



# Blue Ridge Comm Unit Dist. 18

Farmer City, Illinois

**January 28 – 31, 2020**

**System Accreditation Engagement Review**

60039

## 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>2</b>
<b>Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Leadership Capacity Domain .....	3
Learning Capacity Domain.....	5
Resource Capacity Domain.....	6
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® Results .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Assurances .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Insights from the Review.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Next Steps .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Team Roster .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>References and Readings .....</b>	<b>15</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 will be organized by the Levels of Impact within i3: Initiate, Improve, and Impact. The organization of the findings is based upon the ratings from the Standards Diagnostic and the i3 Levels of Impact.

### Initiate

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

### Improve

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

### Impact

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

## Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal to leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the accreditation process examines the whole institution—the program, the cultural context and the community of stakeholders—to determine how well the parts work together to meet the needs of learners. Through the Cognia 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. Using these Standards, Engagement Review Teams 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 Cognia’s Performance Standards. The diagnostic consists of three components built around each of the three Domains: **Leadership Capacity**, **Learning Capacity** and **Resource Capacity**. Results are reported within four ranges identified by the colors. The results for the three Domains are presented in the tables that follow.

Color	Rating	Description
Red	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.									Initiating
	EN:	1	IM:	1	RE:	2	SU:	2	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:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	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:	1	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	1	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	2	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	1	RE:	2	SU:	2	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:	
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for its 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:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	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.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	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.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
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:	
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Improving

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating	
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	2	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	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:	2	

### 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:	3	IM:	3	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:	3	
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.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	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:	3	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	

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

## Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® Results

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

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

eleot® Observations		
<b>Total Number of eleot Observations:</b>		<b>31</b>
<b>Environments</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>2018-19 Averages</b>
<b>Equitable Learning Environment</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.82</b>
Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs	2.81	2.34
Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support	3.16	3.30
Learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner	3.35	3.45

<b>eleot® Observations</b>		
<b>Total Number of eleot Observations:</b>	<b>31</b>	
<b>Environments</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>2018-19 Averages</b>
Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions and dispositions	2.84	2.18
<b>High Expectations Environment</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>2.71</b>
Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher	2.94	2.74
Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable	3.06	2.95
Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work	3.06	2.43
Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing)	2.94	2.67
Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning	3.06	2.78
<b>Supportive Learning Environment</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.15</b>
Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful	3.19	3.07
Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback)	3.19	2.97
Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks	3.19	3.24
Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher	3.29	3.34
<b>Active Learning Environment</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.71</b>
Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate	2.90	2.77
Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences	2.87	2.41
Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities	3.13	3.12
Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments	2.97	2.45
<b>Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>2.63</b>
Learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored	3.03	2.43
Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work	3.06	2.93
Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content	3.06	2.90
Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed	2.90	2.25

<b>eleot® Observations</b>		
<b>Total Number of eleot Observations:</b>		<b>31</b>
<b>Environments</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>2018-19 Averages</b>
<b>Well-Managed Learning Environment</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>3.20</b>
Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other	3.19	3.42
Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others	3.19	3.35
Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another	2.94	2.89
Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions	2.90	3.15
<b>Digital Learning Environment</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>1.79</b>
Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning	2.58	1.97
Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning	2.45	1.79
Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning	2.39	1.61

## Assurances

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

<b>Assurances Met</b>		
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>If No, List Unmet Assurances By Number Below</b>
<b>X</b>		

## 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. A formative tool for improvement, it identifies areas of success as well as areas in need of focus. The IEQ is comprised of the Standards Diagnostic ratings from the three Domains: 1) Leadership Capacity; 2) Learning Capacity; and 3) Resource Capacity. The IEQ results are reported on a scale of 100 to 400 and provides information about how the institution is performing compared to expected criteria. Institutions should review the IEQ in relation to the Findings from the review in the areas of Initiate, Improve and Impact. An IEQ score below 250 indicates that the institution has several areas within the Initiate level and should focus their improvement efforts on those Standards within the Initiate level. An IEQ in the range of 225-300 indicates that the institution has several Standards within the Improve level and is using results to inform continuous improvement and demonstrate sustainability. An IEQ of 275 and above indicates the

institution is beginning to reach the Impact level and is engaged in practices that are sustained over time and are becoming ingrained in the culture of the institution.

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

<b>Institution IEQ</b>	<b>285.81</b>	<b>AIN 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, examples of programs and practices and provide direction for the institution’s continuous improvement efforts. The Insights from the Review narrative should provide contextualized information from the team deliberations and provide information about the team’s analysis of the practices, processes, and programs of the institution from the levels of Initiate, Improve, and Impact. The Insights from the Review narrative should provide next steps to guide the improvement journey of the institution in its efforts to improve the quality of educational opportunities for all learners. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness. The feedback provided in the Accreditation Engagement Review Report will assist the institution in reflecting on its current improvement efforts and to adapt and adjust their plans to continuously strive for improvement.

Several significant systemic themes emerged from the review. Blue Ridge Community District #18 made it a priority to provide and maintain adequate resources and facilities that optimize learning. Observations of a new school building, materials for vocational programs, resources throughout the school sites, and athletic facilities all validate these findings. The integration of digital resources and other instructional resources for students and schools was well planned and tracked. Equity of opportunity for all students was a theme underlying resource allocation. Future planning for growth, resource distribution and maintenance needs was well documented. Major decision-making regarding programs, instruction, and resources were data-supported throughout. Adequate resources ensure students and teachers have the materials needed to optimize student achievement.

**Faculty and staff of Blue Ridge Community District #18 have developed a rich comradery and cohesion that promotes collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance.**

Interviews with teachers revealed that culture of collaboration is established, promoted, and protected to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness. One educator mentioned that, “When one faculty member celebrates, all celebrate, and when one grieves, they all grieve.” Observations of faculty and staff also divulged that faculty, staff, and administration work well together to enhance student success. For instance, faculty, staff, and administration are all joyfully giving of their own time to make a medieval feast and theater production happen later this spring. Surveys of faculty validated that a culture of collaboration is evident and that teachers share a close bond and actively seek to help one another. An example of how teachers help each other was demonstrated in a vibrant mentoring program for new teachers (and teachers new to the district). Veteran teachers give of their time and talent to help new teachers succeed. Not only does the district guide this program to focus on academics, but also includes multiple mentor/new teacher social events. Most stakeholders from students to faculty, staff and administrators “have a place” and feel valued. Such an environment allows for collaboration, sharing of ideas, and an optimal work environment. The district should continue to monitor collaboration and collegiality of faculty, staff, and administration to

further enhance learner performance and organizational effectiveness.

**Blue Ridge Community District #18 (BRCD) provides remarkable academic and extracurricular programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.** Documents showing course schedules, enrollment forms, academic choices, and teacher assignments revealed numerous choices in core subjects, collegiate-level offerings, languages, electives, band, performing arts, and athletics that rival those of any school district in the region. While interviewing students at all levels, they mentioned that BRCD offers many opportunities to meet their individual needs. They noted from the earliest years in elementary school, extracurricular clubs are offered that help students connect with the academic community. Secondary students noted that they felt well-prepared for their next level of placement due to the wide offerings available. Technical education and college preparation courses were two commonly noted paths which students feel help make them ready for life after high school. Parents, teachers, and students were also quick to note the wide range of extracurricular offerings available, including sports, agriculture, foods/nutrition, and many clubs. Observations and school records document the plethora of extracurricular selections made available to all students at BRCD. Having such choices not only ensures students are college/career ready, but also provides a wonderful “hook” for students to safeguard that the individual needs of all students are met at BRCD. The district should continue to build on the wide range of opportunities already available to students at BRCD, evaluating and monitoring stakeholder needs.

**Equitable learning environments do not exist throughout the three physical sites of the school district to ensure that students develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities established by the school district.** Variations are evident for behavioral expectations which cause variations in the educational opportunities and learning among school sites. Observations of classrooms, hallways, and common areas disclosed that some buildings have excellent management, while other sites lack in this area. Observations of sites where enhanced management is needed revealed that students there spent less “time on task” as opposed to students in other buildings. Stakeholder interviews confirmed this finding. When asked why students perform well behaviorally in one site as compared to another, a student replied, “They don’t allow that at this building.” Student interviews at one site further revealed that students treat teachers there poorly and interrupt learning frequently. Data from the school system indicated that when students left buildings where management lacked, deficiencies in content area proficiency also lagged. Parents and administration, in interviews, similarly noted that such incongruous learning environments among school sites coupled with inconsistent expectations (behavioral and academic) have existed for many years. Such disparities in learning environments will negatively impact student proficiency throughout the district. The district should design, monitor, and analyze a program that will ensure common expectations for learning and behavior that are equitable at all school sites to provide a learning environment conducive to learning.

**Observations, interviews, and teacher lesson plans indicate data is being collected, analyzed, and used by some, but this process is not systematic and systemic.** Interviews with faculty found that some data is collected through Aimsweb, teacher-made tests, state-required tests, and the like. However, the data is not uniformly used to guide curricular and instructional decisions. Student interviews divulged that many students were not exactly sure of what data is collected, nor how it is used. They expressed a desire to have more access to data to guide their academic career. School records and self-assessments also noted that data is collected, such as the SAT data, but it is not uniformly studied, analyzed, and used to enhance learning. School records also revealed a lack of common metrics used for data collection and analysis. The district should engage all stakeholders in systematic, systemic data collection to guide and monitor educational decisions because when multiple stakeholders (e.g. administrators, teachers, parents, students, etc...) and use assessment

data to guide instruction, learning improves.

**Consistency in use of instructional strategies, high expectations of students, and level of rigor vary significantly among classrooms throughout all subject areas.** Observations of classrooms revealed disparities in rigor of instruction, especially between sections of the same class or grade level. Students and parents in interviews also noted that expectations of students varied, especially between physical sites. Observations further revealed differences in pedagogy and instructional practices. In some classrooms (at all levels), students were actively engaged, while in other rooms students were taught using lectures, notes, and tests. Students and parents mentioned repeatedly that expectations were high at two sites, but quite low at another. Scores and institutional documents validated these findings. For example, content area scores in the same subject tended to be high at one site, but drastically lowered at another, when comparing the same group of students. The district should monitor and evaluate equitable learning opportunities and best practices to ensure they have consistent expectations and appropriate levels of rigor at all levels and physical sites of BRSD.

Blue Ridge Community District #18 should address the use of the above findings and insights from the review to further the institution's continuous improvement process.

## 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 professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members complete Cognia training and elect certification to provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p><b>Dr. Stephan Sargent</b> Lead Evaluator</p>	<p>After graduation from Oklahoma State University with a bachelor's in education and a minor in science education, Dr. Sargent taught science for years as a teacher in Ponca City, Oklahoma. He graduated from The University of Tulsa with a master's in school counseling. He then 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. He currently volunteers with Cognia for PK-12 schools and reviews graduate reading programs for the International Literacy Association (the SPA for CAEP/NCATE). Finally, Dr. Sargent works extensively with Quality Matters, the recognized body that certifies on-line courses for P-12 and higher education.</p>
<p><b>Mr. Brian Gee</b></p>	<p>Mr. Gee is currently the principal at Goddard Academy (alternative high school), Lakeside Academy (24-hour secure foster care group home) and the Goddard Virtual Program. He has served as an administrator for 14 years in rural, inter-city and suburban school districts. Mr. Gee has held the roles of assistant principal, athletic director and principal. While serving as a building principal, he led the district through a Cognia (North Central) accreditation process. Mr. Gee serves in leadership roles for the Kansas Association of Secondary School Principals and the Evaluations Review Committee for the Kansas State Department of Education.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p><b>Mrs. Phyllis Cavallone</b></p>	<p>Mrs. Phyllis Cavallone is the Chief of Academics for the Office of Catholic Schools for the Archdiocese of Chicago. Previously, Mrs. Cavallone was a principal at St. Therese Chinese Catholic School. During her tenure, she transformed the once-struggling inner-city school, earning several honors, including U.S. Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence (2011 &amp; 2018) and an Intel School of Distinction National Finalist. Mrs. Cavallone was named the 2017 Stanley C. Golder Golden Apple Leadership Award winner, the 2017 Lead. Learn. Proclaim. Award from the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA), the 2017 National Distinguished Principal Award by National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the Technology Leader of the Year by <i>Learning and Technology</i> magazine. Mrs. Cavallone has taught high school and college mathematics and has reviewed four middle school mathematical textbooks. Phyllis received her master’s degree in educational administration and supervision from Roosevelt University, a graduate degree in mathematics education, her B.A. in elementary education from Saint Xavier University, and holds a Kellogg School of Management Certificate– Center for Nonprofit Management at Northwestern.</p>
<p><b>Mr. Hedi Belkaoui</b></p>	<p>Hedi Belkaoui is the Director of Continuous Improvement for the Archdiocese of Chicago Catholic Schools. In that position, he coordinates the school improvement plans of the 176 schools in the Archdiocese, the use of assessment data, and professional development to achieve goals related to increased student achievement and accreditation. Mr. Belkaoui currently holds a masters’ degree in educational leadership from Dominican University and is currently enrolled in his third year in a doctoral program at National Louis University. He also has a bachelors’ degree in social science with an endorsement in secondary education. Mr. Belkaoui has experience as a teacher, an administrator, and a Regional Director of Turnaround Schools at the Archdiocese of Chicago supporting and managing principals. Hedi has led school efforts to regain accreditation at schools and supported district level accreditation efforts at the Archdiocese of Chicago.</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.

