



# B. M. Hanson Elementary School

---

811 Burke Avenue  
Harvey, ND USA

**February 12 – 14, 2020**  
**School Accreditation Engagement Review**

259886

## 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 .....	4
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 institution commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning including the expectations for learners.									Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.3	The institution engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational process and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution’s purpose and direction.									Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	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:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	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 institution.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.									Impacting
	EN:	4	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:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.4	The institution has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers who support their educational experiences.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
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:	1	EM:	
2.6	The institution implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the institution's learning expectations.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Improving

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating	
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	1	Improving
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to demonstrable improvement of student learning.										
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	1	Initiating
2.12	The institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.										
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	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	
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	Improving
3.1	The institution plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the institution's effectiveness.										
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	2	Improving
3.2	The institution's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	1	Improving
3.3	The institution provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	1	Initiating
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.										
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	1	Initiating
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	3	Improving
3.6	The institution provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the institution.										

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
3.7	The institution demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the institution's purpose and direction.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
3.8	The institution allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the institution's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	2	

## 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		
Total Number of eleot Observations:		20
Environments	Rating	2018-19 Averages
<b>Equitable Learning Environment</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.82</b>
Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs	2.04	2.34
Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support	3.04	3.30
Learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner	3.12	3.45

<b>eleot® Observations</b>		
<b>Total Number of eleot Observations:</b>	<b>20</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	2.71	2.18
<b>High Expectations Environment</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.71</b>
Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher	2.75	2.74
Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable	2.96	2.95
Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work	2.33	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)	2.46	2.67
Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning	2.46	2.78
<b>Supportive Learning Environment</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.15</b>
Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful	3.17	3.07
Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback)	2.83	2.97
Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks	2.96	3.24
Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher	3.04	3.34
<b>Active Learning Environment</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.71</b>
Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate	2.62	2.77
Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences	2.21	2.41
Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities	3.12	3.12
Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments	2.38	2.45
<b>Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.63</b>
Learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored	2.25	2.43
Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work	2.88	2.93
Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content	2.62	2.90
Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed	2.38	2.25

<b>eleot® Observations</b>		
<b>Total Number of eleot Observations:</b>		<b>20</b>
<b>Environments</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>2018-19 Averages</b>
<b>Well-Managed Learning Environment</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.20</b>
Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other	2.88	3.42
Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others	2.83	3.35
Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another	2.62	2.89
Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions	3.00	3.15
<b>Digital Learning Environment</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>1.79</b>
Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning	1.58	1.97
Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning	1.38	1.79
Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning	1.42	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>267.5</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.

The Engagement Review Team identified three themes during the review that will support the continuous improvement process for B. M. Hanson Elementary School (BMHES). These themes are focused on the areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. The implementation of several programs and a wealth of data can be used to strengthen the current strategic plan and continuous school improvement goals. The following themes are meant to be used as a roadmap for continuous improvement.

**Implementation of a comprehensive district strategic plan is supported with goals, strategies and activities that are part of a continuous improvement process.** Most stakeholders were not aware of the district strategic plan, nor has it been reviewed recently. The elementary school has a Continuous School Improvement (CSI) plan, but again many of the staff and parents were not familiar with, nor were aware of the plan’s existence. Review of the district strategic plan and the school’s goals indicated a focus on student engagement and readiness. Communicating the plan with stakeholders along with the development of an implementation and monitoring strategy will increase accountability and progress toward identified goals. A well-developed strategic plan supported by data and goals designed to impact student achievement could help unify the K-12 staff in a common purpose, such as the school’s goal of “engaging and preparing learners to be choice ready.”

**Alignment of the K-12 curriculum is lacking in part due to the disconnect between the elementary and secondary staff.** The staff and administration indicated very little interaction between the two buildings. Staff indicated they had common professional development in the past, but that practice ended to address the unique needs of staff in each building. While the needs of the staff in each building should be addressed by data-supported professional development, the lack of interaction or common goals has created a separation that is not conducive to a healthy district-wide culture and climate. This was supported by interviews with staff and administration. The elementary staff has begun the process of identifying priority standards along with proficiency scales; however, data from staff and administrative interviews and classroom observations indicate a need for K-12 curriculum alignment. Having curriculum alignment as a common goal could create unity and focus the entire staff on a continuous improvement goal that impacts student achievement. The curriculum

alignment process could include scope and sequence, vertical and horizontal alignment and identifiable readiness goals for each grade level. The team would recommend further collaborative work with the elementary and secondary staff to leverage their experiences and knowledge. It is recommended that the institution pursue these goals in a format that is both written and accessible for appropriate stakeholders. This common goal of alignment of the K-12 curriculum could help address the disconnect between the elementary and secondary staff.

**Data is inconsistently used to guide instruction and to ensure all learners' needs are being met through differentiated instructional strategies, but preliminary positive efforts with professional development and Professional Learning Communities (PLCS) can improve it.**

Student performance data is available from multiple assessments, e.g., NWEA MAP (Northwestern Education Association Measure of Academic Progress), STARS (Skills Training and Related Services), NDSA (North Dakota State Assessment), and others. On the very positive side, NWEA MAP data has indicated an increase in student achievement in both math and reading over the past three years! However, it was not clear how student data was being used to guide instruction. Data from interviews with all stakeholder groups, classroom observations, numerous formative and summative assessments, and perception data gathered from surveys and inventories supported the need to use existing data to improve instructional practice and address individual student needs. There were examples of teachers using the data to guide instruction, but those were the exception rather than the norm. The practice was most evident in the lower elementary grades and within special programs. The school's professional development plan has had numerous high-quality trainings for all staff through the North Central Educational Cooperative (NCEC, but these trainings have not always been focused on the specific goals identified in the continuous improvement plan. Effective use of data to impact instruction could serve as the focus of professional development and for staff in their Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Therefore, professional development must be available for all teachers and para-educators and systematically implemented and monitored to ensure effective practices become embedded in the instructional routine. Meanwhile, the regularly scheduled PLC time being used exclusively to identify priority standards and proficiency scales for standards-based grading could also be used for analysis and use of data to impact student learning. The implementation of structured PLCs that meet weekly has been a positive change and very beneficial to both staff and students. Staff have found a common focus that has improved building climate and culture, and students have appreciated the time available each week to complete homework and work on projects. The counseling program indicated plans to use the student time to expand career exploration and readiness for all students. Therefore, the professional development plan should include staff training on the analysis and use of data to improve and differentiate instruction and facilitate the scaffolding of curriculum to meet the needs of all students. The consistent and school-wide use of data to guide instructional practice will have a direct impact on student achievement.

The Review Team felt it was important to recognize several exemplary programs that have been impactful to the school and community. They include the community-based project and the "Quiet Zone."

**The annual community-based project is embedded in the school's culture.** This was shared as a highlight of the interviews with students, staff, parents and board members. What started out as a small class project several years ago has now become a major undertaking led by the sixth grade and involving the entire school and community. The students identify possible areas to address, gather information and decide what aspect of the community they want to impact. The students conduct research, create awareness and coordinate a fundraising project to meet their goal. The class prepares a presentation on the project as a culminating event. The project has resulted in recycling at school, the purchase of protective vests for local law enforcement, and many other impactful additions to the community. The entire community knows that each year the sixth grade will lead the school through a project to benefit the entire community. This has become embedded in the school and it would be unfortunate for this project to be discontinued due to staff changes.

**The implementation of the "Quiet Zone" has been very helpful and a welcome change.**

Students shared they may attend Quiet Zone Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday mornings from

7:50 a.m. to 8:20 a.m. Students use the time for test prep, homework help, math help and reading. Students indicated having a designated and monitored time and place to regularly get help or to simply read has made a significant difference for them and many choose to attend each day. Finally, students also benefit from an extensive list of community-based education programs that have been incorporated into the school year. Community members come to the school or the students go out into the community to receive education on a wide range of topics from agriculture to medicine.

In summary, B.M. Hanson Elementary School can be very proud of its strong commitment to its students and the healthy culture and climate that was observed by the Review Team. The school and staff have strong support from the community as was expressed by stakeholder groups. The school also has several initiatives and programs like the priority standards, the Quiet Zone and the annual community project that can and will have a positive impact on student achievement. What appears to be in initial stages are formal structures for using data to impact instruction and monitoring to ensure quality of implementation and fidelity to the process. The Review Team believes the school is positioned to quickly move from the Initiate level to Improvement and Sustainability levels. Involving the entire staff and stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of continuous school improvement process is the first step. It is our desire that the Engagement Review provides a roadmap for the construction of a quality school improvement plan with specific goals, strategies and activities will help ensure high expectations and student success.

## 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 elite 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>Michael Heilman, Lead Evaluator</b></p>	<p>Michael Heilman has over 37 years of service in public education as a teacher and administrator. He started his career in education as an Agriculture Education Teacher and FFA Adviser in Minot and Garrison. As a high school principal, Michael served in the districts of Garrison, Dickinson and Bismarck, North Dakota over a span of sixteen years. His last four years in public education were as assistant superintendent for secondary schools in Bismarck, North Dakota. After a short retirement, Michael spent one year with Cognia in the North Dakota State office and two years as principal at Christ the King Catholic Elementary School in Mandan, North Dakota. Michael has served on both school and systems Cognia teams and led the process for Bismarck Public Schools in May of 2013. He currently works part time as the Burleigh County superintendent of schools and continues to serve as a Lead Evaluator for Cognia Engagement Reviews in North Dakota.</p>
<p><b>Michele Lind</b></p>	<p>Michele Lind has 18 years of experience in education. She is in her second year as principal of Cathedral Elementary School in Bismarck. She has a bachelor's degree in mass communications and home economics education from North Dakota State University. She earned her master's degree from the University of South Dakota in 2017. She has worked as a weekly newspaper editor, a middle school and high school home economics teacher, and as a library media specialist. Before assuming the role of principal, she was a library media specialist in Mandan Public School District, where she served two elementary schools for five years. Prior to moving to Mandan, she lived with her family in Rugby, where she was the K-12 librarian. Michele has served on district and school leadership teams for Cognia reviews. She also served on a review team in the spring of 2019. Cathedral School completed its first Cognia Engagement Review in October 2019.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p><b>Tammy Meyer</b></p>	<p>Tammy Meyer is the Instructional Strategist at Devils Lake High School. After graduating from Valley City State University, Mrs. Meyer began her teaching career doing home visits for the local Headstart program. She then moved to the elementary setting. After receiving her master's degree, also from VCSU, she went on to be an instructional designer and adjunct instructor for Lake Region State College in Devils Lake. Tammy returned to the public-school setting as a math instructional coach, eventually ending up at Devils Lake High School. In her current position, she works with teachers, oversees the school's professional development, and leads their MTSS and Cognia teams. Tammy has served as a Cognia team member on three Engagement Reviews.</p>
<p><b>Sarah Beck</b></p>	<p>Ms. Sarah Beck has worked in the field of education for over twelve years as a substitute teacher, classroom educator, and currently as a principal. She works for McClusky Public Schools as the PK-12 Principal and has been in McClusky for three years. Ms. Beck has advised a Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA) chapter, judged FBLA-PBL competitive events, served as the AP Coordinator and a concession stand supervisor at previous schools. She graduated from Western Governors University with a M.A. in educational leadership and a B.A. in business education from Weber State University. Ms. Beck has been a part of the leadership team at McClusky Public Schools for the past three years and looks forward to working as a team member to assist other schools in their accreditation process.</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.

