Tallassee City Board of Education

Tallassee, Alabama

cognia

Table of Contents

cognia

Cognia Continuous Improvement System

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

The findings of the Engagement Review Team are organized by the ratings from the Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic and the Levels of Impact within the i3 Rubric: Initiate, Improve, and Impact.

Initiate

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

Improve

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

Impact

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

cognia

cognia

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

cognia

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:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	4	**EM:** 3	
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:**	2	**SU:**	3	**EM:** 2	
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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:** 3	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:** 4	
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:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:** 3	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	3	**EM:** 3	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	1	**SU:**	3	**EM:** 3	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**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.									Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 3	

cognia

Leadership Capacity Standards											Rating
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	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.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	2	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	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.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	4	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	2	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	2	
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	

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	4	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	2	
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	1	

Resource Capacity Domain

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

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating
3.1	The system plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the system's effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	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.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	

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:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
3.7	The system demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.8	The system allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the system's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	

Assurances

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

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

Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

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

cognia

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	318.23	CIN 5 Year IEQ Range	278.34 – 283.33

Insights from the Review

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

The Engagement Review Team (team) identified five themes aligned to the continuous improvement process at Tallassee City Schools (TCS). Presenting both strengths and opportunities to guide the system's improvement journey, these themes focus on the working relationship between governance and leadership, visionary long-range planning, professional learning structures, system-wide standard operating procedures, and formal data analysis across the system. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, this remote review did not include classroom observations. To rate the Cognia Performance Standards, the team gained information through a review of the evidence and interviews of representatives of all stakeholder groups.

The school board functions within an effective operational structure and an excellent working relationship with leadership. Interviews with board members confirmed they work in a spirit of harmony and cooperation; adhere to a code of ethics; function within defined roles; and establish and ensure adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness. One resource the board subscribes to for ongoing support and updates is *Policy Pipeline* through the Alabama Association of School Boards, a resource used for their recent five-year policy review and revision process. Evidence of the board's operational structure included the code of conduct, the board policy manual, *Policy Pipeline* references, and documentation of whole board training. All board members are expected to be certified, and they expressed positive attitudes about their participation in whole board and personal training. The superintendent praised the board's leadership saying, "They work collaboratively as a team whether considering policies to support student learning or improve institutional effectiveness." The board emphasized that they trust and support the superintendent for the day-to-day administration of the system.

As a graduate of Tallassee City Schools, the board president has background institutional knowledge and is well respected in the community. His leadership promotes leadership and direction for the system among other stakeholders. Interviews revealed that parents and community members support leadership and the system's purpose and direction. Students in one school said their school has signs in the hallways to promote the goal of going "above the bar" to support the purpose and direction of TCS. Stakeholders described TCS as being family oriented and caring and spoke of their trust of leadership.

This positive and collaborative relationship between stakeholders will continue to move TCS toward higher student achievement and operational effectiveness.

The system demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and the effective use of resources in support of the system's purpose and direction. Stakeholders discussed many completed and ongoing projects that demonstrate strategic resource management over time. The system has completed most of the components of the current capital plan and has a draft copy of the 2021-2025 strategic plan waiting for board approval. Goals include the completion of a $21 million new high school which began in January 2021. The project will be funded by a city sales tax approved for capital improvements of TCS, a city bond issue, and a state bond issue. The strategic plan also includes over $300,000 of renovations, additions, and improvements to current facilities. Documents and interviews revealed excellent financial stewardship resulting in a healthy reserve fund. An existing building in the community was purchased to house the career and technical education (CTE) program which has increased enrollment and has plans for additional course offerings. An alternative education program (Tiger Pride Academy) supports students with life struggles and/or behavior problems. All K-12 students are provided an iPad for school and home use. A recently hired instructional technology leader provides technology professional development and iPad support. TCS purchased Edgenuity, a K-12 digital curriculum, to help meet the needs of virtual learners during Covid-19. The high school offers dual enrollment and Advanced Placement (AP) courses and the elementary and middle school have state-of-the-art STEM labs. TCS has a strong Response to Intervention (RtI) program as well as enrichment opportunities to meet students' needs. The competitive robotics teams have been expanded from the middle school into the high school. TCS also has award-winning choir and band programs along with traditional sports and clubs and some non-traditional opportunities such as archery and fishing teams. The system is fortunate to employ a registered nurse at each campus to meet students' physical, mental, and emotional needs. Because of the challenge of hiring and maintaining certified teachers in critical areas, TCS recently implemented a sign-on bonus to attract teachers in high-needs areas.

The system's professional learning structure and expectations lack collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organization effectiveness. Although TCS has worked diligently to provide iPads for all grade levels, evidence did not indicate the devices are being used effectively. Students said, "Our notes are on the iPad; otherwise, we don't use them that much." They also talked about "listening to teachers teach" and completing paper worksheets. Teachers stated that the 1:1 implementation has not changed the way they teach. The system is working towards integrated, active classrooms through ongoing professional development supporting the SAMR Model, a framework that categorizes four degrees of classroom technology integration: Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, and Redefinition. However, teacher and student interviews revealed minimal knowledge of how the SAMR Model would change instructional strategies and the team did not note professional collaboration on project-based learning and innovative learning environments. Four years of the district conducted eProve™ Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® (eleot®) results showed digital learning scores were the lowest of the rated categories.

The superintendent noted one of the goals of the new 2021-2025 strategic plan is to demonstrate effective, innovative, and collaborative instructional leadership practices. Several programs, such as Google classroom, Edgenuity, ACT prep, and STEM labs, support the accomplishment of this goal. The system provides training for staff members and, as an incentive, pays staff members to become Google certified. Evidence and interviews showed the schools have coaching and mentoring programs, and each school has an instructional leader and a technology assistant. Recently TCS hired a system-wide instructional technology leader to model strategies in the classroom and provide additional professional development.

The superintendent noted the need for a more formalized professional learning structure across the system to provide opportunities for horizontal and vertical learning sessions. This structure would also promote staff collaboration and instructional strategies to engage students in a more collaborative, project-based learning style, accelerating them past substitution and augmentation to modification and redefinition in the SAMR Model, and thus preparing them for their future careers.

The review of documents and interviews with leaders revealed a lack of well-documented system-wide standard operating procedures (SOPs) across departments and schools. While the chief school financial officer (CSFO) was readily able to discuss finance procedures, interviews showed most operations lacked defined procedures to ensure that all schools are operating uniformly. Policy manuals submitted for the team's review reinforced that many operational procedures are handled school by school. While procedures exist and are adjusted each year, little data and stakeholder input are collected to determine changes for improvement. Clearly established and communicated SOPs from the system level will ensure continuity of expectations and experiences for the schools and provide opportunities for stakeholder input to help avoid current problems resulting from non-uniform procedures.

Although data are collected, TCS lacks a systematic process to ensure that the data are consistently analyzed and disaggregated for decisions regarding academic and organizational programs and services. In his overview, the superintendent noted the challenge of data analysis. He shared that due to the small size of the school system and the community, stakeholders often analyze data informally without using valid analysis of data for continuous improvement. The system analyzes attendance and state test data, which are presented to and reviewed by the board. In interviews, teacher and students referenced computer-generated data, especially from Edgenuity which creates individual learning plans called MyPath for students to progress and master skills independently. In some classes students use a percentage of class time to work on MyPath. Elementary students keep data notebooks and teachers conference with them. Upper-level teachers said they are not trained nor expected to analyze data. The team saw multiple examples of data collection but few examples of data analysis.

Stakeholder interviews confirmed that the system administers multiple surveys and needs assessments; yet the team found little evidence that the results are analyzed, used to improve instruction and/or organizational effectiveness, or communicated to stakeholders. Parents said they did not recall receiving communication about the results of completed surveys. Of the survey results the team reviewed, the only one with analysis was a recent survey regarding returning to school after the pandemic. Students said they sometimes meet with leaders to provide input, but mostly just have informal conversations without receiving feedback.

Interviews revealed that the system provides programs and resources when teachers and leaders can justify the purchases. Consequently, TCS has many programs to meet instructional and operational needs but little data to determine effectiveness. A commitment to formalize the systematic analysis and use of longitudinal data to assess program effectiveness, operational efficiency, and student achievement will ensure that improvement plans are embedded and sustained throughout the system.

In conclusion, the passion for continuous improvement is evident and contagious among TCS stakeholders. A more intentional approach to develop two-way communication with stakeholders will ensure their connectedness to schools and the system. The Five Fundamentals for Tallassee City School's Success, created by the superintendent, along with the positive and deeply embedded family culture in Tallassee will move the system forward in their journey of continuous improvement as they implement the superintendent's slogan "boots on the ground."

cognia

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.

cognia

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
Carol Deweese, Lead Evaluator	Mrs. Carol Deweese joined Cognia in 2014 as a team member and school lead evaluator. In 2018 she completed the requirements to serve as a system lead evaluator. Mrs. Deweese's professional career began at the elementary level in a private school environment teaching music. Continuing in the private sector, she taught high school computer programming and application. She moved to public education in 2000, serving as an instructional technologist. Mrs. Deweese retired in 2014 as the district's instructional technology coordinator. Mrs. Deweese earned degrees from Mississippi State University and Delta State University. She is IC3 certified, a certified Promethean trainer, power school university certified, and has been a certified Apple Foundations Trainer. Since her retirement, Mrs. Deweese has served on numerous Cognia teams, including as an Associate Lead Evaluator and Lead Evaluator.
Keith Shaffer, Associate Lead Evaluator	Dr. Keith Shaffer joined the staff of Cognia as a state director for Mississippi in 2013 after serving in public schools of Mississippi for 29.5 years. His experience ranges from teacher of mathematics and speech communications to building and district level administration. As a district leader, Dr. Shaffer worked in the areas of technology, curriculum and assessment, federal programs, and human resources. Having served as an elected superintendent as well as an appointed superintendent in two different districts, Dr. Shaffer provided leadership by example in continuous school improvement. Dr. Shaffer served as an adjunct professor in mathematics and educational leadership for over ten years at MS Delta Community College and Delta State University. He served as a provider of professional learning opportunities for the department of education as well as the school boards association. Dr. Shaffer obtained degrees in mathematics, curriculum and supervision, and educational leadership from Delta State University.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Kasey Feagin	Kasey Miles Feagin has served in public education in South Carolina for the past 23 years starting as a high school social studies teacher. Other roles Kasey has held are assistant principal, principal, director of assessment, senior director of curriculum, instruction and assessment and currently serves as Chief Operations Officer for her school district. Ms. Feagin has earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Francis Marion University, a Master's Degree from the University of South Carolina in Educational Leadership and an Educational Specialist Degree in Superintendency from Arkansas State University.
Brandon Kiser	Dr. Brandon Kiser currently serves as the principal of Admiral Moorer Middle School in Eufaula, Alabama. He has fifteen years of experience in education as a science teacher, coach, assistant principal, and principal spanning grades K-12 in both county and city school districts in the state of Alabama. Dr. Kiser earned degrees from both Troy University and Auburn University. He also currently serves as the vice president for the Alabama Association for Middle Level Education as well as the District 2 secretary/treasurer for the Alabama Association of Secondary School Principals.
Emily Waldrop	Mrs. Emily Waldrop is currently the principal of Bridgeport Elementary School. This is Mrs. Waldrop's 17th year in education. She spent 13 years in the elementary classroom, three years as an assistant principal at Skyline School, and is currently serving as principal. Mrs. Waldrop has a Degree in Elementary Education, a master's in Elementary Education, and a master's in Instructional Leadership. She has served on three Cognia Engagement Review teams. Mrs. Waldrop enjoys serving on accreditation teams as well as further her educational experiences through professional development opportunities, and professional conferences.

cognia

References and Readings

AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/continuousimprovement-and-accountability.

Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention program.* New York: Routledge.

Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like.* Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/what-continuously-improving-system-looks-like.

Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools.* Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/sites/default/files/CISWhitePaper.pdf.

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

Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing.* New York: Hachette Book Group.

Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education.* San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation_continuous-improvement_2013.05.pdf.

Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change.* New York: Teachers College.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory.* New York: George Braziller, Inc.

cognia