



Lauren's Institute for Education

Gilbert, Arizona

September 13-16, 2020

School Accreditation Engagement Review

312124

Table of Contents

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.....	4
Resource Capacity Domain.....	6
Assurances	7
Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®.....	7
Insights from the Review.....	7
Next Steps	10
Team Roster	11
References and Readings	13

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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	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:	4	SU:	2	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	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:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	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:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	1	RE:	2	SU:	2	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:	3	RE:	4	SU:	4	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:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	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:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
2.6	The institution implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	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:	3	EM:	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.12	The institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	1	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:	2	EM:	
3.2	The institution's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	3	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:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	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:	2	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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	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:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	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.

Institution IEQ	313.0	AIN 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, 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.

The Engagement Review Team identified several themes from the remote review that supports the continuous improvement process at the Lauren's Institute for Education (LIFE). These themes present strengths and opportunities to guide their improvement journey.

LIFE engages and seeks feedback from all stakeholders, who champion the purpose and improvement of the institution. It was consistently reported in stakeholder interviews that the day-to-day activities at the school are focused on the school's mission statement of "improving quality of life for people affected by developmental disabilities through specialized, caring and affordable services." The Pillars document summarizes the concepts that make the school's culture: Environment, Honesty and Integrity, Whole Child Approach, Collaboration, Eclectic Care, Accessible Services, Professional Growth, and Dreamers. The Academy Team Meeting Process document provides guidance for meetings with parents to enable the educational team (consisting of teachers and various therapists and related service providers) to discuss student progress and set goals. In interviews, parents, students, teachers, and school's providers expressed that school leaders were accessible and that they felt supported and "heard." A program named "Wolf Days" includes two days at the beginning of the school year when teachers and staff hold meetings with freshman to share expectations and the school's culture. The creation of an on-campus "Teen Room" and a partnership with a nearby gym were two of many examples given of leadership listening to stakeholder suggestions and acting on those suggestions. The Fidelity Process describes the classroom observation system that is designed to ensure that curriculum and classroom management provide a high-quality educational experience for students and the fidelities are used to identify areas in need of growth. Per stakeholder interviews and artifacts, LIFE invites feedback from parents and staff via annual satisfaction surveys. The results of these surveys are analyzed by the staff and drive the goals of the institution in the upcoming year, as described in the School Improvement Plan. The survey questions are aligned with the school's purpose. The team recommends that leaders continue to welcome stakeholder feedback and collect qualitative and quantitative data from stakeholders related to the purpose and progress of LIFE.

By identifying and addressing the specialized needs of learners, LIFE presents equitable opportunities for learning and achievement as well as relationship-building among staff, students, and families. The school provides three tracks at the academy: behavioral, academic, and functional life skills. All learners have a team of support personnel including teachers, paraprofessionals, therapy providers, and a behavioral support team. Parent and staff annual satisfaction surveys and interviews with parents, service providers, teachers, and leaders indicated that the LIFE program is deeply ingrained in inclusively accepting and serving all students. LIFE provides a safe, family environment for all students and treats the "whole child" through collaboration with a cohesive interdisciplinary approach. The school improvement plan includes goals and action steps focused on engagement and differentiation for all students. All students have an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) that specifies a curriculum and appropriate support services to meet individualized learning needs. Evidence of professional development included a presentation on ILP Goal Writing that provided training on how to write SMART (specific, measurable, achievable realistic and relevant, and time-limited) goals for students. Leader and parent interviews indicated that individual learner progress is reported through weekly, quarterly, and annual data reports. In interviews, students and parents expressed a feeling of being part of a family, feeling safe at school, and receiving necessary services in one place. The Academy Academic Process document thoroughly described the school's assessment system to ensure that the learning needs of students are met. The school implements a Tap In/Out Policy designed to protect the well-being of employees by encouraging self-awareness when support is needed; therefore, allowing the employee to continue to improve the quality of care. When a staff member or their supervisor feels that a mental or physical break is needed, a break is

provided. It is recommended to continue to stay true to the mission of the organization and continue to implement, support, and measure the effectiveness of best practices for this specialized group of learners.

LIFE provides and allocates an abundance of material, information, human, and fiscal resources to support the curriculum, programs, stakeholders, and student learning. Annual satisfaction surveys and interviews with staff, school leaders, and governing board members revealed stakeholders have equal access to material and information resources and are actively involved in the identification of necessary resources for curriculum, instruction, and program development. Teacher interviews indicated that they have the materials they need, and leader interviews indicated that teachers do not incur out-of-pocket expenses. The LIFE artifact library is vast and includes (among other things) stakeholder handbooks, bylaws, and classroom and meeting procedures. LIFE engages in long-range planning to effectively manage and use its resources, as evidenced by interviews with school leaders and governing board members. Most recently, this was evident in fundraising and financial planning for facility expansion and for the transformation of LIFE into a self-sustaining community. The Miscellaneous Processes document described the annual budget meeting as a time for the leadership team to meet once a year to review and forecast the organizational budget. Additionally, the school operates an assistive technology closet that is designed to provide access to adaptive equipment and flexible seating to create personalized learning environments for students. As LIFE grows, the team recommends continued stakeholder involvement and feedback in the provision and allocation of resources.

Formal, ongoing, and data-driven coaching and leadership activities for leaders and aspiring leaders have not been implemented. Artifacts provided by the organization and interviews with school leaders indicate that LIFE engages new and struggling teachers in mentoring and modeling programs. However, it was not evident that LIFE intentionally and systematically builds the leadership capacity of experienced and talented teachers, current leaders, or aspiring leaders. Per interviews with teachers and school leaders, professional development and leadership activities are self-initiated. Further, no formalized process for evaluating leaders exists. When no formal leadership protocol is implemented, it is difficult to measure growth over time. Feedback to leaders is primarily provided via annual satisfaction surveys and leadership interviews. Thorough job descriptions are provided for the Academy Administrator, the Administrator of Curriculum and Professional Development, the Homebound Lead Instructor, and Lead Teacher for the Academy, but it is unclear how leadership performance is measured or how plans for the growth of leaders is provided. A fair and unbiased evaluation of leader performance should be based on multiple sources of data to reflect performance in the many facets of leadership and will help to avoid informal subjective processes for leadership evaluation. It is important to devote adequate time and resources to the design, development, and execution of a comprehensive and quality leadership performance evaluation system. The team recommends that the school create intentional opportunities to build the leadership capacity of experienced and talented teachers, current leaders, or aspiring leaders. As a follow up, the school should also develop means to measure the effectiveness of these activities.

A process to continually and formally assess the programs and organizational conditions intended to improve student learning has not been implemented. While survey results and stakeholder interviews showed an overall satisfaction in the services received, evidence was lacking to show internal, formalized processes to regularly evaluate and refine programs and practices. Evidence showed many processes and procedures are in place for leadership to evaluate the implementation of the curriculum and the effectiveness of instruction through quarterly fidelity checks. The analysis of survey results and the School Improvement Plan indicate that data are used to determine the effectiveness of some curricular plans (reading and math). However, measures to gather, analyze, and use data to determine the impact of all school initiatives are inconsistent. A data-driven and collaborative process for assessing the district's programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning will improve organizational effectiveness. Leaders are encouraged to formalize a process to ensure that all programs to improve student achievement and organizational effectiveness are monitored with clearly defined criteria to determine the efficacy in meeting stated goals and objectives and are adjusted in response to the data.

Formalize processes to attract and retain qualified staff and establish means to evaluate the effectiveness of the recruitment and retention process. According to leaders and governing board members in interviews, LIFE has responded to historical employee dissatisfaction, as expressed in annual surveys, to retain qualified staff. For example, LIFE began to offer longevity pay and shortened the contract of staff without reducing pay. Such measures are reactive, and LIFE has not created or implemented formal processes to proactively retain or recruit staff. It is noted that multiple vacancies exist in the school's organizational chart. Further, no evidence exists that data are collected, analyzed, and used to evaluate recruitment and retention processes or that recruitment and retention of staff have improved over time. It is recommended that the leadership formalize processes to personnel needs, including an assessment of talent and qualifications in order to identify, attract, and retain qualified staff and establish means to evaluate the effectiveness of recruitment and retention practices.

Lauren's Institute provides vital and quality services for students and the community. Utilizing the recommendations from this report will assist Lauren's Institute in its ongoing 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 elect certification to provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p>Karla Gable, Lead Evaluator</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>Cortney Georgia</p>	<p>Cortney Georgia is in her first year as principal of PXU Digital Academy, a new, online school in the Phoenix Union High School District. Prior to this year, she served the Camelback High School community for seven years in the roles of assistant principal for instruction (two years), assistant principal for registration (three years), and professional development specialist (two years). Cortney began her career in education as a high school English teacher after graduating from Arizona State University with her Master of Education in curriculum and instruction and before that, her Bachelor of Arts in English literature. She holds a K-12 principal certificate from Northern Arizona University and, at this time, is pursuing her Doctorate in Education at Grand Canyon University. Cortney has participated in a number of Cognia Engagement Reviews over the past three years across the state of Arizona.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p>Kara Huss</p>	<p>Kara Huss is the executive director and board-certified behavior analyst at William’s Community School. She has been with William’s Community School since October of 2011 where she has served in roles of special education teacher, ABA therapist, assistant director, and director in the private school setting. Kara has an undergraduate degree in all-level special education and a master’s degree in education with a specialization in autism and developmental disabilities. She was previously certified as an ec-12 special education teacher and ec-6 general education teacher. Kara also is a board-certified behavior analyst and has been practicing as a BCBA since January of 2013. Kara has experience both in the classroom as a lead teacher as well as advising and supervising special education classroom teachers in an administrative role since 2015. Kara also works as a BCBA providing Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)</p>
<p>Matt George</p>	<p>Matthew Georgia is the principal at Cesar Chavez High School for Phoenix Union High School District in Phoenix, Arizona. He has served as the principal for five years and prior to this position, as the assistant principal for instruction for four years at Camelback High School. Matt is currently a doctoral student at Grand Canyon University. He received his MS in special education from National University (San Diego, CA) and BS in general science from Fordham University (Bronx, NY). His teaching experience is in the field of special education, where he spent the first eight years of his career.</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
- 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.

