



# Marion County Board of Education

---

**Buena Vista, Georgia**

**May 2-6, 2021**

**System Accreditation Engagement Review**

**217425**

## Table of Contents

<b>Cognia Continuous Improvement System</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Initiate.....	1
Improve .....	1
Impact .....	1
<b>Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Leadership Capacity Domain .....	3
Learning Capacity Domain.....	4
Resource Capacity Domain .....	5
<b>Assurances</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Insights from the Review</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Next Steps</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>11</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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
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:	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Improving
	EN:	3	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:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

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

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
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:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

## 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.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
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.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating
3.6	The system provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the system.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
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:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
3.8	The system allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the system's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

## 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.



## Insights from the Review

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

The Engagement Review Team (team) identified five themes from the review that aligned to the continuous improvement process at the Marion County Board of Education (MCBOE). These themes present strengths and opportunities to guide the system's improvement journey as they move forward. The first and most powerful theme that emerged was an intentional focus on the system's sense of community and school climate, which became the foundation for the remaining themes. Those themes embrace a focus on mission and vision, use of data, long range planning for staffing needs, and effective use of technology.

**Stakeholders have intentionally developed a cohesive, caring sense of community and familial identity that is pervasive in all facets of the institution.** The supportive academic and social culture that permeates the institution bolsters stakeholder's attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success. Observations, interviews, and surveys all exposed a resplendent culture and community that is unmistakable and has been embedded for years. A number of parents and students mentioned that multiple generations of their families have attended MCBOE and are all still heavily involved in the "school community." Many administrators, teachers, and staff are graduates of the system. Everyone from students to faculty, staff, alumni, community stakeholders, and administrators "have a place" and feel valued. Community stakeholders refer to the system as the "hub of the community," and mentioned that "this is because of what the people who run the school have created for us." Students shared how "connected" they are with faculty and noted that faculty are there for them, not just academically but to help them in life and advocate for their needs. One student mentioned that a faculty member recently contacted his sibling (a MCBOE graduate) in college to check on his progress. Faculty shared this same sentiment. One teacher noted that students even have their telephone numbers to contact them anytime. Parents revealed how connected they are with the school system, both through their children and other projects sponsored through the system. A parent academy, parent organization, booster clubs, and other facets all involve stakeholders and build a shared sense of community. Taken together, this involvement and sense of community has developed what parents call the "hometown pride and spirit" in their school. Finally, surveys of stakeholders confirmed the strong sense of family and community that is widespread. Such an environment fosters a workplace and school system that is conducive to learning. The system should remain vigilant in gathering data and utilizing results to advance this exceptional climate and culture. Ultimately, flourishing students not only excel in the classroom, but as part of the community as well.

**The system has developed a school culture with internal and external stakeholders that is committed to meeting the purpose, mission, and vision delineated by the school.** Governing board members noted that the mission and vision guide their every decision. They shared that while meeting the mission and vision of the system was “lofty,” it was definitely “attainable.” Students shared the mission and vision of the school in their own words and also were eager to discuss the associated slogan, “One Team, One Fight,” that MCBOE has coupled with the mission and vision. Students gave multiple examples of how they use this slogan to guide their own work and endeavors. Extensive stakeholder involvement in the development and refinement of the school’s mission was evident. Parents shared that they had been heavily involved in the initial drafting. Teachers were pleased that they annually have the opportunity to revisit the mission and vision and refine it as needed. One faculty member noted that the administration had included a recent revision suggested by her school staff. Not only do parents and faculty share an affinity for the mission and vision, but external stakeholders do as well. Utilizing numerous techniques, external stakeholders are involved in the mission and vision. They receive updates and also provide input to this important aspect of the system. Newsletters seeking input, surveys, newspaper updates, and a 95% parent conference participation rate all ensure that stakeholders are aware of the mission and involved in its regular revisions. Such dedication and focus on the system’s unified purpose allow the school to work through multiple individuals to meet the admirable goals outlined in the mission. The team encourages MCBOE to continue to maintain a concerted focus on the school’s mission, collect data on its effectiveness, and involve all stakeholders.

**Multiple sources of data are collected, but systematic analysis and data-supported decision-making is not pervasive throughout all facets of the system.** While numerous sources of data are collected, observations of artifacts and interviews with multiple stakeholders substantiated a need to begin using data at an enhanced level to make better-informed educational decisions. Artifacts, interviews, and teacher plans indicate data is being collected, analyzed, and used by some but not all stakeholders. Teacher remarks corroborated the need for them to coordinate the use of data to make both systemic and classroom decisions. Teachers noted that data is collected, and some reports are sent to them, but not much is done with it to monitor and adjust curriculum or system processes. Some teachers mentioned using data to group students, but this was not consistent throughout the system. Other faculty noted use of data provided by the state of Georgia but used this only occasionally.

Using data to implement a quality assurance process to ensure system effectiveness and consistency was not evident. When asked how stakeholders were assured of the quality of the system, most were unaware or said, “we just think things are working OK, but don’t really know.” When discussing program effectiveness and long-range planning, stakeholders were unsure of supporting data. Using data to guide professional development and professional learning communities (PLC’s) was not uniform throughout the system. Faculty and staff noted that often they are provided a listing of professional development from which to choose that do not necessarily correspond to data from evaluations or self-determined needs. They also mentioned that many PLC’s are run as a grade-level meeting as opposed to a meeting focused on analyzing data and making data-based decisions. Helping stakeholders to judiciously choose what to collect, analyze, and use is essential. While there is interest in the importance of data and metrics being developed, this work is in its infancy. MCBOE is encouraged to explore ways to thoughtfully and systematically collect, organize, and analyze data so that multiple stakeholders use this information to guide instruction, document improvement, and coordinate programs across the system to document growth over time. When multiple stakeholders systematically use carefully selected assessment data to guide instruction and program effectiveness, learning improves.

**A clear plan for resource management that includes long-range planning in support of the institution's purpose and direction, especially in the realm of succession plans and recruitment of a diverse faculty and staff, was not evident at MCBOE.** Interviews indicated concern with the

system's current attempts to recruit and retain a diverse faculty and staff. Governing board members noted that recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty is also a concern they share. While there is interest, little was documented to show such work. Internal stakeholders mentioned a desire to work more closely with area colleges to attract qualified personnel. Multiple faculty and staff mentioned they have worked for decades in the system and soon plan to retire. However, a succession plan was not available, nor were employees aware of any plans to deal with a possible extensive need for educators in the near future. Interviews also revealed concern for staffing based on the teacher shortage faced in Georgia. One educator noted, "We just don't think about this, but it sure could make a difference in how students' needs are met." Faculty noted that having a more visible, updated presence in social media is desired to help locate possible educators. Moreover, mentoring, induction, and coaching is limited. While required, basic orientation is available, more formalized methods of teacher induction and mentoring are not well-documented. Interviews showed that there is uncertainty in the role and assignment of mentors for new faculty. Teachers mentioned that sometimes after attending a conference or workshop they return and share, but little else, including coaching, is available. Such mentoring, induction, and coaching could help attract new educators and retain those hired. Other educators mentioned that they would like to see a renewed emphasis on "branding" of the system to help draw educators and increase the diversity of the teaching staff. Therefore, MCBOE should consider exploring multiple facets of long-range planning that include personnel, roles, funding, resources, and other aspects that maintain a focus on student needs in the midst of constant change. Such planning will support the institution's purpose and direction and ensure students' success over time. Especially given the system's small size, faculty, and staff, having a plan for the eventual transition of positions becomes even more critical.

**MCBOE has limited systemic expectations and operations that effectively integrate digital resources into teaching, learning, professional practices, and organizational effectiveness.**

Artifacts, documents, and interviews reveal inequity in availability of and use of technological strategies to support teaching and learning needs. While MCBOE has begun integrating digital resources throughout the system, exploration of the effective use of current technologies to enhance student success is warranted. Interviews of students, parents, and faculty all revealed that greater use of and enhanced knowledge of digital resources are profoundly needed for academic success. Students noted they often have limited access to digital resources in class and revealed that such access could "really help us learn more." Parents and students both mentioned that technology is not routinely allowed to be checked out or brought home, leading to inequity of digital resources. Student, parent, and faculty interviews all pointed to the need for not only more technology access for all, but for enhanced, modern ways to make use of this resource. Faculty noted a desire to have professional development in practical use of digital resources to enhance instruction.

In terms of organizational effectiveness, parents stated that they would like to see MCBOE "redo their website and rethink how social media is used." Parents noted that little information they need is available on the system website and finding what is available is difficult and time-consuming for them. Parents also revealed their personal, extensive use of social media and their desire for the system to more effectively use this tool for communication. The current technology plan is dated, and a renewed plan would benefit from inclusion of methods to study effectiveness of digital resources (in addition to tracking usage patterns), equity of resource availability, usage of technology to share data and communicate effectively, and planning for future implementation. Adequate digital resources and their effective use lead to improvement of professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness. Therefore, it is suggested that the system explore ways to garner needed digital resources and more effectively use what they currently retain.

In conclusion, by building upon strengths and prioritizing needs for improvement outlined in this report, the Marion County Board of Education can successfully continue its improvement journey. The system

has achieved many goals thus far and is very capable of continuing its reputation of excellence. The school's leadership team is encouraged to study these five themes, Cognia Standard ratings, and insights to create an action plan that will provide next steps.

## 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
<p><b>Dr. Stephan E. Sargent, Lead Evaluator</b></p>	<p>After graduation from Oklahoma State University with a bachelor's in education and a minor in science education, Dr. Sargent taught for years as a classroom teacher in Ponca City, Oklahoma. He taught science as well as all subjects in homeroom courses. Dr. Sargent graduated from The University of Tulsa with a master's in school counseling and a doctorate in reading/literacy from Oklahoma State University. He has taught developmental reading to adults, reading methods courses, study skills courses, and served as a reading specialist for an athletic team. Later, Dr. Sargent began work at Northeastern State University as a professor of reading methods. He teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in reading methods and works extensively in the NSU Reading Clinic. Dr. Sargent works closely with area schools, teaching the majority of his courses in clinical settings. Dr. Sargent works closely with school accreditation at all levels. Since 1992, he has volunteered with Cognia for the accreditation of PK- 12 schools and reviews graduate reading programs for the Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP).</p>
<p><b>Kristen Carroll</b></p>	<p>Dr. Kristen Carroll is the executive director of data strategy at Douglas County School System in Douglasville, Georgia. In this role Dr. Carroll works to increase data-driven decision-making by organizing the district's data collection processes, engaging in ongoing analytics, and developing data literacy among stakeholders. She is currently participating as a cohort 12 data fellow with the Strategic Data Project at Harvard University Graduate School of Education. She earned a Ph.D. in political science from Texas A&amp;M University, where she researched K-12 education policy and administrators. Following her doctoral program, she worked as a postdoctoral researcher at Vanderbilt University studying K-12 labor markets and served the Tennessee Department of Education Department of Human Capital as a policy analyst through the Education Pioneer summer fellowship. She has published a number of solo and peer-reviewed research articles in journals such as <i>The American Review of Public Administration</i>, <i>Public Performance and Management Review</i>, and has a forthcoming article in the <i>American Journal of Education</i>.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p><b>Lynn Cato</b></p>	<p>Dr. Lynn Cato currently serves as the McDuffie County Schools director of curriculum and instruction in Thomson, Georgia. Her responsibilities encompass curriculum development, instruction, assessment, professional learning, pre-kindergarten programming, accountability, federal programs, public relations, and accreditation. Dr. Cato previously served as a teacher, mentor, assistant principal, and principal in the district before transferring to the central office. She earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in history from Augusta College, a master's degree in instructional technology from Troy State University, an education specialist degree in educational leadership from Augusta State University, and a doctorate in educational administration from Georgia Southern University. Her certification fields include grades 4-8 language arts, 4-12 social studies, gifted, leadership, and teacher support specialist. Dr. Cato has been named as a Teacher of the Year, a DAR American History Teacher of the Year, and a member of the Georgia Middle School Association's Team of the Year. She serves on the Georgia Department of Education System Test Coordinator Advisory Council, chairs the Thomson-McDuffie County Library Board, is a member of the Bartram Trail Regional Library Board, and represents the district on the East Georgia P-20 Collaborative, the CSRA RESA endorsement committee, and Archway Partnership teams.</p>
<p><b>Sharwonda Peek</b></p>	<p>Mrs. Sharwonda Peek is a 21-year career employee with Duval County Public Schools in Jacksonville, Florida. She began her career as a middle school exceptional education teacher and while serving in this capacity she worked to develop the micro-society magnet program, which resulted in the middle school being the first to house a student-run credit union that served members of the community. She has served in the district as coordinator of magnet programs, middle school assistant principal, and as principal of one of the highest performing middle schools in the county. Mrs. Peek currently serves as assistant superintendent in the Office of School Choice overseeing all choice options offered to students to include magnet, special transfer options schools, charter, home education, and family empowerment. Her current capacity involves program development for magnet and other choice schools in the district. She holds a bachelor's degree in marketing and a master's degree in human resource management and educational leadership. She is currently pursuing her Doctorate of Education in organizational effectiveness. Mrs. Peek has successfully completed the National Institute of School Leadership (NISL) program and is certified in exceptional student education, educational leadership, and school principal.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p><b>Dorable Dangerfield</b></p>	<p>Dorable Dangerfield is a 30-year employee with the St. Tammany Parish Public School System in Covington, Louisiana. She has served as a teacher, assistant principal, principal, human resources supervisor, and currently serves as a curriculum and instruction supervisor. Some of Mrs. Dangerfield's key responsibilities include supervision of the ELA curriculum, professional development for teachers, new administrators, and aspiring administrators, and school supervision. She mentors six to eight principals each year. In addition, she serves as the district liaison for state programs such as mentor teachers, content leader training for ELA, teacher residents and student teachers. Mrs. Dangerfield collaborates with other supervisors on district-wide teacher and administrator evaluations, recruitment, university partnerships, sexual harassment investigations, and federal reports. She has a B.A. degree in elementary education from Dillard University, M.Ed. in administration and supervision from Southern University at Baton Rouge, over 30 additional graduate hours in educational leadership from Southeastern Louisiana University, and is a graduate of the National Institute of School Leadership (NISL) program. Her Louisiana certifications include school superintendent, parish/city school supervisor of instruction, supervisor of student teaching, principal and elementary grades 1-8.</p>
<p><b>Shannon Hammond</b></p>	<p>Mrs. Shannon Hammond is the director of federal programs for the Walton County School District in Monroe, Georgia. In that position, she oversees all federal programs and directly coordinates Titles I, II, III, and IV. Mrs. Hammond also coordinates the ESOL program and is the professional learning coordinator for the district. Mrs. Hammond holds degrees in middle grades education, school counseling, early childhood education and PK-6 leadership certification. She has experience as a teacher, counselor, and administrator in Pre-K through grade 8, and serves as an instructor for the ESOL endorsement program with Northeast Georgia RESA. Mrs. Hammond serves on multiple Cognia Engagement Reviews in Georgia and Florida.</p>

## 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](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.



