



# Moscow School District

---

Moscow, Idaho

**February 23-26, 2020**

**System Accreditation Engagement Review**

228355

## Table of Contents

<b>Cognia Continuous Improvement System .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Initiate .....	2
Improve .....	2
Impact.....	2
<b>Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Leadership Capacity Domain .....	3
Learning Capacity Domain.....	5
Resource Capacity Domain.....	6
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® Results .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Assurances .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Insights from the Review.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Next Steps .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Team Roster .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>References and Readings .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## Cognia Continuous Improvement System

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

The findings of the Engagement Review Team will be organized by the Levels of Impact within i3: Initiate, Improve, and Impact. The organization of the findings is based upon the ratings from the Standards Diagnostic and the i3 Levels of Impact.

### Initiate

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

### Improve

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

### Impact

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

## Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal to leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the accreditation process examines the whole institution—the program, the cultural context and the community of stakeholders—to determine how well the parts work together to meet the needs of learners. Through the Cognia Accreditation Process, highly skilled and



trained Engagement Review Teams gather first-hand evidence and information pertinent to evaluating an institution's performance against the research-based Cognia Performance Standards. Using these Standards, Engagement Review Teams assess the quality of learning environments to gain valuable insights and target improvements in teaching and learning. Cognia provides Standards that are tailored for all education providers so that the benefits of accreditation are universal across the education community.

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

## Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

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

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

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

### Leadership Capacity Domain

The capacity of leadership to ensure an institution's progress toward its stated objectives is an essential element of organizational effectiveness. An institution's leadership capacity includes the fidelity and commitment to its purpose and direction; the effectiveness of governance and leadership to enable the institution to realize its stated objectives; the ability to engage and involve stakeholders in meaningful and



productive ways; and the capacity to implement strategies that improve learner and educator performance.

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The system commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning including the expectations for learners.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
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:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	2	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	2	EM:	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	1	RE:	1	SU:	3	EM:	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	2	EM:	
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for its institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	

## Learning Capacity Domain

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

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.1	Learners have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities established by the system.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs and skills needed for success.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.4	The system has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers that support their educational experiences.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Improving

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating	
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	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.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.										Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	2	EM:	2	
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.										Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	2	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4	
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	4	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.										Initiating

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating	
	EN:	1	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	1	
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.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	

## Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® Results

The Cognia eProve™ Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) is a learner-centric classroom observation tool that comprises 28 items organized in seven environments aligned with the Cognia Standards. Classroom observations are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes. Trained and certified observers take into account the level of embeddedness, quality, and complexity of application or implementation; number of students engaged and frequency of application. Results from the eleot are reported on a scale of one to four based on the students' engagement in and reaction to the learning environment. In addition to the results from the review, the average results from all reviews for the previous year are reported to benchmark your results against. The eleot provides useful, relevant, structured, and quantifiable data on the extent to which students are engaged in activities and/or demonstrate knowledge, attitudes, and/or dispositions that are conducive to effective learning.

The insights eleot data provide an invaluable source of information for continuous improvement planning efforts. Although averages by eleot Learning Environment are helpful to gauge quality at a higher, more impressionistic level, the average rating for each item is more fine-grained, specific and actionable. Institutions should identify the five to seven items with the lowest ratings and examine patterns in those ratings within and across environments to identify areas for improvement. Similarly, identifying the five to seven items with the highest ratings also will assist in identifying strengths within and across eleot Learning Environments. Examining the eleot data in conjunction with other institution data will provide valuable feedback on areas of strength or improvement in institution's learning environments.

eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot Observations:		61
Environments	Rating	2018-19 Averages
<b>Equitable Learning Environment</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.82</b>
Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs	2.75	2.34
Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support	3.54	3.30
Learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner	3.51	3.45
Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions and dispositions	2.03	2.18
<b>High Expectations Environment</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.71</b>





<b>eleot® Observations</b>		
<b>Total Number of eleot Observations:</b>	<b>61</b>	
<b>Environments</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>2018-19 Averages</b>
Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher	2.87	2.74
Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable	3.08	2.95
Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work	2.33	2.43
Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing)	2.98	2.67
Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning	2.74	2.78
<b>Supportive Learning Environment</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.15</b>
Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful	2.98	3.07
Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback)	2.80	2.97
Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks	3.52	3.24
Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher	3.57	3.34
<b>Active Learning Environment</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.71</b>
Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate	2.89	2.77
Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences	2.59	2.41
Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities	3.18	3.12
Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments	2.18	2.45
<b>Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.63</b>
Learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored	2.61	2.43
Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work	3.07	2.93
Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content	3.25	2.90
Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed	2.26	2.25
<b>Well-Managed Learning Environment</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.20</b>
Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other	3.39	3.42
Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others	3.38	3.35
Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another	2.36	2.89



<b>eleot® Observations</b>		
<b>Total Number of eleot Observations:</b>		<b>61</b>
<b>Environments</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>2018-19 Averages</b>
Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions	3.20	3.15
<b>Digital Learning Environment</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>1.79</b>
Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning	1.67	1.97
Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning	1.51	1.79
Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning	1.20	1.61

## Assurances

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

<b>Assurances Met</b>		
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>If No, List Unmet Assurances By Number Below</b>
<b>X</b>		

## Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

Cognia will review the results of the Accreditation Engagement Review to make a final determination concerning accreditation status, including the appropriate next steps for your institution in response to these findings. Cognia provides the Index of Education Quality (IEQ) as a holistic measure of overall performance based on a comprehensive set of standards and review criteria. A formative tool for improvement, it identifies areas of success as well as areas in need of focus. The IEQ is comprised of the Standards Diagnostic ratings from the three Domains: 1) Leadership Capacity; 2) Learning Capacity; and 3) Resource Capacity. The IEQ results are reported on a scale of 100 to 400 and provides information about how the institution is performing compared to expected criteria. Institutions should review the IEQ in relation to the Findings from the review in the areas of Initiate, Improve and Impact. An IEQ score below 250 indicates that the institution has several areas within the Initiate level and should focus their improvement efforts on those Standards within the Initiate level. An IEQ in the range of 225-300 indicates that the institution has several Standards within the Improve level and is using results to inform continuous improvement and demonstrate sustainability. An IEQ of 275 and above indicates the institution is beginning to reach the Impact level and is engaged in practices that are sustained over time and are becoming ingrained in the culture of the institution.

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

## Insights from the Review

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

The Engagement Review Team identified a number of themes reflective of the Moscow School District's continuous improvement process. These included strengths and opportunities that offer perspective and guidance to the improvement journey.

**The team found a deeply embedded students-first culture throughout the system that results in strong relationships for all students.** "Welcoming" was a recurring theme heard in interviews with all stakeholder groups, as well as "supportive learning environments," as corroborated by highly rated elect classroom observations. The development and nurturing of positive relationships among learners and staff are highlighted in the first two bullets of the institution's purpose, which highlight to have "a safe environment" and "a sense of belonging." The five purpose bullets were stated by stakeholders with an emphasis on the first two being primary. The institution demonstrated a commitment to providing equitable learning opportunities for all students, including those with special needs, through resource allocation, staff support, and data analysis. The team learned of the system's efforts to close achievement gaps for subpopulations. Financial and staffing documentation provided evidence of the commitment to high achievement for all students. This was articulated in interviews with parents, staff, and system leaders. Recent work with horizontal and vertical alignment of instruction driven by standards provided teachers and school leaders opportunities to deliver on consistent high expectations for all students.

**The team learned that the system attracts and retains qualified personnel and supports high levels of resource allocation.** Both certified and classified staffing levels significantly exceed state averages, which result in reduced student-to-teacher ratios and high levels of paraprofessional support. Classroom observations indicated that strong human resources were embedded in the culture and appeared to be protected by the system. Anecdotal feedback shared that the selection process for certified staff was competitive, often resulting in experienced and highly qualified candidates. Focused interviews with leaders and staff indicated that the system used formal processes to establish individual goals with staff and monitor progress towards their attainment. In addition to sufficient allocations of human resources, through interviews with staff, the team learned that formal processes are in place for the selection of information resources and materials to support the needs of students, staff, and the system. The core curriculum adoption process involved classroom teachers from the impacted disciplines and grade levels. Selections of materials followed a process based on consensus from broad-based stakeholder input. Instructional staff indicated they

were appropriately represented in resource selection, with the exception of special education staff, who were not specifically included in the determination of core materials. The system allocation of resources was aligned with priorities to improve student performance and overall organizational effectiveness. Classroom observations indicated that class size ratios were low, and instruction was frequently individualized to meet the needs of students. Student interviews consistently indicated that the relationships between students and staff were very positive, with many students indicating that the best thing about their school was their teacher.

**The existence of a comprehensive and formal strategic planning process could be an important form of establishing accountability and stakeholder involvement.** In its review of evidence that was provided, interviews with staff throughout the system, and a review of the web site, the team was not able to identify a formal strategic plan. Strategic planning, implemented with fidelity, would ensure the system worked to develop and outline stakeholder engagement in leadership, instruction, assessment, community outreach, and facility planning, while consistently focused on student achievement goals. The planning process would allow all stakeholders to discuss the vision for the system and the best methods for its achievement. The plan would serve as a guide for all members of the school community aimed at providing a coherent, comprehensive, and logical progression of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, as well as providing the big picture of the system's future needs. All stakeholders could determine how their work fits into the plan and how they could support each other and students in their efforts to achieve the goals. While many of the components of strategic planning were operational in the system, formalizing the strategic planning process could foster collegiality and create opportunities for discussion on the direction of the organization. The planning and implementation processes would promote the open and candid exchange of ideas, supporting the system's efforts to strengthen communication with stakeholders, including resolution of disputes, and working out effective solutions.

**The institution has self-selected a goal of improved communication, which was verified as a need by most stakeholder groups through interviews and surveys.** There was a lack of evidence of stakeholder input to strategic planning other than compliance with State mandates. Data reviews showed the system performing at high levels and above the State averages on student achievement measures. However, the team was unable to find plans for continuous improvement to sustain and continue the upward movement. Expectations for continuous improvement was not articulated at the institution level, either by the governing board or district leaders. The team learned of a concern among school leaders and staff not to appear competitive in their community communications lest this impairs relationships with their sister schools and staffs. Interviewees often stated that key communicators for school and system information to staff, students, and parents were through the building administration. Communication from the system level tended to bypass building-level leadership rather than engaging them in two-way, vision-building, and problem-solving actions. This had resulted in parent and association activities challenging some goals and processes planned at the top. The lack of engagement with all stakeholder groups in decision making that is predicated on continuous improvement appeared to limit the effectiveness of both building and central office leadership in their contributions to the system.

**Leaders reported, and teachers confirmed that their schools had a mentoring program to assist new teachers.** Each school appointed a veteran teacher with an extra assignment to work with new teachers. At one school, the mentor teacher had expanded his support to assist second-year teachers as well; however, this was not an expectation for the position. Teachers reported that grade-level teams or departments also provided assistance to new teachers. A few teachers indicated

they have informal opportunities at the building level to share professional practices through peer observations. Based on staff interviews, the team learned that there were no system-wide training, expectations, and ongoing guidance for mentors. There was no evidence of instructional coaching. There was evidence that the human resource staff provided necessary onboarding information related to payroll, benefits, and substitute teaching. Once onboard, and with the identified mentorship, instructional staff ongoing guidance and support was largely through collegial relationships. The team noted that instructional staff participated in collaborative learning communities each Friday, as negotiated through the master agreement. While the research identified that effective collaborative learning communities for professional educators include school leadership, teachers and administrators confirmed that the agreement excludes principals from meetings. The levels of principal knowledge of proceedings and outcomes of the meetings were mixed, depending largely upon relationships, rather than formal practice. Teachers expressed a lack of direction for their collaborative learning time. They stated that although they tried to use the time effectively, they were not sure of intended outcomes. Collaboration time was largely determined by grade levels or departments. Minimal evidence that data to monitor or assess the effectiveness of the collaborative learning structure in improving student learning and professional practice was being collected and used to make adjustments and guide improvement.

The team learned that the system had invested considerable financial support to provide digital resources intended to improve teaching, learning, operations, and overall organizational effectiveness. The existence of digital resources, such as key web-based programs for operational support, i.e., Power School, Skyward, Fast Track, internet system, and effective Wi-Fi accessibility, was noted. In classroom observations, it was evident that there was limited use of digital resources by learners. Students using digital resources, such as Chromebooks, were often engaged in an intervention program. There was little evidence of students actively using digital resources to gather, evaluate, research, create, solve problems, and/or work collaboratively. The team could not establish the existence of a formal, strategic technology plan. There did not appear to be any system-wide plan or direction to address the use of digital resources for learning and professional practice. The development, implementation, and monitoring of such a plan would provide guidance to the more effective use of the wealth of digital resources in supporting teaching and learning to the greater achievement of learner needs to thrive in this 21st century.

The Moscow School District is to be commended for many excellent programs and practices that are occurring for learners, their families, and staff. The team wishes the school community the best as it proceeds on its journey of continuous improvement. It is expected that these insights may provide some guidance as the system and schools consider the next steps on their achievement of stated strategic results.

## 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
<p><b>John Sedey, Lead Evaluator</b></p>	<p>John Sedey has been a teacher, school and district administrator, and educational consultant. Since retiring from public school administration, he has been in private practice, primarily consulting to an intermediate school district, a community college, three alternative schools, and four charter schools. He is the Executive Director of an education non-profit corporation. John has provided leadership to career and technical education, guidance, and social services, assessment and testing, student data systems, alternative education, state and federal program administration, education-business partnerships, and environmental education. He has been a senior developer for one of the eleven New American Schools Development grants. In his advocacy for college and career readiness, he has consulted with federal and state departments of education. John holds a bachelor's degree in history and business, a master's degree in education administration, and has done additional graduate work, including that as a Bush Public School Executive Fellow. He has led more than a hundred Cognia reviews in 30 states in the past ten years.</p>
<p><b>Robin Gilbert, Associate Lead Evaluator</b></p>	<p>Robin Gilbert has dedicated 40 years to public education as a teacher, elementary school principal, district curriculum director, and now serves as superintendent of Payette School District. In addition, Robin teaches for Northwest Nazarene University as an adjunct professor working with graduate studies in education leadership. She has a B.A. in elementary education, M.A. in school administration, and an Ed.S. with a superintendent endorsement. She has developed expertise in areas of curriculum, assessment, systems change, professional learning, and school leadership. Her current district is using Cognia's continuous improvement resources to monitor and measure the growth of instructional practices across schools. Robin has previously served on two district accreditation review teams in Idaho and Wyoming.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Jim Foudy</b>	<p>Jim Foudy is the superintendent of the McCall-Donnelly school district. He has served in this capacity since 2015. His prior position was as an elementary principal for McCall-Donnelly from 2003. Early in his career, Jim taught at Garfield and William Howard Taft elementary schools in Boise, Idaho. His experience began in first grade for four years, fifth grade for two years, and sixth grade for one year. Jim holds a B.A. in elementary education, an M.A. in education administration, and an Ed.S. Jim started serving on Cognia review teams in 2019.</p>
<b>Dr. N. Shalene French</b>	<p>Dr. French began her Idaho K-12 career as an 8th-grade mathematics teacher in the Bonneville School District. She thoroughly enjoyed teaching and coaching but felt she could have a greater influence on the quality of education all students received as an administrator. Dr. French has served as an assistant principal, principal, and district director of human resources. Currently, she serves as the superintendent of the Caldwell School District. She is an advocate and proponent of early childhood education, Making Middle Grades Work, and Advanced Opportunity/College and Career Readiness.</p>
<b>Leonard Paul</b>	<p>Leonard Paul is retired from Cognia, where he served as Vice President, Pacific Region. His prior position was associate director for the Northwest Accreditation Commission. Prior to the accreditation positions, he served with the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, NV as a region superintendent, assistant superintendent for secondary schools, high school principal, curriculum specialist, and teacher. He was named the Nevada Principal of the Year in 1991, received the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce Community Achievement in Education Award in 2001, and received the Northwest Accreditation Distinguished Service award in 2004. His early career experience was a scene designer and scenic artist for the Las Vegas entertainment industry. He received degrees from Northeastern College, Colorado State University, and an advanced degree from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.</p>



## References and Readings

- AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/continuousimprovement-and-accountability>
- Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention program*. New York: Routledge.
- Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/what-continuously-improving-system-looks-like>
- Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/sites/default/files/CISWhitePaper.pdf>
- Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/savvy-school-change-leader>
- Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing*. New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education*. San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from [https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation\\_continuous-improvement\\_2013.05.pdf](https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation_continuous-improvement_2013.05.pdf)
- Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Teachers College.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory*. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

