



# City of Cape Coral Municipal Charter School System

---

Cape Coral, Florida

**November 8 - 11, 2021**

**Corporation Accreditation Engagement Review**

224465

## Table of Contents

<b>Cognia Continuous Improvement System .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Initiate.....	3
Improve .....	3
Impact .....	3
<b>Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Leadership Capacity Domain .....	5
Learning Capacity Domain.....	6
Resource Capacity Domain .....	7
<b>Assurances .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality® .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Insights from the Review .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Next Steps .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Team Roster .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>References and Readings .....</b>	<b>14</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 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 organization commits to a documented purpose that defines beliefs about learning, including expectations for the organization.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the organization's purpose.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
1.3	The organization engages in a continuous improvement process that leverages its performance and future success based on documented evidence.										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 organizational 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	The organization markets and promotes itself through processes that are transparent and reflect the organization's purpose.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.8	Organizational leaders demonstrate business acumen.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
1.9	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness and professional practice.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
1.10	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the organization's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.11	The organization provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3
1.12	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making for improvement.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
1.13	The organization implements a documented quality assurance process for its institutions to ensure organizational effectiveness and student learning.									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 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	The organization ensures learners have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning expectations.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
2.2	The organization develops and implements equitable, relevant, and targeted programs and/or services to meet the needs of its institutions.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4
2.3	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, relevancy and collaborative problem-solving.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
2.4	The organization's learning culture promotes the development of attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	3
2.5	The organization has a formal structure to ensure learners are supported during their educational experiences.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
2.6	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
2.7	The organization implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.									Impacting



Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.8	Educators implement instructional strategies that ensure learners' needs are met and that learners are engaged in deeper learning experiences.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	3	
2.9	Learning progress is reliably assessed, and results are used to update curriculum, program services, and instructional practices deployed to educators.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.10	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.11	The organization implements a process to continuously assess its programs, services, and organizational conditions to improve its overall effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	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 organization plans and delivers professional learning to improve the organization's learning environment and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
3.2	The organization's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.3	The organization provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	3	
3.4	The organization attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the organization's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.5	The organization integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating
3.6	The organization provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of learners, staff, and the organization.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
3.7	The organization demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the organization's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4
3.8	The organization allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the organization's identified needs and priorities to improve organizational effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	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	386.41	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.

The Oasis Charter Schools (OCS) Accreditation Engagement Team (team) noted the quality of "The Journey" that the system has accomplished and provides the following to suggest and encourage possibilities for the next steps along the way. The team was especially attentive to the phrase, "data-based, student driven" that describes the system's approach to meeting the needs of all students and how carefully processes and programs are aligned to these guiding words, resulting in the high performance of the system and its students.

**The system operates effectively under consistent and appropriate policies and procedures developed over time and according to needs, applied by seasoned, skilled professionals.** All board meetings, workshops, agendas, minutes, and board policies are posted on the district website in compliance with Florida's sunshine laws. OCS also works with Neola (formerly Northeast Ohio Learning Associates), a board policy development service that supports school boards in writing, implementing, revising, and maintaining board policies to keep them current with ever-changing state and federal policies. All employees have access to the system employee manual which discusses policies and expectations ranging from employee dress code to leave policies. Additionally, each school provides staff members with their own employee handbook with policies, procedures, and expectations. Policies and procedures can develop "as needed" with little guidance other than what professionals recognize as necessary at the moment. From the Executive Summary supplied for the engagement review, "Oasis Charter Schools also desire to focus on systemic development of standard operating procedures. Policy is updated regularly by the superintendent, but procedures are not specific to each policy. It is also our goal to further develop our Human Resources Department to capture a wider talent pool and revitalize our recruitment and retention practices." This was supported during administrative interviews. One principal stated that "it would be nice to have one system-wide manual for all standard operating policies so that when 'Situation X' happens, you know from the manual what to do." In the Executive Summary, it was recognized that "OCS should develop system-wide standard operating procedures (SOPs), as well as an annual evaluation, revision, and improvement process for these SOPs." The team suggests OCS

develop a systemic process to develop and apply consistency of procedures and practices across the system.

**The system maintains an outstanding culture that focuses on transparency and allows the schools to face challenges head-on.** Through interviews with leadership, teachers, staff, parents, and students, a consistent theme was identified regarding the commitment of stakeholders to the culture of transparency that is focused on the system's vision and purpose. The leadership team explained the formalized process of developing the system's strategic plan using multiple forms of data and analyzing perception data from surveys. Stakeholders are expected to engage through regular and consistent communication as evidenced by multiple surveys, presentations, partnerships with board and city, planning sessions, town hall meetings, and committees. Annual surveys are conducted to determine stakeholder perception and satisfaction within each school's instruction, environment, and support of its teachers and employees. These surveys are acted upon to drive intentional change. The Teacher Advisory Committee (TAC) provides for open communication to the superintendent. Each school has representation in the TAC and then takes the information back to their assigned schools. Stakeholders in the system were able to articulate strengths and opportunities for improvement related to the system's vision and mission. System personnel identified steps in plans of action for sustainability and improvement; the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) initiative came about after reviewing student achievement data, discussions with workforce leaders, and perception surveys. The K-12 initiative is reviewed two times per year and is open to multiple perspectives, including national leaders on STEM. The system implements procedures and processes that have become an embedded expectation of transparency as part of the culture with formalized processes that are regularly monitored. The team noted how effectively the culture of continuous improvement is driven by open communication, continuous information, engagement of stakeholders in virtually every aspect of systemic operations, and information from the collection and analysis of data so that transparency is a natural by-product of the everyday functions of the system. The team suggests that the system clearly identify and describe these structures and incorporate them into the SOP so transparency is guaranteed in the culture for continuous improvement.

**The commitment to "community" is a powerful force supporting creating and sustaining high levels of collaboration among all stakeholders to support student learning and systemic quality.** At every level, from the superintendent through the families, there is a pervasive sense of "community that engenders a common bond of trust, values, performance, and integrity." System leadership and employees described how all plans, activities, communications, and practices are designed to foster and sustain the qualities of caring and the building of relationships for the sake of the students. Leaders, staff, students, and families dedicate time to collaborate in groups on grade, department, and school-level plans and issues. Team meetings, professional learning communities (PLCs), and mentorships support student learning and continuous assessment and improvement. Teacher and staff evaluations are meant to create discussions and to coach employees to improve practices. The traditional Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) created a branch of the organization called the "Oasis Watch Dogs" made up of "dads of great students" to volunteer for practical as well as educational support throughout the school day. These activities are scheduled and guided for the parents in collaboration with teachers. The PTO is dedicated to raising funds and enhancing the morale of the teachers. Teachers and students described how students teach students, teachers mentor teachers, and leaders have regularly scheduled team meetings, PLCs, and principal meetings with the superintendent underscoring the cultural norms of community commitment and approach in the system. In interviews, teachers, parents, and students were able to elaborate on the results of stakeholder surveys in this area. When the required parent volunteer hours were suspended during the pandemic, parents continued to volunteer with social distancing ideas and once the campuses were opened again to parents. Documentation of programs across the system revealed intentional program implementation for struggling students and

accelerated students, K-12. With the collaborative family and community approach, the intentional plan includes all students at all grade levels in quality programming for their academic, career, social, and emotional needs. Related to the theme of standard operating procedures, the review team suggests OCS implement a careful record- and data-keeping process so that these valuable initiatives can be analyzed for effectiveness, strengthened, and not lost or forgotten if the person in charge moves away or is reassigned.

**The system is focused on data-based, student-driven decision-making, which supports quality assurance by maintaining focus on the individual student's needs.** On micro and macro data levels, the system leaders collect data, extrapolate the most meaningful information, and implement practices, interventions, and changes based on this information. The system provided documentation of these practices, and these were corroborated in interviews with educational leaders and teachers. The 2021-2024 strategic plan is based on student performance data from all four schools using the Florida State Assessment (FSA) for English language arts (ELA), math and science achievement, and school grades in elementary schools, civics, and middle school algebra achievement, and high school data. Advanced Placement (AP) exams and Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE) exam results, social studies achievement, and college and career acceleration results are collected, reviewed, and analyzed to continue programs and advocate for continued support or request additional funding and materials. Using these data, strategic planning sessions are held every three years. System-wide goals are identified and summarized; and timelines for achieving goals are established, including plans for attracting, hiring, and retaining teachers, digital technologies for classroom and administrative purposes, and professional development. These goals are reviewed annually and revised at future strategic planning sessions. Surveys are used throughout the system and the year providing additional sources of data and proof of the commitment to a data-based and student-driven approach. Annual surveys are conducted to determine stakeholder perception and satisfaction with OHS instruction, environment, and support of its teachers and employees. The parent/community questionnaire was administered in the spring of 2018 and fall of 2019. The analysis of the town hall meeting in 2018-2019 was included in documentation provided by the system. Parent perception surveys were conducted to determine satisfaction with virtual environment and device connectivity/issues. In the fall of 2020, schools opened with a face-to-face or virtual option. The system repeatedly surveyed families to determine technology and internet needs and capabilities as well as satisfaction with the online learning offerings and environments. Results of the system's surveys indicate support and commitment to the educational, academic, logistic, and social/emotional wellness of the student body. Revisions to the strategic plan have been based on the data from the above-mentioned surveys and data from the formative and summative student assessments at grade, school, and system levels. The team noted the embeddedness of all these processes but did not find a comprehensive, formal plan. This directed the team back to the SOP issue. One review team member made the observation, "It's very difficult to make it to the top (a top-performing system in the state), but it's even more difficult to stay there." The team discussed how the system must continually "fine-tune" all processes and procedures to continue to improve. These gains are achieved in very small, incremental increases over time. The processes then must be carefully described, maintained, systematically analyzed, and the results used in highly-informed, strategic decision-making. The team commends the system for having achieved this level and encourages the system to identify and sharpen the focus on key factors that will squeeze additional growth from already finely tuned practices and procedures, hence the SOP recommendation.

**The leadership structure of the system and its ability to involve all stakeholders guide the system's purpose and direction.** As evidenced in the interviews of stakeholders of the system, the current leadership has brought consistency and high expectations to the entire organization. The transparent and humble demeanor of the system leadership, teachers, and students supports the pervasive culture of working as a non-hierarchical team and the focus on student well-being and

achievement. In the 2017-2018 school year, there were many changes in leadership, including the superintendency and several principalships. Parents and the community sought stability and consistency in leadership. Since 2018, stakeholder surveys have provided strong evidence of improvement in teacher and parent perception and approval of the direction of the system and its schools. The system's purpose is clear and stated in measurable terms in the strategic plan, on system and school websites, and the team heard these in interviews with stakeholders. Each school is committed to the core values:

**Environment-** Oasis Charter Schools provide unique learning environments and a community atmosphere where accountability, integrity, and collaboration are valued, and diverse perspectives are encouraged to promote overall student success;

**Student Achievement-** A rigorous curriculum that is relevant to student's needs, and stimulates their natural curiosity, imagination, and critical thinking is evident. Oasis Charter Schools believes student achievement is the result of high staff expectations, quality lessons, challenging curricula and differentiation in teaching and learning; and

**Community Engagement-** By developing meaningful partnerships in the community, Oasis Charter Schools enriches both the students' socio-emotional well-being and academic life, which helps validate the reputation as a high performing school of choice.  
(From the system website)

Stakeholders described how the leadership of the system is not afraid to face a challenge head-on and take action to find a remedy while involving multiple stakeholders to develop comprehensive formal structures and plans to achieve goals. Stakeholders also commended the leadership for their efforts as role models, advocates for their system, and transparency in effecting the continuous improvement of every aspect of the system. The review team encourages the leadership to sustain effective leadership structures and processes that have become embedded in the systemic operations and drivers for the effective work of the leadership team and search for key factors in the processes and structures that will drive improvement.

In summary, OCS is commended for its consistent and appropriate policies, system culture, support for system community, data- and student-driven decision-making, and stakeholder involvement. By enhancing its standard operating procedures, as described in the themes above, OCS could strengthen its ability to sustain effective practices over time. Future school and system leaders could have the documentation they need to continue implementing proven effective practices.

## Next Steps

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

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

## Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography/ Title(Lead Evaluator Only)
<b>Jonathan Moore,</b> <b>Lead Evaluator</b>	Drew Moore began his teaching career as an elementary music teacher in Shreveport, Louisiana. In 1978, he moved to the university setting adding multiple subjects to his teaching repertoire and there began working in accreditation through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Professional experiences include public school education, media director at a residential high school for the gifted in math, science, and performing arts, instructor for the local university and university laboratory school administrator. Retired in 2008 after thirty-three years in public and higher education, he now chairs and serves as team member on Engagement Review teams at the school, system, distance learning, and corporate levels. He also serves on the Cognia Global Accreditation Commission and a Cognia Lead Evaluator Mentor. Degrees include Bachelor of Music Education, Master's in music, Specialist Degree in public school administration and Doctorate in education technologies from Northwestern State University in Louisiana.
<b>Phil Metcalf</b>	Associate Lead Evaluator, Cognia Mentor
<b>Shanna Flecha</b>	Executive Director
<b>Miriam Rube</b>	Head of School



## 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](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.

