



Snow Canyon Middle School

Saint George, Utah

November 3 - 6, 2020

School Accreditation Engagement Review

235561

Table of Contents

Cognia Continuous Improvement System	3
Initiate.....	3
Improve	3
Impact.....	3
Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review	4
Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results	4
Leadership Capacity Domain	5
Learning Capacity Domain.....	6
Resource Capacity Domain	7
Assurances	8
Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®	8
Insights from the Review	9
Next Steps	11
Team Roster	13
References and Readings.....	16

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 administrations of the desired practices, processes, or programs for quality and fidelity. Standards identified within Initiate should become the focus of the institution's continuous improvement journey toward the collection, analysis, and use of data to measure the results of engagement and implementation. Enhancing the capacity of the institution in meeting these Standards has the greatest potential impact on improving student performance and organizational effectiveness.

Improve

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

Impact

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

Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

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

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

Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity Domain

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

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The institution commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.3	The institution 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 institutional effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	1	SU:	1	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:	4	IM:	3	RE:	2	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 institution.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
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:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	2	
2.6	The institution implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	4	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:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	3	

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
2.12	The institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

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.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
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:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
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.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
3.6	The institution provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the institution.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	

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

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	318.50	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 Engagement Review Team (team) identified several themes from the review that support the continuous improvement process at Snow Canyon Middle School (SCMS). These themes present strengths and opportunities to guide its improvement journey.

Snow Canyon Middle School implemented an effective structure to ensure that learners develop positive relationships with significant adults in the school setting through the homeroom advisory program. These relationships are enhanced by an effective communications system to support stakeholder involvement. SCMS instituted a homeroom at the beginning of the 2015-16 school year which is still functioning today. The purpose of this homeroom period is to ensure each student is monitored by at least one adult on campus. Teacher interviews confirmed their support of this program and suggested its success was based on frequent monitoring of student progress and advocacy. During opening remarks, the principal described that teachers are asked which students they choose with whom to build a connection during the school year. The principal later follows up with staff on how well each one does in making those connections as evidenced on teacher contact logs. Students confirmed their recognition of the support they receive from staff on a district-wide survey. The majority of them responded “mostly” or “completely” to the statement, “I am accepted by the adults at school.” Students who have been identified as needing additional supports are assigned to special adult advocates who have the skills and professional training to offer student assistance as needed. Data collected from teachers are analyzed to determine if the number of positive connections has increased and to determine if those connections improve student performance. Unfortunately, due to the COVID-19 virus and its impact on students' attendance at school, the survey was not administered in the 2019-20 school year. The school's efforts in building strong relationships with students was acknowledged and celebrated by a board member during interviews. The board member recognized and appreciated the amount of faculty involvement at school activities and sporting events.

The relationships between adults and students are enhanced and supported by an effective communications system that engages the stakeholders at a high level. Data derived from the student connections program are used as discussion points during professional learning community (PLC) meetings which are held weekly. This information, as well as other school-related topics and issues, are also presented to the school's community council. Feedback was welcomed and used to help formalize adjustments to mid- and long-range goals. It is also uploaded to PowerSchool in support of the teacher evaluation cycles as evidence of their efforts in meeting individual student needs. Additionally, district personnel visit the campus at least two times per month to meet with faculty

members and to observe classroom instruction. Interviews with teachers, parents, district leadership, and a board member give insight regarding how active participation is valued and supported by the school leadership. The principal also values shared leadership as evidenced by the three-year rotation of teachers who serve as leaders within his leadership team. In addition to robust weekly communications with staff and parents, the school provides regular student progress updates via PowerSchool.

The team recommends that the school leadership continues to provide support for a strong adult/student partnership in which students know they are valued and appreciated. Additionally, the team also encourages the school to further enhance its communications by formally documenting the various forms of communications used in order to keep the stakeholders current on school matters.

SCMS monitors student achievement to ensure individual student's needs are met through the alignment of learning opportunities to the core standards.

Teachers also monitor and adjust instruction based on the results of student performance on Common Formative Assessments (CFAs). The School's Mission and Commitments statement includes the following, "We ensure a guaranteed viable curriculum" (GVC). In its efforts to make this statement a reality, the leadership embeds equitable learning activities aligned to this purpose in most aspects of school life. For the teaching staff, this means following a roadmap provided by PLC teams in which pacing tasks and guides are shared at the beginning of each quarter. Interviews with leaders and teachers indicated that this practice is deeply ingrained and protected throughout the culture and operation of the school. The superintendent confirmed this when sharing information about the digital tracking tool used by the school to monitor progress toward meeting the Consolidated School Improvement Plan (CSIP). According to the principal, this tool contains multiple years of PLC assessments, intervention efforts, extension activities, and reflection data sorted by school year, by subgroups, and courses. The school uses this information to support its efforts in meeting the needs of all students. It also contains a tool called Guaranteed Vital Curriculum (GVC) that includes learning goals and CFAs developed by PLC teams from the state core. Professional growth plans are developed and stakeholder input contains reflection on student and parent feedback through school and district surveys. For the students, this means participation in CFAs in order for their achievement to be tracked and their strengths and weaknesses to be reviewed by staff in order to make the necessary adjustments to their instruction. It is noted in the instructions for the CSIP that "if 75% of the students did not understand a concept, it is not an intervention problem, the initial instruction needs to be examined." The school used the results of its most recent school accreditation visit as leverage in developing CFAs and incorporated this action as part of its five components in improving the culture of the school.

PLC collaboration is at the center of all five components of the School Improvement Plan and is an integral part of the school's professional culture and hiring practices.

Interviews with teachers found they feel immediate support and acceptance through their PLC teams when they come into this school. They are provided with resources and curriculum that has been developed over several years which makes their transition to a new environment rewarding. They are included in weekly collaboration meetings and discussions with colleagues as evidenced on weekly agendas, they have the tools and resources to become successful educational professionals as seen on presentation and training videos, and they develop a true love and passion for the students with whom they are engaged to help them realize their dreams for the future as contained within the student and teacher survey results. It is within the PLC structures that CFAs are developed and then delivered to students on a regular basis. Teachers determine student proficiency on these assessments before and after interventions, reflect on the effectiveness of their instruction based upon assessment results, and make necessary adjustments to improve their strategies in delivering instruction to students. During teacher interviews, they discussed how they are supported by their colleagues especially while

discussing student data and instructional strategies within PLC team meetings. The PLC initiative is greatly supported and enhanced by members of the central office within the local school district. All of Washington County School District embraces the PLC culture and contributes via the Land Trust Funds to the allocation of staff and resources at the local school level to ensure each school engages in the collaborative process.

In addition to the discussion of student data and instructional pedagogy often heard within the PLC team meetings, the school permits staff to be involved in the hiring of new teachers whenever a teacher vacancy exists. The SCMS learning coach said, “SCMS teachers find potential teacher candidates to fill vacancies that would be a good fit for the students, the school, the culture, and the departments.” Additional avenues are available to the school when attracting and hiring certified staff to teach at the school. The principal, in his opening remarks about the school, referred to the cooperative relationship with the local university which works with the school in hosting students participating in its teacher preparation program as practicum and student teachers. In teacher and leader interviews, it was made clear to team members that a formal process wasn’t needed to attract quality teachers. The low turnover of staff and the school’s reputation for having quality teachers attracts other professionals to the community and to the school. A teacher tracking document used to record teacher hiring decisions showed that over the last six years, only 21 teachers have transitioned out of the school. Many of these were due to moving to other areas of the state as well as retirements.

SCMS is encouraged to continue supporting the Washington County School District’s initiative of centering its collaboration and professional growth within PLC practices. As a result of these practices, the staff will continue to grow professionally and may desire to remain at SCMS for the duration of their educational careers.

Although a site-based informal mentoring and coaching program exists, the school is encouraged to formalize the program by documenting the practices included in it. In interviews with school leadership and staff, it was determined that a mentoring and coaching program exists; however, there was no evidence of documentation of the practices used to more fully support the school’s newest teachers. The team learned that although there is no evidence of a formal mentoring program at the school level, new hires engage in an induction program through the district called Early Years Enhancement (EYE). In this program, new teachers receive district training and ongoing support. New teachers at SCMS also receive on-site support by a part-time learning coach who models student engagement strategies, discusses student data, and checks in on teacher progress throughout the year. Under the direction of the principal, the learning coach plans and conducts peer observations. All teachers observe one another and provide feedback to their colleagues.

The school leadership and instructional coach are encouraged to formalize the site-based mentoring and coaching program so that as transitions take place a clear and precise plan exists for others to follow.

Next Steps

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

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



- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.
- Continue the improvement journey.

Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
John Barlow, Lead Evaluator	John Barlow, a retired school administrator, is the director of academic supports for Academica Nevada - a charter school service provider in Las Vegas. He is an educator who taught Spanish, publications, and student leadership for the Clark County School District for five years. He entered leadership by earning a master's degree in educational leadership from NOVA Southeastern University and accepted leadership roles in Clark County as a dean, assistant principal, principal of his alma mater (Boulder City High School), and two new area high schools. Mr. Barlow entered the charter school community by opening Somerset Academy Sky Pointe 6-12 campus. After two years of serving as the principal of Somerset Sky Pointe, he became the executive director of Somerset Academy of Las Vegas. Within four years, he helped increase the number of schools by two, and oversaw a total of seven charter schools with a total of over 9,000 enrolled students and over 550 licensed employees. Over the past 20 years, he served as a commissioner for the Northwest Association of Accredited Schools (NWAC), participated in school review teams as a team member, and led teams as lead evaluator for Cognia. He has also led international accreditations teams in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p>Karla Gable</p>	<p>Dr. Karla Gable currently serves as a part-time, online faculty in the School of Education at Capella University, mentoring doctoral candidates in the capstone phase. She was previously core faculty in the School of Education, teaching graduate courses in educational leadership, developing online courses, and serving as a clinical lead. She has served the School of Education representative for Quality Matters, a nationally recognized, faculty-centered, peer review process designed to certify the quality of online courses in higher education. Previously, she served as a (full-time) lecturer in the College of Education, graduate studies in educational administration and supervision at Arizona State University at the West campus. Prior to that, she was the assistant superintendent in the Litchfield School District in metropolitan Phoenix, AZ. She has also served as a special education teacher, school counselor, assistant principal, middle school principal and special education director, and director of educational services. In addition, she is the past president of the higher education division of Arizona School Administrators. She earned her Doctor of Education at Capella University in educational leadership and management and has also obtained a Master of Arts in education in guidance and student personnel, a Master of Counseling, and a Bachelor of Arts in special education. She serves as a lead evaluator and a field consultant for Cognia.</p>
<p>Lynn McCann</p>	<p>Lynn McCann is an assistant principal at Sports Leadership and Management Nevada in Henderson, Nevada. In that position, she is responsible for overseeing athletics, attendance, the National School Lunch Program, discipline, facilities and supervises mathematics, science, health, and physical education. Ms. McCann holds an M.S. in educational leadership from Nova Southeastern University. She has a B.S. degree in education and is licensed in administration, biological sciences, physical education, and health. Ms. McCann has experience as a teacher and administrator in K-12 education as a K-12 teacher and a 6-12 assistant principal.</p>
<p>Rodney Saunders</p>	<p>Rodney Saunders is the principal of Doral Academy of Nevada-Pebble Campus, a K-8 public charter school with an arts integration focus. The school earned 5-Star status at both the elementary and middle school level in 2018-2019 school year. Doral Academy was also voted the best charter school by the Las Vegas Review Journal's "Best of Las Vegas" two years in a row. Prior to Doral Academy, Mr. Saunders worked in the Clark County School District as a teacher, assistant principal, and principal. He had the honor of opening a new elementary school in 2009. He was named the Administrator of the Year by the Clark County Librarians Association. Mr. Saunders attained his Bachelor of Arts in elementary education from Marietta College in Marietta, Ohio, and his Master of Arts in administration and supervision from the University of Phoenix.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p>Christine Simo</p>	<p>Christine Simo has been in education for 20 years. In the year 2000, she earned her bachelor's in elementary education at Florida State University and then taught first and second grade in Panama City, Florida for ten years. She worked with interning teachers as a student teaching supervisor for Florida State University. After earning her National Boards certification in reading and language arts in 2010, she relocated to Las Vegas, Nevada. She taught first grade in Las Vegas for two years and then moved to a Somerset charter school in North Las Vegas as a first-grade teacher. After earning her master's degree in charter school administration at NOVA Southeastern University, she moved into a reading strategist position and then as an assistant principal at Somerset Losee. This is her third year as an administrator at Somerset Losee of North Las Vegas for grades K - 2.</p>
<p>Crystal Thiriot</p>	<p>Crystal Thiriot is a director of academic support at Academica Nevada, a charter school service provider in the Las Vegas area. She currently works with the seven Somerset Academy of Las Vegas schools ranging from grades K-12 with over 9,000 students. Ms. Thiriot was previously the Board Chair of Somerset Academy of Las Vegas during which time the system grew from two schools to five. Ms. Thiriot taught grades 1, 2, and 5 for the Clark County School District prior to becoming involved with charter schools. Ms. Thiriot graduated Summa Cum Laude from Southern Utah University with a B.S. in elementary education. She was a member of an international accreditation team and was trained as an international accreditor.</p>

References and Readings

- AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/continuous-improvement-and-accountability/>
- Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention program*. New York: Routledge.
- Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/what-continuously-improving-system-looks/>
- Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/CISWhitePaper.pdf>
- Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/savvy-school-change-leader/>
- Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing*. New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education*. San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation_continuous-improvement_2013.05.pdf
- Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Teachers College.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory*. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

