Christ the King Elementary School

Omaha, Nebraska

cognia™

Table of Contents

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 (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 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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.3	The institution 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:**	4	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional 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:**	3	**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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**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:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	

Learning Capacity Domain

The impact of teaching and learning on student achievement and success is the primary expectation of every institution. An effective learning culture is characterized by positive and productive teacher/learner

cognia™

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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
2.4	The institution has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers who support their educational experiences.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	3	
2.6	The institution implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the institution's learning expectations.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	

2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:** 4	
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 institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:** 3	

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 institution plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the institution's effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 3	
3.2	The institution'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:** 3	
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.									Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 3	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 3	
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 2	
3.6	The institution provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the institution.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	4	**EM:** 4	

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

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.

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. 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 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 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.

Institution IEQ	363.00	**AIN 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, 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 the 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 strong themes across various domains and Cognia Performance Standards within the Impact category: Christ the King Catholic School's (CTK) strong sense of purpose and mission through common goals and core values, a well-developed, goal-oriented, and data-driven action plan with allocated human and financial resources, and the monitoring and adjusting instruction based on students' individual needs. The entire community was committed to and actively engaged in the education of students. Additionally, two areas were found within the Improve category: the school had not fully leveraged the capabilities of its current level of available technology, the induction, mentoring, and coaching program was not formally implemented.

CTK was a mission-guided institution whose stakeholders shared a strong sense of purpose and mission through common goals and core values. The institution was guided by the mission statement, and the goals and core values were ingrained in the culture and operations of the school. The evidence indicated a high degree of embeddedness among all stakeholder groups and the school community at large (alumni and donors). A review of the mission documents, the school website, the principal's report, and focus group interviews validated this finding. The theme of being mission guided was easily apparent. Each stakeholder group shared similar insights about the mission and how the school communicated, shared, and lived these ideals. Teachers and students verified the expectations for teaching and learning and were offered solid support from the administration, parents, and governing boards. Every decision was made through the lens of the school's mission and guiding tenets.

Mission documents, such as the handbooks for each stakeholder group, offered a specific roadmap for achieving the goals set forth by the institution. During the interview process, the team discerned a high level of engagement and dedication from each respondent about the institution's culture. These responses included statements such as, "We are a close-knit community." A student volunteered "My favorite thing is the sense of community and that everyone accepts new people. These statements not only mirrored the mission of the institution; they also corroborated the qualitative evidence from the eleot report supplied by the school in the Equitable Learning Environment and the Supportive Learning Environment. Students reported they were supported and had opportunities to grow and learn in an atmosphere very clearly aligned with the mission and vision. The Engagement Review Team recommends that the school continue to offer programs such as the Student Organizational Support program, the Passion Project, and the Kindness Program. Further, it might be useful for marketing purposes to tout the "Student-centric culture" as a deeply ingrained and protected trait. The team recognized the high level of embeddedness found across stakeholder groups about the mission and purpose of the school and commended its efforts.

The school had a well-developed, goal-oriented, and data-driven action plan and allocated human and financial resources based on identified needs. The faculty and administration were committed to continuous improvement that yields high levels of engagement regarding the mission and leads to student success academically and personally. These concepts were evident among all stakeholder groups. Most groups used the established data analysis process, the written expectations, and a cyclical review of initiatives and programs to monitor progress and adjust accordingly. The school team used alumni interviews, annual stakeholder surveys, program evaluations, and data analysis to ensure organizational effectiveness, especially in the academic areas. During the interview process, teachers shared that they met monthly in their professional conversation team (PCT) to craft goals based on observations and data in core subject areas. The team observed analyses of multiple data streams in both math and language arts over several years. The school also used Sycamore as a multi-purposed, web-based platform to communicate across stakeholder groups and track student progress. Teachers and administrators used data binders to pass along results on individual students. Teachers often met in teams to monitor students who may need more intensive intervention or support. The school effectively used support personnel to ensure that students develop positive relationships with adults and peers.

Additionally, the evidence sources (e.g., focus group interviews, institution provided documents, team observations) indicated that most stakeholders were involved in actions that cultivate the atmosphere of self-responsibility, leading to preparation for the next level. Parent responses were like students on how they felt about the school and the purpose of the school. One respondent noted, "I know my kids are going to do great long term and be men and women for others." The evidence from the school-provided eleot report also showed a strong sense of respect between and among classmates, teachers, and administration. A dual sense of community and cohesion had emerged from the active engagement of stakeholders and programs and curriculum that addressed the social, emotional, spiritual, and academic needs of students.

The Engagement Review Team recommends the school and leadership continue to encourage stakeholders to participate in activities and opportunities reflective of the existing high standards. The team also suggests the school continue to encourage students and parents to offer feedback and suggestions through surveys, exit interviews, and parent committees for the purpose of evaluating programs and developing goals designed to meet the needs of students and families.

The school monitored and adjusted instruction based on students' individual needs by using assessments, observations, and stakeholder feedback to provide a well-rounded quality Catholic education. The team found strong evidence of a multi-layered process to strengthen school effectiveness and mission fidelity. Sources included the goal-based action plan, the Steering Board meetings' minutes, interview data, and the annual report presented to board members and parents.

First, the team concluded the school and most stakeholders were actively involved and dedicated to providing a quality, student-centered education that furthers the school's mission. The structure of boards, committees, and teams provided multiple leadership perspectives to use for continuous improvement initiatives and strategies. The committees and boards include a variety of groups (e.g., Parent Club Steering Board, Educational Trust, Visioning Board, Teacher Advisory Team, Professional Conversation Teams, Student Organizational Support, House Captains, Student Council). The work of these groups provided the team with evidence of input from leadership, parents, staff, and students that contributed to the decision-making and implementation of new programs and initiatives.

Second, the administration, boards, and committees enjoyed a high level of trust and mutually supportive relationships. The principal and board members commented on the degree to which all

stakeholders had a deep affection for the school. Evidence gathered through interviews, meeting minutes, and a review of the annual report was indicative of a culture that generously shared financial resources to support student learning. This means they participated because there was such a firm belief in sustaining and protecting the culture and what the school offered to students. The team recommends that the community celebrate the unity between internal and external groups.

While many areas fell within the category of "Impact," there were three areas solidly in the "Improve" category. The first two included staff supervision and evaluation, which also encompassed mentoring. The third area involved providing a learning environment that fully leveraged available technology resources. All three areas emerged as opportunities to improve through building more formal and deliberate practices.

The school's mentoring, coaching, and induction/retention program had not been fully realized.

The team found that the structure of the staff included a multi-level hierarchy. Both the principal and assistant principal were responsible for monitoring teaching and learning, but the department chairs did most of the direct supervision. During the focus group process, the teacher participants mentioned opportunities for regularly-scheduled meetings with department chairs, and some opportunities to meet as a whole staff or face-to-face with the administrators. Many suggested that leaders were accessible, appreciated ideas from the bottom up, and that feedback was welcomed. In addition to anecdotal evidence, there was corroboration through interviews with leadership that some analysis of results of the supervision process was conducted departmentally, but there was less of an emphasis on the whole staff. There was also heavy dependence on informal meetings or comments made in passing, such as a brief meeting in the hall that begins with "How are things going?" or updates through emails about calendar/event communications.

Little evidence of formal mentoring beyond an onboarding class for indoctrination into the Christ the King culture existed. The induction program was viewed as a positive step; however, the team suggests a more formal process be created to monitor and analyze how teachers improve and fine-tune professional practices, specifically with regard to meeting the needs of all learners. This would especially pertain to teachers who are new to the institution or those who teach the new curriculum. While the team acknowledged that many teachers and staff had been at the school for an extended period, formal activities may allow the leadership to evaluate the need for individualized professional development and target areas for improving pedagogy. The team also suggests tracking turnover and retention rates to analyze how the school can move from improving to the embeddedness of a formal mentoring program, thereby impacting student learning and program effectiveness while retaining high-quality personnel.

The school had not yet fully leveraged the capabilities of the current level of technology available to students, teachers, and staff. The school's eleot report corroborated this observation and indicated that learners infrequently used their digital tools to collaborate and create original works across the curriculum. The digital environment was in the early stages in some curricular domains, and the school leadership had begun to give digital learning more attention. The school had spent considerable time and effort in developing a remote learning plan and training teachers to use devices effectively for teaching in a remote environment, specifically in response to the current pandemic. Additionally, financial resources were expended to give teachers the digital tools to present curriculum to learners during in-person learning, as well as to those students who have remained at home for learning. As an example of the recent development in this area, feedback from parents and the Teacher Advisory Team was considered on how to deliver lessons digitally when the school was creating the return-to-school plan for the current year. The administration acknowledged that the

method initially selected for remote instruction was difficult to manage, and a different platform was universally adopted. The evidence indicated that the school improved but had not reached its potential level of impact.

The institution is encouraged to continue to expand the use of digital collaboration among students and teachers. The team also recommends expanding course offerings that include opportunities for self-guided learning in collaborative teams and to create projects with real-world applications that would dovetail with institutional goals. The team commends the school for taking the initiative to address the needs of learners in grades five through eight, specifically through the Passion Project. It is also suggested that future professional development activities include time for teachers to discuss and share ideas that incorporate collaborative elements and differentiated instruction using digital devices across all grade levels.

To conclude, Christ the King Catholic School should be commended for the successful way stakeholders are mission-focused. This focus led to actions that consistently improved student learning, created a sense of community, and led to innovative programs that address the needs of students by educating the whole person. The school community worked together to ensure that the institutional goals were the foundation for all aspects of school life, while simultaneously maintaining high academic standards and appreciating the rich traditions of a Catholic school education. Decisions regarding human and financial resources, long-range academic planning, and mission fidelity also made CTK a highly effective educational community. The team recommends that the institution continue applying that same type of focused process to all other initiatives. Further, CTK and all stakeholders should celebrate the success and longevity of their school community and continue the current path for continuous improvement.

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 eleot 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
Trish Wallinger, Lead Evaluator	Trish Wallinger is currently the principal of St. Mary's Catholic School in Bellevue, Nebraska. She has over 30 years of experience in education. Her commitment to quality education through Cognia accreditation began in 1990, serving as chair of her school improvement team. She has since served as a team member on several engagement review teams at both the K-6 and secondary levels. Dr. Wallinger received her master's degree in administration from the University of Nebraska at Omaha and her doctorate in educational leadership from the College of Saint Mary in Omaha, Nebraska. She authored her doctoral dissertation on "The Use of Twitter for Professional Development." She has presented at the National Catholic Education Association Summer Leadership Conference on the topic of Catholic identity. Her professional experience includes teaching at the K-12 level, in public and private institutions, and administration of a K-8 Catholic school.
Janet Hurt, Associate Lead Evaluator	Dr. Janet Hurt currently serves as the director for Volunteer Services at Cognia. Her previous roles include teacher, guidance counselor, assistant principal, principal, associate superintendent, interim superintendent, associate executive director for a large education cooperative, and project director for the largest Race to the Top grant in the USA. Dr. Hurt has worked in school and district turnaround. She, for example, led a low performing school to become a National Blue-Ribbon School of Excellence and a district from low to high performing. Dr. Hurt has authored several peer-reviewed articles and a book. She has won several awards, including the Kentucky Professional Development and the Friend of Education awards. Finally, she has been an invited speaker and presenter in a variety of places across the country and in Europe and Asia.
Barbara Marchese	Dr. Barbara Marchese has been a principal in the Omaha Archdiocese for 30 years. She was principal at St. Philip Neri for 14 years and is currently the principal at St. Vincent de Paul School. Prior to that, she taught first grade. She holds a doctorate in educational administration and has taught at the university level. She has been a member of several accreditation teams, principal and superintendent search committees, and a mentor to principals in the archdiocese. Currently, she is spearheading a mentoring program for new principals in the Omaha Archdiocese and is mentoring three principals this year.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Debbie Hall	Mrs. Debra Hall has been a second-grade teacher in the Louisville Public Schools for 21 years and a member of her districts' Cognia team for five years. This was the first year the school was accredited. Prior to this, Debra was on her school's continuous improvement team. This team updated the district's mission and vision, organized data, and were the leaders for the accreditation preparation. She earned a master's degree in reading with an English language art (ELA) endorsement and a math specialist certificate. Debra has experience writing Star standards, which have progressed to the state developed and approved standards. Debra takes every opportunity to further her teaching. She is a lifetime learner who enjoys sharing all new and effective education methods.

References and Readings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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