Catoosa County School System

Ringgold, Georgia

cognia

Table of Contents

cognia™

Cognia Continuous Improvement System

Cognia defines continuous improvement as "an embedded behavior rooted in an institution's culture that constantly focuses on conditions, processes, and practices to improve teaching and learning." The Cognia Continuous Improvement System (CIS) provides a systemic, fully integrated solution to help institutions map out and navigate a successful improvement journey. In the same manner that educators are expected to understand the unique needs of every learner and tailor the education experience to drive student success, every institution must be empowered to map out and embrace their unique improvement journey. Cognia expects institutions to use the results and the analysis of data from various interwoven components for the implementation of improvement actions to drive education quality and improved student outcomes. While each improvement journey is unique, the journey is driven by key actions. The findings of the Engagement Review Team are organized by the ratings from the Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic and the Levels of Impact within the i3 Rubric: Initiate, Improve, and Impact.

Initiate

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

Improve

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

Impact

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

cognia™

Cognia 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:**	3	**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:**	2	**EM:**	4	
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:**	4	**EM:**	4	
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:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	4	**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.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Initiating
	EN:	3	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	1	**EM:**	2	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
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:**	4	**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.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	4	
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	4	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**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.									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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**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:**	4	**SU:**	4	**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:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**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	
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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	

Resource Capacity Standards		Rating
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: 3 **IM:** 4 **RE:** 4 **SU:** 4 **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.

Institution IEQ	347.74	**CIN 5 Year IEQ Range**	278.34 – 283.33

Insights from the Review

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

Several themes emerged as a result of the Remote Engagement Review at Catoosa County Public Schools (CCPS) including a focus on meeting the needs of all students, collaboration among all staff, documenting decisions made using data, curriculum, and staffing. These themes are offered to strengthen and complement the improvement journey of the system.

CCPS has developed a clear focus on meeting the needs of all students in a decentralized system. CCPS shared documentation of and discussed in the overview presentation and in focus group presentations, its transition in 2016 to become a Georgia Charter System. The work of the school community in this effort has led to a deep commitment to the system's mission, vision, and values which focus on meeting the needs of all students at all levels.

The organization is trusted, meeting stakeholder needs and making a difference in participants' lives. The CCPS mission guides all activities, curriculum, instruction, procedures, and policies. As part of its application to become a Georgia Charter System, the system adopted mission, vision, and belief statements as its purpose documents. CCPS conducted a development process and regularly reviews these documents. The mission, which is "Catoosa County Public Schools is a student-focused learning community, where excellence is expected from staff and students, every day, without exception," drives the system in all endeavors. Commitment to the mission was echoed during focus groups, including teachers, parents, and students throughout the review.

CCPS has made substantial changes in its organizational and institutional culture and has grown through these changes. The shift to becoming a Georgia Charter System, with governance at the school building level and leadership at the system level, has resulted in a system that knows its stakeholders well and has grown a culture that is truly committed to its purpose. Many of the leaders and staff interviewed expressed that they have received focused training and support as they have taken on new roles in the organization. Leadership development training has enabled staff to grow and take on new responsibilities. A strong system of recruitment and retention encourages professional staff to stay at CCPS.

The Georgia Charter System structure has enabled CCPS to become a system that leads transparently at the district level, and that has ownership and commitment at the school building level. School board members reported in focus group interviews that they have a clear understanding of their role and the role of the system superintendent. The Board receives training and support from the state school board association. The Board's regular review of system policies and posting of agendas, minutes, and policies shows the transparent nature of the system-level leadership. The building level Governance Coalitions have authority and ownership including decision-making power on the school budget and input in

staffing decisions. The balance between system and building leadership is in place with all actors on the same page with regard to the focus on all students.

The development and implementation of the College and Career Academy is an example of the system meeting the needs of all students. CCPS shared its plans and progress in the implementation of this initiative. During focus group interviews, the board, community partners, systems and building-level leaders, teachers, and students all shared their enthusiasm for the College and Career Academy. The focus on specific pathways is driven by business partnership, system capacity, and student interest. This work is clearly in line with the system's mission and purpose.

The system has grown into an organization that is truly student-focused. During focus group interviews, all stakeholders shared the strength of family engagement. Communication between school and home is regular. Parents reported that they receive newsletters and messages regularly. Outreach and community partnerships provide numerous opportunities for curriculum enhancement and for work-based learning. During focus group interviews and in documents shared to support the review, it became clear to the Engagement Review Team that students have opportunities to develop relationships with their peers and with adults.

The system has developed strong programs of academic intervention to act on its commitment to the success of all students. CCPS shared documents that demonstrate the regular assessment of student learning, analysis of the achievement data, and placement of students in academic environments where help is provided for students that need it. Staff shared, in focus group discussions, their protocols for data analysis and decision making. Intervention is strong at all levels, including the high school.

The mission drives stakeholder support. Stakeholders take actions that align with the school's mission. Stakeholders choose to come to the school because of the mission. It was evident in the school's documentation and in stakeholder interviews that CCPS is truly a mission-centered community. Staff, leaders, parents, teachers, and students all provided words that describe the value promise "Every child, every day, without exception!" and mission when they spoke in focus group interviews when asked to describe CCPS. When asked for words that describe the organization, stakeholders reported descriptors such as all, caring, supportive and collaborative, which echo the value promise and mission statement. Documents such as agendas and minutes show that school leaders work to offer instruction that provides students with opportunities to carry out the mission. The mission is carried out with quality and fidelity.

The documents shared with the Engagement Review Team show that CCPS has developed a clear system of documenting the analysis of student achievement data in terms of academic intervention. System leaders document data analysis at the system and building levels in presentations. CCPS leaders and staff are reminded to consistently document the actions that they take based on the data so that they can evaluate effectiveness as those actions are implemented.

CCPS has developed a culture of collaboration in which staff are working together toward the same goal. The Professional Learning Community (PLCs) model is pervasive across the Catoosa County Public Schools culture at both the system and building levels. During the Overview presentation, the system superintendent shared the history of PLCs in Catoosa and the deep commitment that the system has made to organizing communication and collaboration through PLCs. The system shared several PLC documents including agendas and schedules. PLC training has been strong and continues for new staff, as they enter into the system. During focus group interviews with teachers at the building level, they shared that everyone has a role and knows what their role is for the PLCs in which they participate.

Training through Solution Tree in the PLC model has resulted in staff across the district, at every level, that truly believe in the process. The PLC documents shared and the comments during focus group interviews show that the system has organized PLCs for every purpose and that the PLC structure is truly collaborative among teachers and between teachers and administrators. The CCPS superintendent commented during an interview that "our administrator meetings became PLCs." Everyone knows where PLC documents are kept and their roles in maintaining the documents. The expectations for all participants are clear. The structure and tools to succeed are provided. PLCs result in strong ownership at the classroom, building, and systems levels.

The documents shared with the Engagement Review Team show that CCPS has developed a consistent system of documenting PLC meetings in many areas including data analysis, curriculum, and intervention. PLCs are in place for each grade level and content area. Communication among PLCs is expected. CCPS leaders and staff are reminded to consistently document the actions that PLCs take so that they can evaluate the effectiveness as those actions are implemented.

CCPS is becoming a data-driven organization that collects many forms of data on a regular basis. During interviews with school leaders and staff and in the review of documentation and evidence, it became clear to the Cognia Engagement Review Team that data are regularly collected through periodic academic assessments, and through stakeholder surveys. The major sources of summative academic achievement data are the NWEA MAP assessment, Georgia state assessments, and system-developed formative and summative assessments administered at the end of each course. Stakeholder feedback data come from the administration of surveys. Parents and students know how to access data about student learning. Leaders are aware of the data collected and where the data are housed.

CCPS has the opportunity to document how these data are used and acted on in PLCs in making decisions to inform the improvement process. CCPS gathers many forms of data and would benefit if staff document, on an ongoing basis, not only what the data are telling them, but also the decisions that they make based on the data.

A strength of CCPS is the teacher observation protocol, where it has the opportunity to collect, analyze, and use the data for continuous improvement efforts. The system is encouraged to continue to use student achievement data, stakeholder survey data, and observation data as part of the assessment of needs for professional learning and as part of the process to review and refine the goals that form the basis of the improvement process.

During a focus group interview, staff discussed the new data rooms that will provide opportunities for data exchange to facilitate targeting interventions for students in need. Staff described periodic data analyses that are used to drive these academic interventions. The data rooms will be useful tools to allow staff to focus their efforts. In addition, the use of student data notebooks was mentioned in reviewed documents and during focus group interviews. The system is encouraged to use the student data notebooks to help students develop skills and expectations for monitoring their own learning progress.

One area where CCPS may find value in strengthening its data collection is in following students after graduation and into college and careers. The system shared older exit survey data. Getting feedback from students after graduation will give the system perspective on its investment in the College and Career Academy.

The system could better document how it uses its data to measure outcomes and evaluate the effectiveness of programs and initiatives. The system might initiate a process of reflective evaluation of the effectiveness of these efforts in terms of student achievement and stakeholder satisfaction.

Documenting the analysis of data and the evaluation of programs and initiatives will help the organization to focus its efforts.

The curriculum at CCPS is adjusted based on a revision of standards data collected to identify achievement gaps. In documentation provided and during focus group interviews, CCPS staff shared the ongoing process in which the curriculum is regularly reviewed and adapted to make sure that student needs are met. Achievement data are regularly used at every level and in every content area to monitor student learning, identify curriculum gaps, and adjust the curriculum to address those gaps. This work is ongoing through PLCs embedded across the system and is guided by content specialists and leadership at each grade band. PLCs work at all grade levels and in all content areas to develop units and lesson plans that are aligned to standards. In addition, staff have the opportunity to adjust and adapt instruction based on the analysis of both formative and summative achievement data. The system has a strong set of structures in place to monitor and adjust the curriculum. These structures build ownership of the curriculum at both the systems and building levels.

CCPS provides school buildings wide latitude in making choices regarding instructional programs, resources, and materials. Teachers, academic coaches, and leaders shared, during focus group interviews, how they use these resources to support student learning. The system is encouraged to pay attention to evidence of programs that work, evaluate the effectiveness of resources, and document the actions and decisions that it makes in terms of these resources.

CCPS has a very strong system of intervention, making sure that students get needed help. The system is reminded that focus is needed on both the interventions and the regular instructional program (Tier 1) provided for all students. The effectiveness of the instructional program provides a solid foundation for the system.

In the documentation provided to support the review, CCPS shared many samples of work done in student projects across many grade levels and content areas. Students shared during focus group interviews that they enjoy working on projects and that group work gives them opportunities to learn in different ways. Clubs and extracurricular activities are available to interested students. The team notes that it found limited use of interdisciplinary and cross-curricular perspectives in the projects and activities reviewed. The system is encouraged to think about creativity, innovation, and group collaboration, which are part of the 21st-century skills that are needed by all students. It is important that the system provide all students a chance to engage in opportunities to develop these skills.

CCPS recruits staff, provides professional development, develops leaders at all levels, and conducts evaluation and feedback to support an effective workforce. The system shared its efforts to monitor staffing needs, provide orientation and induction for new staff, provide professional development and training based on identified needs, and systematically provide support to develop leadership skills for interested staff. In the documents and evidence provided to support the review, CCPS provided staffing needs documents developed in several of the system's school buildings. It is clear that there is a regular annual process to identify staffing needs and build the budget to make sure that staffing needs are met.

CCPS uses student achievement data, classroom observation data, and teacher-identified needs to develop its needs assessment for training and professional development. Professional Development is provided through system-wide sessions, opportunities to meet building identified needs, instructional fairs sharing best practices among instructional staff, and support for individual teacher participation in conferences and training. The system gathers data through session evaluation and through the classroom observation process.

The system has adopted a comprehensive program of leadership development that supports aspiring leaders at all levels. The CCPS board participates in training that sets the tone at the top of the organization. Students have leadership opportunities in various clubs and organizations, in athletics, and in student council where they have formal roles. Teaching staff all have specific roles in the numerous PLCs across the district. Building level governance coalitions provide leadership roles for parents and community members. The fact that there are 19 graduates of the Aspiring Leader Academy who currently serve as administrators in CCPS shows that the system is cultivating and nurturing leadership skills. The system is currently in a deliberate and specific process of planned succession for several positions. This transition process is providing consultation and handoff as staff assume new roles and responsibilities.

CCPS tracks staff retention data and has identified a specific issue with retention for a specific group of employees. During a focus group interview, staff described the data analysis that led to the recognition of the issue, the research that was done, and the plan that the system has developed to address the issue. CCPS is encouraged to carry out this plan and to monitor the impact over time.

As new teaching staff come into the system, a program of onboarding, induction, mentoring, and coaching is provided. The system shared session agendas, and logs of session attendance. During focus group interviews, several staff were able to describe their experiences as new staff and the support that they received. The system is reminded to monitor the induction and mentoring process to ensure it continues to work at a high level.

To summarize, there are many sustained initiatives and programs in place at Catoosa County Public Schools. The whole team, including the board, leaders, staff, students, and parents, is committed to the success of all students, staff, and community. Communication and support were also observed to be evident among all stakeholders in the district. While there are many successes, there are several ongoing opportunities for improvement that can be undertaken by collective effort. This work will take the system to even higher levels of performance and student outcomes.

Next Steps

Upon receiving the Accreditation Engagement Review Report, the institution is encouraged to implement the following steps:

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.
- Develop plans to address the areas for improvement identified by the Engagement Review Team.
- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.
- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.
- Continue the improvement journey.

Team Roster

The Engagement Review Teams are comprised of professionals with varied backgrounds and expertise. To provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes, all Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members are required to complete Cognia training. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography (Lead Evaluator Only)
Paul Bielawski, Lead Evaluator	Paul Bielawski is a field consultant and Lead Evaluator with Cognia, working with schools, school systems, and corporations on accreditation and school improvement. He has degrees from Albion College and the University of Michigan with advanced training in the areas of curriculum, foundations, history of education, international and comparative education, sociology of education, evaluation, and educational policy. Paul retired following a career of 37 years with the State of Michigan in leadership positions in grants, technology, curriculum, school improvement, assessment, policy, accountability, and data collection and reporting. In his State role, he spent many years engaged in the work of Cognia in Michigan. In his consulting role, he focuses on policy and data analysis related to school improvement.
April Aldridge, Instructional Specialist, Georgia Department of Education	
LaTonya Cratic, Curriculum Director, Miller County Schools	
Melinda Fonteboa, Principal, Ellijay Elementary School, Gilmer County Schools	
Allison Rodriguez, Assistant Principal, Chattahoochee County Middle/High School	
Mana Smith, Principal, Calhoun Primary School, Calhoun City Schools	

References and Readings

AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/continuous-improvement-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 https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/what-continuously-improving-system-looks/.

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 https://source.cognia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/CISWhitePaper.pdf.

Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/savvy-school-change-leader/.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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