



Gwinnett County Public Schools

Suwanee, Georgia

March 6 - 9, 2022

System Accreditation Engagement Review

215139

Table of Contents

Cognia Continuous Improvement System	2
Initiate.....	2
Improve.....	2
Impact.....	2
Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review	3
Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results	3
Leadership Capacity Domain	4
Learning Capacity Domain	5
Resource Capacity Domain.....	6
Assurances.....	7
Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®	7
Insights from the Review	8
Next Steps	12
Team Roster	13
References and Readings.....	15

Cognia Continuous Improvement System

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

The findings of the Engagement Review Team are organized by the ratings from the Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic and the Levels of Impact within the i3 Rubric: Initiate, Improve, and Impact.

Initiate

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

Improve

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

Impact

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

Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

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

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

Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity Domain

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

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The system commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	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:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.3	The system engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system 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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	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:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	2	EM:	

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	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.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	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.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	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:	3	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:	4	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	2	EM:	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	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 system plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the system's effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
3.2	The system's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	2	EM:	
3.5	The system 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:	

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
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:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.7	The system demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.8	The system allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the system's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	2	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	351.13	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.

Gwinnett County Public Schools is comprised of 141 schools, serving 179,500 students with 22,000 staff members. The superintendent has been on the job for just under eight months. The Engagement Review Team (team) proceeded with the established protocols and based on review of documents and interviews offers the following themes for consideration.

There is pervasive commitment and support for the system's vision and mission. As a part of the superintendent's process for the development of the new strategic plan, a series of *Look, Listen and Learn* sessions were conducted across the system involving community, parents, teachers, principals, and students. These sessions were designed to gain insights but also to serve as an introduction to the community. Many processes for stakeholder involvement and increased communication were expanded to include various task forces, community and student advisory boards, and leadership academies. During each stakeholder interview, the team was told about the superintendent's vision and most expressed an awareness of and a commitment to supporting the direction that the system is heading. Capitalizing on this support, this administration has involved several internal and external stakeholders to develop the "Blueprint for the Future," the strategic plan for the system.

One primary focus found within the Strategic Initiatives and Priorities (SI&P) document is a more direct focus on educational equity. Specific language is included throughout the SI&P to reinforce the importance of providing a quality and effective education for all students regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic background, English proficiency, faith, socioeconomic status, or disability. This is embodied in the training provided for system and building level administrators inclusive of equity-centered leadership, equity-centered leader actions, cultivating a culture of belonging and inclusion, and implementing and monitoring an equity centered school plan. As a part of the vision of the incoming superintendent, every administrative staff person participated in exploring Learning 2025, a book study, and leadership training. Principals and district-level staff were able to share the intent of the vision and the role each would play in its implementation. This noteworthy effort should be continued with specific actions to follow.

Strong leadership development processes are in place. The superintendent's overview and stakeholder interviews expressed that the system has a well-supported process to ensure leadership

development opportunities exist at all levels. The grow our own process, “Quality Plus Leader Academy” within Leadership Development, has formalized trainings in place for aspiring leaders. Each individual interested in becoming a leader participates in the Aspiring Principals, Aspiring Assistant Principal, Teacher Leadership, or Coaching Endorsement program(s). Grow our own has been implemented using the Wallace Foundation’s principles. The superintendent has initiated a Learning 2025 initiative, based on the school superintendent’s association. The AASA (The School Superintendents Association) has launched a national commission to provide leadership through a student-centered, equity-focused approach to education. The major focus of this effort is to safely and equitably prepare students for future work and society. Gwinnett County Public Schools is serving as one of the demonstration districts. District staff spoke of the book study, *Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity*, and its positive impact and how integration of the whole child tenets, in order to carry out the themes, has begun. Students also shared that they have many opportunities to be school-based leaders through clubs and organizations. Many of the students also served on the superintendent’s advisory council. Students are provided leadership opportunities through student government, student ambassadors, Model United Nations, Beta club, honor societies, GEAR UP, Air Force Junior Reserve Officer Training Course, and various other sports and clubs within their schools.

Interviews of board, community, and school personnel indicated a high level of engagement and communication between and among stakeholders. Across the system, a variety of groups communicate several perspectives. Regularly scheduled meetings are established to receive input, inclusive of the collaborative learning teams, teacher advisory council, parent advisory committee, superintendent’s student advisory council, the superintendent’s business leader’s council, school improvement councils, Career and Technical Education advisories, and the local school administrative association. These entities meet with the superintendent and/or cabinet to provide input and feedback regarding district processes and procedures. Several communication tools are used to get the message to the public, inclusive of the web site, newsletters, emails, social media, television. and school marquis. As one community member shared, “You have to avoid them to not know what’s going on.”

Strong support systems for teaching and learning, inclusive of data and other resources, are in place. Interviews with teaching staff indicated that teachers have adequate resources for teaching and learning. The system provides curriculum resources, pacing guides, interventionists/coaches, and other adequate professional development for teachers and administrators. The team was repeatedly told, “We are data rich.” System level personnel include a chief data officer responsible for data distribution throughout the system with the use of data governance teams and an executive data steering committee. The platform for all teachers and administrators to access data varied between PowerSchool, E-CLASS, Synergy, and Power VI. Teachers access these data to formulate discussions and actions during professional learning communities (PLCs). Student interventions are based on the data and instructional coaches use data to identify professional learning strategies for teachers. Observational data are also used to inform professional development as well as for developing Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

Collaborative learning teams or PLCs focus on instruction and assessments. The team learned that there are various names for these groups, depending on the school setting. School teams meet to review student achievement data and interventions. Educators are communicated with frequently regarding learning progress. Teachers have access to Synergy Gradebook, which provides predetermined weights associated with tests and classwork. The system publishes an Accountability Report which provides information to the public regarding the system’s progress. This information is also shared through school councils, business advisory boards, and targeted community groups.

The system identified a need for specific disaggregation of data and the need for more leading indicators of student progress. The system is encouraged to analyze multiple sources of data to determine the root

causes or reasons for outcomes. Of note, longitudinal data from the cohort analyzer projected that the graduation rate has been 82% over the last four years but may decline in coming years. The team could not determine how the system has used these data; however, consideration should be given to a laser-like focus on data analysis to determine not only early interventions and outcomes but reasons for this declining trend. Suggested data for consideration may include attendance, discipline, curriculum, observational data, and satisfaction surveys. A comprehensive review of these data may inform potential processes or actions and may aid in identification of causes.

A process is in place to supervise all instructional and non-instructional staff. A prescriptive, results-based evaluation process is identified at the system level for all professional staff, Gwinnett County Public Schools Effectiveness Performance Standards. These evaluations include an extremely detailed rubric, a reflection component, and growth goals for district and school-level personnel. The board is responsible for evaluating and overseeing the actions of the superintendent. The superintendent now has direct supervision over and evaluation of the executive cabinet. The process has district level leaders evaluating principals; and principals and assistant principals evaluating instructional and non-instructional staff. Each group must include self-reflections and develop a professional learning goal for the next review period. This process is replicated among all divisions and offices within the system, such as the child nutrition office, the maintenance office, the transportation office, and the technology office. The process serves the system well and is worthy of continuation.

The focus on educational futures, career planning, and addressing the specialized needs of all students is sporadic. The vision is inclusive of the creation of a system where students acquire knowledge and skills to be successful in college and careers. The cluster concept, having different programs offered at different schools, may limit equitable access for students. While the team understands the concept, it seems to defy the system's equitable intent. The team also heard that teachers were not always clear or felt strong in the delivery of services for students with specialized needs. As previously mentioned, the system has processes for gifted student referrals, English Language Learner (ELL) supports, early intervention programs, Response to Intervention, and special education training. When speaking with school level personnel, there seemed to be disparate perceptions of the type of services to be provided for students. Parents also shared that there were concerns at selected schools regarding the level of services provided for their children. While concern did not surface for the specialized needs of gifted and talented students or students with limited English, there was persistent expression regarding special education. The system is encouraged to analyze services available for this population, the training provided for instructional and support staff, and the information provided for parents. Students and parents indicated that several areas of equity that they would like to see addressed are language equity, special education, inequity among clusters/access to programming, and discipline inequities.

Mentoring programs exist in some schools through community-based organizations; in other schools a targeted focus on Hispanic and African American males; some programs focus on females; still others use their Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) platform or restorative circles to support positive relationships among staff and students. These approaches were as varied as the number of schools. The team suggests a system-wide policy whereby a formal process is developed through which students develop a positive relationship with an adult who supports their educational experiences. This process may assist the rate of relentlessness among students and therefore positively impact the graduation rates, among other benefits. Student engagement instruments are used to assess connectedness and belonging; some schools are using these data to identify wrap around services. Through this process, identified students have access to food, housing, tutoring before or after school and mental health supports. This practice should be replicated with fidelity in all schools within the system.

Relative to the discipline issues, a select group of school-level personnel, inclusive of students, mentioned that discipline consequences appeared to be skewed toward African American males. Recognizing again, that the system is assessing these disparities, the team recommends that this action be maintained and once a process is in place that it be shared with all stakeholders, internal and particularly external.

Opportunities to ensure equitable opportunities and resource allocations for all staff and students are being revisited. When the team reviewed documents and spoke with administrators and teachers, it was evident that building equity for all students is a focused priority for the system. During the overview, the superintendent referenced a book study held among leadership, cabinet, district coordinators, and principals. The featured reading was *Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity*, which focuses on creating equity across schools.

The system provides a robust selection of Advanced Placement courses across all high schools, offers 59 career pathways, K-12 computer science opportunities, and has established a goal to increase the gifted population across subgroups. Teachers are engaging in professional learning opportunities on culturally responsive teaching and the identification of gifted students. A myriad of opportunities exists in various clusters for students to have access to career and technology education programs, gifted and talented programs, special education, and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. Based on parental interviews, it is suggested that the system examine program accessibility within each cluster.

Data-inspired instructional strategies are monitored and adjusted based on the collaborative learning teams or through input from the cross functional teams. Foundational information for instruction is provided through the Quality Plus Teaching Strategies Framework. Common frameworks for teaching, learning, and assessments are provided for teachers across the system. Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and PBIS systems are in place across schools with varying levels of implementation.

Allocation of resources is determined using a formula, adhering to the policies for fiscal management and the district budget information and process. All teachers and administrators shared that they had the resources necessary to teach. Staff described a needs-based point staffing allocation process based on enrollment, socio-economic status (SES), mobility rate, and ESL population. This process not only fosters critical principal input but also allows principals to assign staff at the local school level based on the specific needs of their local school plan for improvement (LSPI) or targeted school plan for improvement (TSPI). Additionally, district staff interviews revealed that a per pupil formula was used by the district to allocate funds for supplies based on SES at each school. The evidence supports that adequate systems are in place for resource projections and suitable human, material, and fiscal allocations. The team is sensitive to the process of resource allocations being revised; therefore, the team encourages the system to review allocations and services to determine if a remedy is required for real or perceived disparities.

The process to continually assess programs and practices is not systemic. The system personnel shared that they are in the process of developing a strategic plan inclusive of district measures, school measures, and external measures. MGT Consulting has been hired to conduct an organizational effectiveness review analyzing resource usage and determining strengths and weaknesses. Schools utilize Key Performance Indicators to determine if annual goals are met related to the school's academic performance. Active stakeholder engagement supports the achievement of the institution's purpose. Avenues of input include surveys, Gwinnett Educational Management System (GEMS) oversight committee, Principals' Corner, Academic Advisory boards, and new teacher support groups. A variety of sources are used to collect input. It is unclear how the information received is used.

The Office of Research and Evaluation provides comprehensive data analysis tools to monitor performance of schools, identify trends, and compare results to other schools with similar characteristics

and demographics as well as benchmark against other comparable districts. Principals and teachers shared that classroom observations and feedback, teacher-developed goals, and school improvement plans are linked to assist in determining the school's annual progress. The system's Results-Based Evaluation System is utilized to ensure ongoing continuous improvement. In conjunction with the Results-Based Evaluation System, each school earns points on the Weighted School Assessment to categorize its annual level of performance. In consideration of analyzing how the system is progressing towards its strategic goals, it is suggested that this analysis process be applied to the system. The chief data officer may be of great assistance in reviewing comprehensive data to determine system processes and productivity.

A strong network of professionals who bring a multitude of talents and have created publications and processes for analysis of most programs exists. Determinations should be made about access and awareness of programs at the school level. Program examination to determine the effectiveness of implementation is important and beneficial. Too many programs or too many priorities can negatively affect implementation. Careful review and strategic planning would serve to prioritize actions, programs, and processes. Further, continued transparent two-way communication is essential for forward movement.

As the system moves to analyze program offerings, consideration should be given to alternative methods to ensure that all students have access to all programs, regardless of where they may attend school in the county. Creative scheduling or alternative instructional delivery are potential contemplations. When reflecting on the needs of all learners, the provision of services for students at each end of the spectrum should be examined in keeping with the mission.

In conclusion, Gwinnett County Public Schools is in transition. The superintendent has been in place less than a year but has great vision for the success of the system. There is great support for the current administration and a strong desire to see it succeed. It is the desire of the team to contribute to that success through the recommendations and suggestions provided within this report. It is also the team's belief, as the superintendent shared, "We are not perfect, but making perfect progress." The team wishes them well.

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/Title
Carmen Pough Banks, Lead Evaluator	Carmen Pough Banks is an educator who has taught on the secondary and post-secondary levels and is retired from the South Carolina Department of Education. Carmen has served as a secondary teacher, as well as a post-secondary adjunct professor. Mrs. Banks has a Master's in Education degree, has strong curriculum development experience, and is noted for her successful work with adult learners. As a career educator and seasoned presenter, she continues to provide staff development and coaching for selected schools in the southeast. Her experiences have included developing and monitoring a system of external review audits for schools designated as below average; monitoring statewide teams; performing on-site visits and reviews of schools designated as unsatisfactory; conducting training for teams performing external and internal audits using three focus areas (leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction and professional development); and working with federal and state legislation translating this into operational procedures. She has been an accreditation specialist for Cognia (formerly AdvancED) for fifteen years, serving as a team member, a school and systems Lead Evaluator and is additionally certified as an early learning, global, and corporate Lead Evaluator.
Ursala Davis	Teacher Effectiveness Coordinator
Carletha Doyle	Principal
Debra Frazier	Principal
Alana Hardison	Chief Marketing Officer
Chris Harth	Chief Operating Officer
Morris Leis	Superintendent
Dan Maley	Teacher
Lori Rodgers	Assistant Superintendent
Travis Thomas	Director

Team Member Name	Brief Biography/Title
Catrina Smith	Academic Officer

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.

