



# Alabaster City Schools

---

Alabaster, Alabama

**November 1-5, 2020**

**System Accreditation Engagement Review**

259263

## Table of Contents

<b>Cognia Continuous Improvement System.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Initiate.....	1
Improve .....	1
Impact.....	1
<b>Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Leadership Capacity Domain.....	4
Learning Capacity Domain .....	5
Resource Capacity Domain.....	6
Assurances.....	7
<b>Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality® .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Insights from the Review .....	9
Next Steps .....	12
<b>Team Roster .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>References and Readings .....</b>	<b>16</b>

# Cognia Continuous Improvement System

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

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

## Initiate

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

## Improve

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

## Impact

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

# Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal in leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the Cognia Accreditation Process examines the whole institution—the program, the cultural context, and the community of stakeholders—to determine how well the parts work together to meet the needs of learners. Through the accreditation process, highly skilled and trained Engagement Review Teams gather first-hand evidence and information pertinent to evaluating an institution's performance against the research-based Cognia Performance Standards. Review teams use these Standards to assess the quality of learning environments to gain valuable insights and target improvements in teaching and learning. Cognia provides Standards that are tailored for all education providers so that the benefits of accreditation are universal across the education community.

Through a comprehensive review of evidence and information, our experts gain a broad understanding of institution quality. Using the Standards, the review team provides valuable feedback to institutions, which helps to focus and guide each institution's improvement journey. Valuable evidence and information from other stakeholders, including students, also are obtained through interviews, surveys, and additional activities.

## Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

The Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic is used by the Engagement Review Team to evaluate the institution's effectiveness based on the Cognia Performance Standards. The diagnostic consists of three components built around each of three Domains: **Leadership Capacity**, **Learning Capacity**, and **Resource Capacity**. Results are reported within four ranges identified by color. The results for the three Domains are presented in the tables that follow.

Color	Rating	Description
Red	Insufficient	Identifies areas with insufficient evidence or evidence that indicated little or no activity leading toward improvement
Yellow	Initiating	Represents areas to enhance and extend current improvement efforts
Green	Improving	Pinpoints quality practices that are improving and meet the Standards
Blue	Impacting	Demonstrates noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact the institution

Under each Standard statement is a row indicating the scores related to the elements of Cognia's i3 Rubric. The rubric is scored from one (1) to four (4). A score of four on any element indicates high performance, while a score of one or two indicates an element in need of improvement. The following table provides the key to the abbreviations of the elements of the i3 Rubric.

Element	Abbreviation
Engagement	EN
Implementation	IM
Results	RE
Sustainability	SU
Embeddedness	EM

## Leadership Capacity Domain

The capacity of leadership to ensure an institution's progress toward its stated objectives is an essential element of organizational effectiveness. An institution's leadership capacity includes the fidelity and commitment to its purpose and direction, the effectiveness of governance and leadership to enable the institution to realize its stated objectives, the ability to engage and involve stakeholders in meaningful and productive ways, and the capacity to implement strategies that improve learner and educator performance.

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The system commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	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:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	3
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3

## Learning Capacity Domain

The impact of teaching and learning on student achievement and success is the primary expectation of every institution. An effective learning culture is characterized by positive and productive teacher/learner relationships, high expectations and standards, a challenging and engaging curriculum, quality instruction and comprehensive support that enable all learners to be successful, and assessment practices (formative and summative) that monitor and measure learner progress and achievement. Moreover, a quality institution evaluates the impact of its learning culture, including all programs and support services, and adjusts accordingly.

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.1	Learners have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities established by the system.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	3
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4
2.4	The system has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers that support their educational experiences.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	4

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

## Resource Capacity Domain

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

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



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.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4

## Assurances

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

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

## Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

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

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

<b>Institution IEQ</b>	<b>355.97</b>	<b>CIN 5 Year IEQ Range</b>	<b>278.34 – 283.33</b>
------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

## Insights from the Review

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

The Engagement Review Team conducted Alabaster City Schools (ACS) review remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The following themes were identified by the team to support ACS with its continuous improvement efforts.

**Alabaster City Schools has established an empowering, leadership environment that is founded on trust, collaboration, relationships, and commitment.** Initially established as a school system in the summer of 2013, ACS has transformed a system of schools to a progressive school system. From interviews with the governing body members, the superintendent, professional staff, and parents, in addition to information from the superintendent's overview, it is evident that the ACS leadership has deeply embedded, trusting relationships. The board of education indicated that their trust and faith in the superintendent and the leadership team are strong and supportive. Also, the superintendent and leadership team noted that they felt secure in the direction, decision-making, and commitment of the board. The principals and teachers also alluded to the decisions and actions of the superintendent and leadership team as being a foundation for collaboration and camaraderie. From survey information and interviews, it was revealed that all ACS leaders work together to ensure that the voices of all stakeholders are heard, that everyone feels a part of decision-making, and that the universal commitment to students never wavers. One parent said, "Teachers and administration totally support all of our children." ACS is encouraged to continue to foster strong stakeholder relationships, transparency, and open communication which will give continual support for the system.

**The culture of the system and its schools was described by various stakeholder groups using words such as "family, welcoming, diverse, accepting, encouraging."** The collegial family atmosphere was not only heard in teacher, student, and parent interviews but also in survey analysis and communication. ACS personnel work diligently to ensure the needs of all children and families are met. The collaborative effort among the system leaders, school personnel, and community members are an integral part of meeting these students' needs. The system has ensured that not only are academic issues met, but also the social and emotional needs of all students are addressed. The team heard in numerous focus group interviews that the combined efforts of various departments to know, understand, and support students at different levels of need was pivotal in the students' pathway to success. In this new day in education with many students enrolled in the virtual learning and many opting systems offering the hybrid method of instruction, it is vitally important to keep all students and families engaged. Reviewing interviews and documentation, ACS personnel have dedicated time, effort, training, and communication to ensure the "family" environment prevails in the schools.

**ACS is encouraged to expand the virtual opportunities for rigorous instruction, high expectations and innovative digital integration opportunities for all students.** In the opening interview with superintendent, he voiced that he was challenged with ensuring “that all virtual students have rigorous, challenging and innovative instruction each day.” Principals, teachers, students, and parents echoed these remarks and challenges. Most students and parents interviewed explained that they all wanted to be back in “normal” school setting; but as the COVID-19 virus has spread, the effects of the virus have curtailed in-person instruction. From a review of documents and interviews with teachers, it is evident to the team that intense training for virtual learning, the securing of digital devices for all students and the focus remaining on student progress are areas being addressed by the ACS leadership at both system and school levels.

**The newly implemented five-year strategic plan (Plan) is a comprehensive, directional, and wide-ranging plan;** the system’s leadership is encouraged to continue monitoring of the comprehensive Plan’s goals, objectives, activities, and evaluative mechanisms. The Plan was developed with input from all stakeholder groups, guides the long-range planning process for the system, and supports the system’s mission and purpose. With input from all stakeholder groups, the voice of the system’s schools, the support of the governing body, and the use of Cognia Self Study process, the Plan was developed during the 2018 and early 2019 school years. The Plan’s five strategic objectives include student outcomes, stakeholder satisfaction, employee development, fiscal sustainability and supports systems. Overriding all objectives is the challenge of managing growth; managing the growth of each objective area will be pivotal to the success of ACS. As one stakeholder said of the Plan, “This Plan will guide our system for years to come.” When adopted by the governing body in October 2019, the implementation phase of the Plan began. As one stakeholder indicated “the Plan is an improvement plan, not an administrative plan.” With regular updates from the superintendent and leadership cabinet, and a comprehensive annual report to the governing body, communication regarding the progress, successes, challenges, and revisions to the Plan will be pivotal to the achievement of the goals and activities addressed in the Plan. The team is encouraged by the transparency and two-way communication efforts of the superintendent and system personnel. Not only did the system seek input from all stakeholders through surveys, committee assignments and in-person conversations but also the system is ensuring that the Plan is a working document that guides, inspires, and fulfills the mission of ACS.

**ACS is focused on ensuring that the structure for the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and professional development offerings serves as a catalyst for instructional initiatives, curriculum alignment and strong relationships with students.** The new initiatives for the schools are focused on instruction and students, are embedded into the classroom procedures, and are vertically aligned for intervention and support. From documentation and stakeholder interviews, the team noted that the Problem-Solving Team (PST) has evolved into the Warrior Support Team (WST). This WST program is a streamlined K-12 support system for struggling students. During the summer of 2020, the system offered elementary students identified as struggling readers the opportunity to attend the Summer Literacy Camp; in addition, also an English Language (EL) camp was offered free of charge to extend English language skill acquisition to students who needed this opportunity. Each of the schools of ASC has developed and implemented the Alabama Continuous Improvement Process (ACIP). School leadership teams, in addition to other stakeholder input from surveys and conversations, fully participated in the development, implementation and monitoring of these plans. The school PLCs with support from the ACS leadership team have taken the lead in implementing new initiatives, virtual trainings and ACIP development. Documentation and stakeholder interviews indicated that professional development offerings included WST training for reading coaches, administrators, and counselors; AIMSweb assessment training for all K-3 teachers; Orton-Gillingham multisensory phonics training for remedial reading instruction; and ongoing training for College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS), Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) and Alabama Math, Science, & Technology Initiative (AMSTI).

Developing, directing, implementing, and monitoring these, and many other, initiatives became opportunities and challenges for leadership and school PLCs. The leadership team and school personnel are encouraged to continue collecting and analyzing data, using data results for necessary changes in classroom instruction and communicating results to all stakeholder groups.

**Alabaster City Schools attracts and retains qualified personnel and provides induction and mentoring opportunities for first-year and early-career teachers.**

However, the system is encouraged to explore expanded opportunities for administrative leadership cadres and to attract employees who represent the diversity of the system. First-year and early-career employees participate in an induction, mentoring, and coaching program developed by the Alabama Teacher Mentor Program (ATMP); the ACS leaders have expanded and implemented this program in all areas of the system. First- and second-year teachers are provided mentors and meet on a scheduled basis with school- and system-level leaders. System leaders monitor the mentoring program and provide training for mentors and mentees. System and school-level leaders observe mentees through walkthroughs and via the Cognia Effective Learning Environments Observations Tool® (eleot®), and then provide evaluation and feedback data. Survey data and evaluation data are reviewed at the school, system, and state (ATMP) levels. ACS developed a plan for attracting and retaining new employees to the system. System- and school-level personnel collaborate to determine the potential units needed for schools to prioritize the areas of instructional need and to predict upcoming staffing needs. Central-office personnel attend college fairs, use website and social media to post openings, and continually assess student population changes that could result in additional staffing needs. From documentation and interviews, the team found that the system's hiring decisions are made by committee decision using a rubric for positions. To ensure all ACS employees know their commitment, work, and dedication to the students is valued, the governing body and superintendent provide instructional supplements to support all employee efforts. From documented evidence and stakeholder interviews, it was apparent that the system collects, analyzes, and uses data from multiple sources to inform decisions regarding practices and processes important to recruit and retain qualified staff. Data reports from recruitment suggest staff induction and recruitment efforts are successful. However, from interviews with the superintendent and other system leaders, ACS acknowledges the challenge of attracting, recruiting, and hiring employees who represent the diversity of the system. Expanding efforts to attract new employees are continually being reviewed, studied, and revised. In addition, the system has a professional, knowledgeable, and dedicated cadre of leaders. In focus group interviews, some leaders identified the need for expanded leadership opportunities for aspiring administrators. In interviews with system leaders, they too indicated the realization that with the growing student population, the need for more administrative staffing and the possibility of current administrators moving to other areas, a leadership cadre of aspiring administrators could help alleviate the shortage of qualified administrators. The system is encouraged to continue the path of hiring qualified staff, of mentoring and coaching new employees, of seeking employees who represent the diversity of the system and of exploring the opportunities for aspiring administrators.

The team's findings identified numerous strengths and reasons for celebrations. These celebrations can be attributed to the dedication of the governing body, the superintendent, the leadership team, administrators, and teachers who believe in the success of every student, a collaborative, unifying spirit to remain focused on students, supportive and encouraging parents and community, and a comprehensive Five-Year Strategic Plan, which will provide guidance and direction in the ensuing years. Next steps include fine-tuning some practices to excel even further. Using the tools and information provided in this report will enable Alabaster City Schools to continue the path of improvement and to maintain the respected standing it currently holds in the community and throughout the state.

## 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 comprise 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
<b>Donna Wear</b> <b>Lead Evaluator</b>	Donna Wear holds a Bachelor of Science, a Master of Arts and Rank I certification from Murray State University (KY). She began her career as a secondary English and social studies teacher followed by serving as a middle and high school assistant principal and principal. She actively led curriculum, instruction and assessment initiatives at the school level. Ms. Wear served as the principal/director of the Commonwealth Middle College. In this position, she was the supervisor and college counselor for dual-credit students from several school systems. Currently, Ms. Wear is a member of the Murray State University faculty. She teaches practicum courses and observes secondary education practicum students. She also supervises student teachers at Murray State. Ms. Wear serves as a Cognia field consultant, a lead evaluator and team member for school and system level Engagement Reviews and diagnostic reviews and a Cognia report reviewer.
<b>Garry Rickard</b> <b>Associate Lead Evaluator</b>	Garry Rickard is a retired educator serving 37 years in the Mountain Brook City Schools in Alabama. In that system, he served as a high school teacher, high school assistant principal, junior high principal and vocational director. After retirement in 2008, Mr. Rickard served as a college supervisor of student teachers. He earned his Bachelor of Science degree in social studies and a Master of Arts in education, and Educational Specialist in school administration. He has served as lead evaluator and/or team member on state, system, corporate, international and early learning AdvancED reviews throughout the United States and the world. He has served as a Cognia state council member and associate director for Alabama and is an Cognia field consultant.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Jamica Bolton</b>	<p>Jamica Bolton is currently employed as an educational consultant with Primm Consulting Associates. She retired from the Bessemer City School System (Alabama) in 2016 where she served as the district graduation coach and a social science teacher. Ms. Bolton's job responsibilities have included, but are not limited to, the development and coordination of curriculum plans, strategic planning, professional development training, identification of students at risk, worked with students to reduce/eliminate at-risk behaviors and develop a graduation plan, Dropout and Accountability reporting to the ALSDE and works to locate "no show" students during the school year and testing coordinator. She is a graduate of Tuskegee University, earned a master's from Grand Canyon University and a second masters in instructional leadership from Alabama A &amp; M University. She has served as a team member and/or associate lead evaluator on several Cognia Accreditation and Monitoring Reviews.</p>
<b>Erika Clark</b>	<p>Erika Clark holds a Bachelor of Science in language arts education from Tuskegee University, a Master of Science in education and an Educational Specialist degree from Jacksonville State University. She began her career as a secondary English teacher followed by a stint as a community college English instructor. She then continued her career as a high school assistant principal and elementary school principal. She actively led Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment initiatives at the secondary school level. She is credited with designing and implementing a student advisory program unique to the high school where she was assistant principal. Currently, Ms. Clark serves as principal of Kitty Stone Elementary School, grades 4-6. In this position, she supervises and coordinates curriculum and services with faculty, staff and families to enhance the middle stages of development in her student's lives as they collectively prepare all students for a successful life. She has served as a team member before.</p>
<b>Jasponica Florence</b>	<p>Jasponica Florence is a successful completer of Alabama State Department's Superintendents Academy and a graduate of the Aspiring Superintendent's Academy of the National Association of Black School Educators. She earned an educational specialist degree from Troy University. She earned a master's degree in biology education from Alabama State University. She has a bachelor's degree from Howard University and is a veteran of the U.S. Army Reserves. She served 10 years as a science teacher, lead teacher and department chairperson at Central High School. She served eight years as a high school principal at LaFayette High School, four years as the director of public relations and career and technical education for Russell County Schools in Phenix City, AL, where she implemented the system's first-ever virtual learning school. She recently retired as school effectiveness officer at Goshen High School for Pike County Board of Education.</p>



Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>David Scott</b>	Dr. Scott currently serves as the Director of Professional Learning for Tuscaloosa County Schools. He has also served as principal, assistant principal, and Director of Curriculum and Instruction. He has a Bachelor of Science degree in business administration with an emphasis in computer information systems and a Master of Arts in teaching mathematics. Dr. Scott also has an Education Specialist in educational administration and a Doctor of Education in Instructional leadership. Dr. Scott has served as a team member on several Cognia Accreditation Engagement Reviews.

## 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.

