



# Chattooga County School System

Summerville, Georgia

**February 27 - March 2, 2022**

**System Accreditation Engagement Review**

215095

## Table of Contents

<b>Cognia Continuous Improvement System</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Initiate.....	2
Improve .....	2
Impact .....	2
<b>Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Leadership Capacity Domain.....	4
Learning Capacity Domain.....	5
Resource Capacity Domain .....	6
<b>Assurances</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Insights from the Review</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Next Steps</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>References and Readings</b> .....	<b>14</b>

# 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		4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
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:	3	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:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4	
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Impacting

Leadership Capacity Standards											Rating
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4	

## 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:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.4	The system has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers that support their educational experiences.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	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.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	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:	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:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4	

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

## Resource Capacity Domain

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

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
3.1	The system plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the system's effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4	
3.3	The system provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	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:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	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:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
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:	3	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.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	

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

## Assurances

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

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

## Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

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

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

<b>Institution IEQ</b>	<b>355.48</b>	<b>CIN 5 Year IEQ Range</b>	<b>278.34 – 283.33</b>
------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

## 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.

In planning and carrying out the Chattooga County School System (CCSS) Engagement Review, it was the intention of the Cognia Engagement Review Team (team) to gain as much information as possible to rate the Standards, review the evidence, and engage all stakeholders in the virtual process. The team engaged in quality information gathering sessions including interviews, presentations by the CCSS leadership team, and a comprehensive review of evidence provided to the team. It is within this context that the team offers the following insights that highlight themes across the school system and ideas for the next steps.

**The system's commitment to its vision and purpose is ingrained and embedded in the culture and reflects shared beliefs about teaching and learning.** All leadership, school staff, parent, and community representatives have opportunities each year to review and offer revision ideas for school and system mission and vision statements. This is documented through agendas and sign-in forms. In the system narrative and the superintendent's overview session, leaders and staff described that the vision and mission statements are then reviewed and approved by the school board each year at the June board meeting. Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's vision and mission and desired outcomes for learning.

Stakeholders are invested in and committed to the system's mission and desired outcomes. The vision and mission statements are listed in system and school documents. The vision is "Prepare students for success through a rigorous education with high academic standards in schools where students want to learn, parents want their children to attend, and teachers want to teach." The mission is "Enable all students to become productive, contributing citizens who can communicate effectively, gather, and use information, make responsible decisions, utilize technology, and adapt to the challenges of the future." Both statements are evidenced with authenticity, fidelity, and commitment to the direction of the system as presented in stakeholder interviews, leadership presentations, and the opening orientation by the superintendent. Board of Education members revealed in the interview session that they are asked for input and invited to the strategic planning sessions held by the system. A board member commented, "We are proud of our administrative team at the top."

During focus group interviews, the team learned that stakeholders complete parent surveys, student surveys, and pulse checks. Stakeholders indicated there is an annual review of the mission statement and all stakeholders have input. Schools have required school improvement plans and active school councils. Some stakeholders knew about the strengths, weaknesses, and growth opportunities in their individual schools. Parents appreciate the use of the Remind app for communication, as well as social media posts. Although parents are very aware of local school goals/plans, little information is known on

a system-wide basis as reported in some interview sessions. The system could consider using these existing platforms to communicate (synthesized) student achievement data and system successes. The team encourages the system to focus on communicating system-wide strengths, weaknesses, system goals and plans to parents and other stakeholders.

The superintendent's opening comments to the team revealed the current strategic priorities for CCSS. The four priorities include increasing student achievement in all content areas, attracting, retaining, and training highly-qualified teachers, principals, and support staff, expanding parent engagement and connectedness, and efficient and effective operational practices. The team commends the system for carefully selecting these priorities and encourages continued success in achieving the strategic priorities. One parent proudly stated, "I appreciate the investment the district makes in my child."

**The system implements processes and programs to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.** Stakeholder interviews and written documents reviewed by the team revealed the school staff's repeated praise for the Trust-Based Relational Intervention Program (TBRI). TBRI is a program that supports the "whole child." All schools have a sensory room available that provides a therapeutic environment to help regulate, calm, and focus the student. The TBRI program is in its first year for several schools and second year for others; therefore, data are still new. The system is highly encouraged to track the data to monitor the effectiveness of the program.

Information provided by the staff indicated English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services are offered to students who have been identified by the *Home-Language Survey* that is completed at the beginning of each school year, and for all new enrollees at the schools. ESOL endorsed teachers work with students in a resource setting or through an inclusion model.

Students with exceptional talents and gifts are identified through teacher recommendation, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment results, parent recommendation, and student recommendation. Students are assessed according to Georgia state rules and policies to qualify for the gifted program. CCSS elementary students are served by a gifted endorsed educator through a resource or cluster model, while middle grades and high school students are served through an advanced content model, with additional resource services when possible.

Students who are deemed homeless and displaced are provided resources through the McKinney-Vento Program Grant to meet their educational needs. School counselors monitor this program and serve as the liaison between the school and home. The system social worker provides professional learning and data about the program to teachers and administrators yearly.

Other examples of specialized programs and services such as the Student Support Team (SST) and the Early Intervention Program (EIP) are available to meet the specialized needs of students. In addition to others, parents and students gave multiple examples of how the system and its schools met their special needs as well as meeting individual learners' needs. Examples given to the team by stakeholders included Helping Hands Food Program, Partnership with Community Clubs (every student at the high school attends a club once a month), and clothes closets at schools along with community support Wi-Fi in buses and Mi-Fi devices during the pandemic. Schools offered paper packets, jump drives, and virtual online options. A community member stated, "There is something for everyone." "Inclusive" was an adjective used to describe the system; and a school administrator said, "We meet students where they are." Many programs have been implemented and informally observed to be successful. However, the system could consider formalizing processes to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of these programs.

**System and school decisions related to student achievement and behavior are guided by the collection, analysis, and use of data.** Focus interview sessions and evidence provided by the system highlighted how the system strives to meet the measurable expectations for learners addressed in the

mission statement in many ways. For example, communication skills along with gathering and using information, decision-making skills, technology utilization, and challenges of the future can be monitored through Write Score test results, Future Problem Solvers competitions, Career, Technical, and Agricultural Education (CTAE) local, state, and national competition results, Google Classroom presentations, and the WorkForce Ready Program. Multiple sources of data are collected to evaluate and analyze feedback from stakeholders. Qualitative data in the form of close-ended and open-ended surveys were presented as the main method of gathering feedback data. Documents provided information that the data are systematically collected from parents and community members annually through links posted on the district and individual school websites, engagement policy questionnaires, and through input surveys offered at meetings and school facilities. Quantitative data such as behavior and attendance reports are analyzed throughout the year. Leaders agree this purposeful data collection provides valuable stakeholder perspectives. System and building-level leaders review, analyze, and share the collected data to inform decision-making and drive improvement efforts.

Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the expectations of the system through many data formats. Discussions with staff, reviewed materials, and narrative summaries revealed both teams of teachers and administrators use academic and perception data to assess progress. Students also actively participate in assessing their progress and setting individual goals. As a result, changes based on this data include revamping the advisement program at a middle school and the participation in small group, culture-driven book studies in some schools. Personnel documents revealed the system employs a team of four district instructional specialists. This team facilitates teacher development of common assessments, provides professional learning and other support, and leads data team discussions.

A variety of data is used in the schools to measure and improve learners' success. All schools, including the high school, use Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data to plan instruction to meet individual learner needs. Other data sources include Milestones, common assessments, and Multi-Tiered System of Supports data (MTSS). Examples of how data collections are used by the staff to monitor and verify learners' progress toward meeting learning expectations and modify instruction include MAP assessment review, MAP data used to set goals and conference with parents/students, data team meetings by grade level and subject meetings to review unit assessment results and plan to modify instruction, monitoring student progress on Study Island and other learning software, reteaching based on formative assessments, reading records, anecdotal notes, workshop closing notes, checklists and conferences used by classroom teachers, small group instruction based on assessment data, and interventionists and teachers using Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Heggerty screeners, reading inventories, and numeracy screeners. Teachers commented on data teams many times in the discussions on data. Teachers and support staff meet regularly to discuss data and make needed adjustments based on data. An area of improvement to consider is a data information session for board members. Interviews revealed that system staff sometimes share data at board meetings and that some schools have data rooms, but no board member interviewed seemed to have a clear understanding of assessment results, available data, etc. The team supports and encourages the continued efforts of the system and its schools to collect, analyze, and use data to guide school/system decisions related to student achievement and behavior.

**The professional learning structure is based on data-driven needs assessment and indicates a commitment to continual improvement.** Several documents, e.g., system narrative, the professional development plan, PowerPoint document from orientation, and interviews, focused attention on professional learning at the school and system levels. The professional development plan is based on the performance of students and staff and the impact of educational programs. According to staff, the instructional practices and funding for the professional learning plan support a pervasive commitment to

equity in academic areas and instruction for all students. The professional learning plan outlines the major system priorities and organization and structure of professional learning.

The team learned from a review of documents and in interviews that teachers participate in district-level professional learning in the form of content-specific learning coordinated and provided by district-level and school-level instructional specialists. This professional learning is geared toward the needs of the content area in respect to programs and resources being used by that area. Some examples include reading and English language arts teachers participating in workshops on a newly implemented (2019) Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH) Reading Program. Math teachers participate in Eureka math training each year as new teachers enter and as updates are needed. Science teachers receive initial training in the Three- Dimensional Learning approach, and then continuous learning is provided to continue the work of how to implement the instructional model. Training is also provided to science teachers for programs used such as Discovery Education. Social Studies teachers participate in training to incorporate inquiry into their instruction as well as workshops on implementing resources such as Studies Weekly. Chattooga County has hosted a district-wide professional learning conference each year for the past 5 years (excluding 19-20 and 20-21 due to COVID-19). This conference includes technology sessions and sessions for specific programs that most teachers use, such as Study Island, Euplastic, and Infinite Campus.

The active professional learning communities at the system and all schools also highlight the commitment the system and schools place on professional learning for all staff. The four district instructional coaches lead courses throughout the year to improve teachers' instructional practices. These courses generally encourage collaboration and collegiality as they regularly bring all teachers together from all five schools

The effectiveness of content-specific professional learning is monitored through observations and conversations with teachers and leaders. Monthly data team meetings assess student performance, and strategies to target learning needs are formulated and implemented. Subsequent data meetings evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies, and this process continues as teachers collaborate and evaluate student achievement.

Professional learning goals of each teacher are monitored through the Teacher Key Effectiveness System (TKES) evaluation system of Georgia to determine if teachers are meeting those goals through their involvement in professional learning provided by the system. Professional learning is embedded in the system for content areas based on curriculum and programs for each of those areas. All new teachers meet with the district instructional coaches to be trained in curriculum for their specific content areas and all available resources. As part of the CCSS mentor program, mentors have the responsibility to "encourage reflection and professional growth of induction teachers." This professional learning is continued based on observations by administrators, school and district level coaches, and district administrators and by needs requested by teachers.

In summary, the team commends Chattooga County School System and its schools for genuine engagement in the continuous improvement process. We hope that all stakeholders will use the insights from this review to move forward in the continuous improvement journey.

## 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 Evaluator Only)
<b>Garry Rickard,</b> <b>Lead Evaluator</b>	Garry Rickard is a retired educator serving 37 years in the Mountain Brook City Schools in Alabama. He served as a high school teacher, high school assistant principal, junior high principal, and vocational director. After retirement in 2008, Mr. Rickard served as a college supervisor of student teachers. He earned his Bachelor of Science degree in social studies, a Master of Arts in education, and an Educational Specialist degree in secondary education administration. He has served as Lead Evaluator and team member on state, system, corporate, international, DoDEA, and early learning Cognia reviews throughout the United States and the world. He has served as a state council member and associate director for AdvancED Alabama and is a Cognia Field Consultant.
Shannon Hammond	Associate Lead Evaluator
Kelly Akin	School Improvement Director
Stacy Arnold	Assistant Superintendent
Katie Hunter	Assistant Principal
Christopher Kirby	Elementary Principal

## 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](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.

