Covington Independent

Covington, Kentucky

cognia™

Table of Contents

cognia™

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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	4	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
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:**	4	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support system effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	4	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	4	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	4	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for their institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	

Learning Capacity Domain

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

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

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.									Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 4	
2.12	The system implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 4	

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:**	2	**EM:** 4	
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:**	3	**EM:** 4	
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:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 4	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 3	
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:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:** 4	
3.6	The system provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the system.									Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	4	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**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:**	2	**EM:** 4	

Resource Capacity Standards		Rating
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: 4 **IM:** 3 **RE:** 3 **SU:** 2 **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	355.97	**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.

Throughout the preparation and the subsequent review of Covington Independent Public Schools (CIPS), it was the full intention of the Cognia Engagement Review Team (team) to gain as much information as possible to rate the Standards, to review the evidence, and to engage all stakeholders in the remote process. The team engaged in quality, information-gathering sessions including interviews of stakeholders, a presentation by the CIPS leadership team, and a comprehensive review of the evidence provided to the team. It is within this context that the team offers the following insights that highlight themes across the organization and ideas for next steps.

Within the fabric of Covington Independent Public Schools, the commitment to the mission and vision exists through a culture described as welcoming, accepting, purposeful, intentional, and safe. The mission of the system is "to inspire and prepare our students to excel academically and personally." The team repeatedly heard from system personnel, parents, and students that all students were encouraged to grow academically, emotionally, and socially. Students especially indicated that teachers and administrators "know us and support us." All stakeholders used terms such as "accepting, community, encouraging, and supportive" when describing the relationships among system and school personnel, students, parents, and community. As an independent, urban system surrounded by larger county systems, CIPS has been intentional in making decisions which will affect the present and future lives of all of their students. The team reviewed Climate and Safety survey data, which revealed that in the elementary schools 95% of students strongly agree/agree that "my school is a caring place." In addition, at the secondary level, 91% of students indicated strongly agree/agree that "teachers expect me to do my best." In the presentation by the CIPS leaders, the superintendent began with "I hope you hear the excitement in my voice" as he talked about the system's educational community, the recently implemented initiatives, and the ever-evolving plans for the future. Interviews and survey data confirmed that students were well-known by teachers, and students indicated they had an adult advocate in their building. To intentionally address behavior, social skills, and peer relations, the system has implemented the CHAMPS (Conversation-level, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation, Success) program, which sets clear expectations for all activities. The system also provides within all schools a Community Learning Center and a Community Learning Coordinator. In addition, the implementation of social-emotional counseling has helped to avert many issues students and teachers face from the impact of the twenty months of uncertainty created by the pandemic. The team encourages the system to foster strong relationships with all stakeholders and seek varied approaches for supporting all students.

The superintendent, Board of Education, system leadership, and school leaders have established an environment that is visionary, progressive, student-centered, and transparent. In seeking an educational environment that supports all learners, the leaders of CIPS have worked to

develop a visionary and progressive path for the system's students. In developing the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) and the Strategic Plan for the system, leaders are integrating initiatives which support both current students and the students who will enter the system in the future. Data are collected and analyzed on student learning and growth, on professional practices implemented in the classrooms across the system, and on the fiscal responsibility and allocation of resources of the system. The Board of Education (Board), in collaboration with the Kentucky School Boards Association (KSBA), establish, review, and revise the policies, procedures, and practices which guide the system. Documentation of policies, timetables for review, and minutes of meetings were available for review by the team. Interviews with Board members and a review of documentation indicated specific trainings for Board members, the code of ethics which each member signs and adheres to, and the written commitments for the members.

Board members adhere to the KSBA guidelines, review fiscal and business management decisions, and receive updates on instructional programs. Throughout the year, each school principal presents a State of the School presentation at specific board meetings. Interviews with Board members indicated that the group is in continual two-way communication with the superintendent through emails, participates in all Kentucky-mandated trainings, and participates in additional trainings when needed. In addition, the Board reviews the Strategic Plan and CDIP to ensure alignment of the Board's focus to the system's goals. Teachers also indicated that the system leaders were visible in the schools, available for consultations and conversations when needed, emphasized a spirit of collaboration, and were supportive of the teachers' innovative instructional practices. Data from teacher interviews indicated that teachers are highly satisfied with support from system leaders and interviews confirmed that teachers had a voice in decision-making issues. One teacher indicated, "The superintendent and system leaders listen, collaborate, and work with us in all decisions."

Interviews with focus group stakeholders, representing several groups, noted that the superintendent and leadership team members were supportive and helpful in both long-range and day-to-day decisions that center on students. Documentation and stakeholder interviews indicated that the superintendent works closely with building-level leadership when making budget allocations, reviewing continuous improvement plans, revising standard operating procedures and practices, and determining needed informational resources and materials. As one stakeholder indicated, "The superintendent's footprints are all over this district" and "He leads by example." Monthly leadership meetings of the system and school-level leaders ensure educational focus is maintained, the voices of all stakeholders are heard, and collaborative efforts guide the system. The district and school leaders provide an open-door approach so that parents, community members, and students can speak directly to district and school leaders. Staff members repeatedly emphasized the visibility of the superintendent and district personnel in schools and at many school activities. Teachers expressed that they have a voice which is heard by system leaders. System leadership was very transparent about challenges in improving student academic performance, increasing consistent, two-way communication, and seeking avenues to retain high-quality teachers. The Board, superintendent, and system and building leaders work tirelessly to implement processes to ensure the system is effective and consistent in efforts to fulfill its purpose. The leadership is encouraged to expand these initiatives and continually seek ways to involve all stakeholders.

CIPS embraces collaboration among system and school personnel in the development of community partnerships and with health agencies to address both physical and mental health challenges. From stakeholder interviews, documented evidence, and social media posts, the team noted the comprehensive, joint effort of collaboration which exists among CIPS' system and school leaders, parents, and community. The students in CIPS are loved, supported, encouraged, helped, and challenged by many adults who give their time, effort, resources, talents, and commitment to ensure the

best opportunities are provided for all CIPS students. In CIPS, the term "it takes a village" becomes "it takes a community." During the past few years, leaders within CIPS have collaborated in specific groups and teams to ensure in-person, hybrid, and remote learning opportunities are available for all students. With additional support from the community, one-to-one technology, the availability of internet hotspots, and technology platforms such as Accessible Textbooks, Mastery Connect, Transcend, Google Classroom, and Clever have become a reality for CIPS. In addition, community support is a pivotal partner for CIPS. Partners include Covington Partners, an organization that has been actively involved with CIPS for many years. The coordinator of the program is an employee of CIPS, and the organization manages the out-of-school time activities for the system. These activities include before-school, after-school, and summer school programs that can reach 900 students per year. Also included are the Leadership and Resiliency Program (LRP) that provides resources for students struggling with substance abuse, a strong one-on-one mentoring program, and a family engagement component that encourages parental involvement at their students' schools. The system also collaborates with the Covington Public Library that provides library cards for all high school students; The Carnegie which provides in-school, out-of-school, and summer school performing arts opportunities for students; and The Center for Great Neighborhoods, an organization which builds thriving families through innovative programs consisting of community organizing, housing development, youth development, and financial literacy. Collaboration with various health agencies is also apparent from stakeholder interviews and artifact documentation. Many students face difficult situations each day within their personal lives. School and professional counselors provide students with not only guidance and advice but also a listening ear and a caring friend to help them navigate daily struggles. As one student indicated, "Our troubles sometimes begin in our community, not in our school." The system also has Peer Advocacy Leadership (PAL) program for upperclassmen to work with younger students. In addition, the system leaders understand that the past twenty months have been difficult, frustrating, and, at times, overwhelming for the faculty and staff. Opportunities for social-emotional support are offered to students and adults of CIPS. The system is encouraged to develop additional collaborative programs within the system and with the at-large community.

The system has developed systemic processes and procedures relating to data-driven, research-based instructional processes, relevant and embedded professional training, high expectations for student achievement, and assessment strategies which include timely feedback to students. Artifact documentation and system stakeholder interviews indicate that over the past several years CIPS has committed to formalizing processes and procedures to improve student learning. The system and school leaders and teacher representatives reviewed the last several years of assessment data, including data from Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), formative assessments, Mastery Connect, and Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (KPREP). The group determined that specific, formalized structures for the system would, in time, begin moving student learning to a more proficient level. The system established ITeams (Instructional Teams), school-based Student Support Teams (SST) and Foundations Teams, principal advisory councils, professional learning community (PLCs) meetings, pacing guides, and district tights (non-negotiables) to support instruction and assessment. The system's results from the collaborative, formalized, systemic procedures were a productive, relevant professional development component, the systemic use of high expectations within each school, and assessment strategies which were aligned to the standards and best practices instruction. As student achievement began to improve, graduation rates increased, and the monitoring and revision of school plans were evolving, then a twenty-month pandemic disrupted many of the initial plans. However, the system personnel were not to be discouraged. Working together, the system has persevered and continues to make necessary revisions, adapt to new learning modalities, and analyze data to determine the necessary adjustments. The system is encouraged to

build on the impressive success of the past few years as they continue to strengthen the academic environment of CIPS.

With the implementation of the new K-12 curriculum, the monitoring and revision of this initiative for curriculum alignments, best practice instruction, and quality assessments are evolving. In August 2021, CIPS rolled out the new K-12 curriculum. The curriculum is intended to create opportunities to engage all learners at high levels and build on skills of the previous school year. To ensure continuity, grade-level and content-level teams have created unit plans. System and school leaders review the units, instructional strategies, and assessments for revision monthly. Common assessments were created in grades 3-12 in various content teams. Grades K-2 common assessments are administered through Mastery Connect. District focus visits, administrator walkthroughs, side-by-side coaching from school-level, instructional coaches, and peer consulting ensure the curriculum is being monitored and adjusted for quality and fidelity. Feedback is provided to teachers weekly by instructional coaches and administrators. Curriculum and instruction data collected by the school are requirements of the systems' assessment analysis protocol. As the system continues navigating the direction and processes of the curriculum initiative, the team encourages consistent monitoring and revision, timely review of the units and assessments, and continued collaboration among all levels of system personnel.

Even though CIPS has a plethora of academic and behavioral data available and detailed procedures for implementing Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) interventions, students struggle in many areas of academic performance, and gaps exist within schools of the system. CIPS is working to ensure higher levels of academic performance by all students; however, using Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) statistics, three of five CIPS elementary schools achieved a 5-star rating, and both the middle and high schools were rated 1-star. The system has implemented processes for ensuring interventions are being utilized at all levels, tutoring is available, Foundations Teams (behavioral) and SST are active at all schools, and data are being used to target students who are struggling academically. The SST reviews data relevant to attendance, behavior referrals, grades, and nurse visits. Each school has a Response to Intervention (RtI) program to address all academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of students. However, as the superintendent stated, "Our main goal is education of our children." The team encourages the system to renew expanded efforts for identifying struggling learners, seeking best practices in instruction and learning, and remaining committed to the education of all students.

In conclusion, the review team commends Covington Independent Public Schools for its commitment to the mission and vision, visionary and transparent leadership, and unwavering focus on students. The Engagement Review Team thanks the system for their genuine engagement in the continuous improvement process and hopes the system will use the insights from this review as they continue moving forward in their quest of ensuring students "Dream. Achieve. Succeed."

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 (Lead Evaluators Only)
Donna Wear, **Lead Evaluator**	Donna Wear holds a Bachelor of Science, Master of Arts, and Rank I (MA +30) certification from Murray State University (MSU). She began her career as a secondary English and social studies teacher, followed by serving as a middle and high school assistant principal and principal. She actively led curriculum, instruction, and assessment initiatives at the school level. Ms. Wear served as the principal/director of the Commonwealth Middle College. Currently, Ms. Wear is a clinical supervisor for the MSU's Teacher Quality Institute and serves as an adjunct faculty member. She teaches practicum courses and observes secondary education practicum students and student teachers. Ms. Wear is a Lead Evaluator and team member for system, school, charter authorizer, and corporation reviews, serves as a Cognia Content Coach and is a member of the Cognia KY Advisory Council.
Ketsy Fields, **Team Member**	Cognia Kentucky Regional Director
Joe Ganns, **Team Member**	Exceptional Child Educator, Boone County High School
Suzanne Navo, **Team Member**	District Grant Writer, East Baton Rouge School District

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.