



# Hunter High School

West Valley City, Utah

**September 14-17, 2020**

**School Accreditation Engagement Review**

**229811**

## Table of Contents

Hunter High School.....	0
Cognia Continuous Improvement System .....	2
Initiate .....	2
Improve .....	2
Impact.....	2
Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review.....	2
Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results.....	3
Leadership Capacity Domain .....	3
Learning Capacity Domain.....	5
Resource Capacity Domain.....	6
Assurances .....	7
Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®.....	7
Insights from the Review.....	7
Next Steps .....	10
Team Roster .....	12
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 will be organized by the Levels of Impact within i3: Initiate, Improve, and Impact. The organization of the findings is based upon the ratings from the Standards Diagnostic and the i3 Levels of Impact.

### Initiate

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

### Improve

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

### Impact

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

## Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

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

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

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

## Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

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

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

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

### Leadership Capacity Domain

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

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

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

2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	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:	4	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:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	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:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	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.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	1	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:	2	SU:	1	EM:	

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating
3.7	The institution demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	
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:	3	SU:	3	EM:	

## Assurances

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

Assurances Met		
YES	NO	If No, List Unmet Assurances by Number Below
X		

## Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

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

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

<b>Institution IEQ</b>	<b>306.00</b>	<b>AIN 5 Year IEQ Range</b>	<b>278.34 – 283.33</b>
------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

## Insights from the Review

The Engagement Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the processes, programs, and practices within the institution to arrive at the findings of the team. These

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

Hunter High School (HHS) has established a culture of high expectations for students and staff, while they undergo a transition period between an abrupt closure of schools due to the pandemic in the spring of 2019, a change in the principalship, and a continued push from the Granite School District to remain true to the timetable of implementing proficiency-based grading (PBG) in all classrooms. The Engagement Review Team identified four themes which provide a perspective regarding where the school stands in their improvement journey and how they may move forward to serve the future needs of a diverse student population.

**Internal and external stakeholders at the school level had limited involvement in the development and review of a specific, measurable continuous improvement process which supports and promotes the school's mission and vision.** HHS has served the West Valley Community of Utah for approximately 30 years. The vision and mission statement of HHS does not appear to be something of which interviewed students, teachers and parents are aware. The Lead Evaluator asked if they could read the vision and mission from a poster in the classroom, as the Lead was told it was printed on posters, but the posters could not be located by stakeholder groups. The School's Land Trust Plan was identified as the school's Continuous Improvement Plan, which includes goals, strategies, and affiliated costs, thus the school meets the Assurance for having a Continuous Improvement Plan. However, the team found a disconnect between the goals of the School Land Trust Plan and those listed in the Executive Summary. The only goal that could be recalled was to increase the graduation rate, which is an overall state goal for all high schools.

In a compelling narrative, the school expressed a strong desire to help students succeed; however, the lack of a school improvement plan indicated this was more individually driven than a cohesive plan that all stakeholders had knowledge of and could support. Evidence that there were several programs supporting student learning was backed by documentation, including proficiency-based grading, the "Granite Way" (the district's professional development program), and individual goal setting for both students and staff. However, the school's mission and vision do not include methods or instructional strategies to increase student learning or ways to measure student learning. During discussions with the principal, he acknowledged that clear goals supporting the school's mission would establish direction for all committees, departments, and organizations to follow. That same clarity would aid in documenting resources that promote and support initiatives important to student learning and professional improvements. The school is data-rich, and the administration has promoted a collaborative climate that all internal stakeholders appreciate. Utilizing these resources in identifying SMART goals (specific, measurable, attainable, reality-based, and timely) would provide a clear path for the school's stakeholders to follow. Once a fully developed improvement plan, in support of the school's mission is designed, all key personnel would be engaged in its implementation and monitoring processes to ensure that the desired results, including student learning, are attained.

**Limited analysis and use of trend data across all domains to improve student learning or to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented programs exists at the school.** In documentation provided by the school and in interviews with administrators and teachers, the Engagement Review Team found extensive evidence that formative and summative student data are collected in some subject areas and discussed during professional learning time. However, in reviewing the school's longitudinal data, little to no evidence was available to determine if administrators or teachers used trend data to determine appropriate instructional classroom adaptations to ensure student success. No evidence was shared that professional programs, such as teacher evaluation systems, professional staff development, or mentorship programs are evaluated to determine their effectiveness, as well. When asked if he knew what the evaluation process was for the mentorship program, one of the school's mentors admitted that he was not familiar with any form of evaluation tool other than perception data. Anecdotal data is the primary program evaluation method used for most campus programs at HHS. Interviewed teachers did not have a response when asked if there was a mechanism to offer suggestions for professional development or if there were procedures to determine the implementation of an effective professional development program. Analysis from the teachers' survey demonstrated a desire and a need for teacher training in the collection, analysis, and use of data. The opportunity to identify and implement meaningful classroom instructional strategies based on the analysis of collected data would benefit a culturally and ethnically diverse campus. In addition to differentiation of instruction, higher-order thinking, and effective use of digital resources, teachers could be provided more instructional strategies in their professional "tool kits" to continue challenging all students academically. The school is encouraged to formalize program evaluations to maximize resources and outcomes to strengthen the continuous improvement process. Since the school practices collaborative leadership, all staff participating on committees could be utilized in this endeavor.

**A strong focus on meeting the needs of all students by providing academic, social, and emotional support is an area of strength at Hunter High School.** Interviews with students and staff demonstrated that students are the priority on campus. Counselors meet with all students at all grade levels for career and academic planning, and parents are encouraged to attend via Zoom. Job shadowing, internships, and job fairs provide additional career opportunities and information and is facilitated by the work-based learning specialist. The counseling secretary then tracks all parent and student contacts. The counselors remain current by attending district training to begin each school year, supplemented by monthly meetings. Since increasing the graduation rate is a Land Trust goal, counselors work directly with the credit recovery director to identify students who are at risk of dropping out. Counselors also communicate with both the school psychologist and social worker, as the need for additional student support has increased over the past decade. The social worker has increased her work schedule from two to five days a week, and the school psychologist is now on campus three days weekly. They both meet with students and conduct home visits, accompanied by a campus administrator or the school resource officer. At-risk students are assigned a faculty mentor who frequently meets with the student to ensure classroom success. It is suggested that the school continue seeking ways to maximize this strength in support of its students.

**Mutual respect, responsibility, and collaboration among students, faculty, and staff are built into the school culture.** Strong relationships have been built across the school. The staff members feel valued and supported by administration. Students have opportunities to succeed and feel respected and cared for by their teachers. Administrators protect collaborative time for staff. Professional learning community time is used by teachers to discuss individual students and their needs and to identify methods to improve student chances for success. The school's Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) has continued to improve student behaviors on campus. The PBIS School-wide Evaluation Tool (**SET**) score last year was 82%; three years ago, Hunter High had

the lowest SET score in the state. The PRIDE Program promotes personal responsibility and expectations, and interviewed parents shared experiences where their students were recognized with a PRIDE award for “doing something good.” Support services on campus include the Hunter’s Den, a “store” that provides food, clothing, and hygiene products for needy students and families. Parents interviewed believe that all staff members are approachable. One parent who also serves as a substitute teacher spoke highly of the support she receives from all campus administrators. When stakeholders were asked how they would describe the school, the team heard common words such as “family, kind, caring, inclusive, and opportunity.” The cultural diversity that is embraced and celebrated at the school was impressive to the team, particularly since HHS is one of the largest high schools in the state.

Cognia expects schools to be aware of all accreditation Standards rated as Impacting, and address Standards that are rated at the Insufficient level. The duty of the Engagement Review Team is to review all Standards. Many Standards are interdependent and have been identified as themes in the narrative. Some individual Standards are not aligned with one of the themes above. To provide additional feedback for the school, these Standards are addressed below.

**In reference to the Leadership Domain, the issue of involving and communicating with all stakeholder groups was identified as a concern by parents, students, and some staff members.**

Even though the implementation of proficiency-based grading was a district decision, this process has not been implemented or communicated effectively at the campus level. During interviews with the various stakeholder groups, it was evident that not all students welcomed the change from a standard grading practice to proficiency-based grading for various reasons. Several teachers disagree with the premise and have yet to implement it in any of their classes, even though the directive was to have PBG into effect in at least one class this year. Students and parents believe PBG hurts a student’s grades because of the emphasis on testing. When parents were asked if they understood how PBG works, the response was that they had one or two open meetings with information, but no time was allotted to address questions. Creating more opportunities for all stakeholder groups to have a voice in the school’s direction can make an already good school even better, especially if a process is not well understood or communicated.

In closing, the Engagement Review Team found a strong and caring culture inclusive of building solid relationships among a diverse population. The team suggests the school identify clear goals based on reliable data, with appropriate measurements to provide a path to follow in support of the mission and vision. It is recommended that all staff receive training on how to collect, analyze, and use data, particularly longitudinal data, to improve programs and classroom instruction. They also recommend the school identify structures that will evaluate the effectiveness of various programs. The stakeholders of Hunter High School are encouraged to use insights from this review as they move forward in their continuous improvement journey.

## 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 elite 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
<b>Edy McGee, Co-Lead Evaluator</b>	<p>Dr. Edy McGee began her experience with accreditation in 2006. Prior to her retirement in 2017, she served as both a team member and a lead evaluator for Cognia, accrediting public district schools and public charter schools in Utah. Dr. McGee's professional career spanned 46 years and included teaching secondary English, French, and reading courses and college-level educational administration courses. During the last 20 years of her career, Dr. McGee served as an administrator at the elementary and secondary levels. In 2019, Dr. McGee began doing observations of student teachers for a local college. Dr. McGee earned both a B.A. in English education and an M.Ed. from the University of Utah. She holds a Ph.D. from Brigham Young University in educational leadership and foundations, with an emphasis in bilingual education.</p>
<b>Frances McCraley, Co-Lead Evaluator</b>	<p>Mrs. Frances McCraley, retired after serving in public education for 42 years. She graduated from Northern Arizona University with a Bachelor of Science in education, majoring in history and English, and a master's in educational administration. She began her career in Kingman, Arizona, teaching seventh grade English, then transferred to Mohave High School where she taught social studies courses and served as the social studies department chair. During the next 25 years, Mrs. McCraley taught English at Yuma High, and later at Cibola High, and served as English department chair, NCA Steering Committee chair, and Academic Decathlon coach at both campuses. Mrs. McCraley then became the district gifted coordinator, and later the ESL director. She spent her final years in education as principal of Prescott High School in Prescott, Arizona. She now volunteers as a field consultant and lead evaluator for Cognia.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Kelli Miller</b>	<p>Kelli Miller serves as an assistant principal in Canyons School District in Utah. She is a licensed educator with endorsements in English language arts and educational leadership. She began her career as an ESL-endorsed English language arts teacher in central California. During this time, she was also a basketball and volleyball coach. From 2007-2009, Ms. Miller was a member of the Concurrent Academic Progress Program (<b>CAPP</b>) literacy grant team, through which she wrote expository reading and writing curriculum. This is now widely utilized by English language arts teachers across the United States and California State Universities in their English education teacher training programs. After completing a master's degree in education with an emphasis in curriculum and instruction in 2009, she taught at Canyons School District as an English language arts teacher, data analyst and testing coordinator. She is currently a high school assistant principal at Canyons District.</p>
<b>Lynette Brunderman</b>	<p>Dr. Lynette Brunderman spent 15 years teaching at the elementary level in regular education and in special education classrooms in self-contained, resource, and inclusion settings. She has served as a director of student services in a small rural district where she oversaw state and federal programs. She served as an elementary principal for 12 years, leading the school to A+ recognition. For the past nine years, she has served on the University of Arizona's educational leadership faculty. Dr. Brunderman has served on Cognia review teams for the past six years.</p>
<b>Marlies Burns</b>	<p>Dr. Marlies Burns has 24 years of public education experience. She began her career teaching science and coaching sports, and then as a school principal at the elementary and secondary levels. Working with the Utah State Board of Education, Dr. Burns developed, planned, and implemented schools of choice and evaluated schools and districts at the local, state, and national level. She also worked with associations, special interest groups, legislators, school leaders, and parents to create effective educational communities among diverse constituencies and solve problems. In 2016, she began consulting with various organizations primarily on educational topics and reviewing grants for the U.S. Department of Education. She has served on several engagement reviews for schools, corporations, systems, and digital learning. She earned a bachelor's degree in biology from Brigham Young University in Hawaii, a master's degree in educational leadership from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and a doctorate degree in curriculum and instruction from Utah State University.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Deborah Swensen</b>	<p>Dr. Deborah Swensen is the superintendent of Hawthorn Academy District in West and South Jordan, Utah. She coordinates curriculum, professional development, budgets, state and federal reports, board policy and reports, administrative team procedures, and oversight of the schools' continuous improvement plans. Dr. Swensen holds a Ph.D. in educational leadership from Brigham Young University. She earned an M.S. from Utah State University with an emphasis in gifted and talented education and an endorsement in administration, and a B.S. in secondary education with endorsements in English, drama, debate, and reading. Dr. Swensen has experience as a teacher and administrator and served as the Utah State Board of Education assessment director. She has served as a lead evaluator on several Cognia engagement reviews.</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.

