomplishments of the Monroe County Achievement Center, the Flexible Learning Program, and the Flexible Intervention Program that provide alternative learning opportunities in grades 6-12. A current system endeavor related to improving offerings for gifted students is underway. Rather than a pull-out program or busing students to a central location, there is a shift to the gifted cluster model. To facilitate staffing needs, the system is encouraging and providing incentives for teachers to seek a gifted endorsement to facilitate the in-classroom cluster model.

When addressing what students will need for future success, there is an ever-changing list of attitudes, beliefs, and skills for educators to consider, based on career choices and opportunities that are available and in demand for students to pursue. MCS artifacts included samples of the various STEM learning activities, most of which support creativity, collaboration, and problem-solving experiences that are somewhat more prevalent in schools that have pursued STEM certification. However, there are system initiatives for offering support for STEM activities across all schools. From the artifacts provided, the team learned of sample classroom experiences such as an ecology unit in the Inquiry Lab where students had science inquiry experiences, including making presentations of their projects, procedures, and findings. At the elementary level, there was an example of a cross-curriculum activity that included support from a business partner. Career options now include 28 career pathways under 13 different clusters for students to pursue from a recent partnering with a neighboring school district. The new fine arts center is providing experiences for students who now have a facility for school and class performances, school plays, and student and guest artists and performers to broaden the vision of the students in preparing for possible future careers. However, there was a lack of consistent evidence that all learners engage in projects and inquiry-based activities that also develop their communication skills, self-direction, and monitoring of their own learning progress. Examining ways to equalize those opportunities and collect data over time can be an upcoming possibility.

As MCS explores next steps to building upon current attitudes, beliefs, and skills, an area for future consideration could be a faculty study on the topic of students taking ownership for their learning, which would focus on learning that lasts a lifetime. This concept could be a means of extending the current PBIS program into a lifetime venture. Secondly, there is a need to further incorporate technology into student learning at all grade levels which will entail setting expectations in instructional planning, focused walk-throughs for monitoring and gathering measurable data, and adjusting for improved learning outcomes. Thirdly, building capacity in creativity, collaboration, and problem-solving experiences for all students can ensure that all learners are growing in their learning. Under the “Student Ownership for Learning” umbrella, these suggestions could be foundational to being “Committed to Excellence-Focused on Success” for all students.

In closing, the team thanks the entire Monroe County community for an enlightening professional experience as it learned of the system’s commitment to excellence and the united effort and determination ingrained in the leadership, board, and staff in every aspect of the work done to ensure success for all students. Preserving and protecting the high level of quality assurance that defines Monroe County Schools became the team’s focus in this accreditation review. The system’s capacity for continuous improvement is indeed its educational hallmark. The team applauds the many accomplishments from the past and those in the future.

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 (Lead Evaluators Only)
Mary Anne Hipp, Lead Evaluator	Mary Anne Hipp has committed her education career to teaching and learning, having served as a kindergarten and elementary classroom teacher in both private and public education, as well as an elementary principal for a combined 55 years. She holds degrees and certifications in music education, kindergarten, elementary education, and a Master +30 degree in education administration. She has served on numerous reviews for Cognia across the United States, Latin America, Germany, Italy, Spain, United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Kosovo, and Switzerland. Ms. Hipp has been a Cognia System Lead Evaluator for the past 12 years, serving public systems, faith-based systems, Education Service Agencies, and Department of Defense Activity schools (DoDEA). Mrs. Hipp currently serves as a Cognia mentor for Lead Evaluators.
Dr. Amy Duke, Team Member	Director of Human Resources
Dr. Denise Finley, Team Member	Curriculum and Professional Learning Specialist
Mrs. Kelly McKay, Team Member	Assistant Superintendent
Dr. Sandra Wallace Nethels, Team Member	Special Programs Coordinator

References and Readings

- AdvancED. (2015). *Continuous Improvement and Accountability*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/continuous-improvement-and-accountability/>.
- Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention program*. New York: Routledge.
- Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/what-continuously-improving-system-looks/>.
- Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/CISWhitePaper.pdf>.
- Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/savvy-school-change-leader/>.
- Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing*. New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education*. San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation_continuous-improvement_2013.05.pdf.
- Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Teachers College.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory*. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

