



Horseshoe Bend Middle/Sr High

Horseshoe Bend, Idaho

October 12-15, 2020

School Accreditation Engagement Review

229800

Table of Contents

Cognia Continuous Improvement System	3
Initiate	3
Improve.....	3
Impact	3
Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review.....	3
Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results.....	4
Leadership Capacity Domain	5
Learning Capacity Domain	6
Resource Capacity Domain	7
Assurances	8
Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®.....	8
Insights from the Review.....	9
Next Steps	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.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	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:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional effectiveness.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution's purpose and direction.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	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.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

Learning Capacity Domain

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

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.1	Learners have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities established by the institution.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	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:	2	SU:	3	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:	2	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.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	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:	
2.12	The institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	

Resource Capacity Domain

The use and distribution of resources support the stated mission of the institution. Institutions ensure that resources are distributed and utilized equitably, so the needs of all learners are adequately and effectively addressed. The utilization of resources includes support for professional learning for all staff. The institution examines the allocation and use of resources to ensure appropriate levels of funding, sustainability, organizational effectiveness, and increased student learning.

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating
3.1	The institution plans and delivers professional learning to improve the learning environment, learner achievement, and the institution's effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	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:	3	RE:	3	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.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	1	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	

Resource Capacity Standards											Rating
3.6	The institution provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the institution.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
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:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
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:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	

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	296.00	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 (team) identified several themes that represent strengths and opportunities to guide Horseshoe Bend Middle/Senior High School in their continuous improvement journey. They include effectively meeting students' specialized needs, the lack of a formal mentoring and coaching process, and the need for stakeholder input and involvement.

Horseshoe Bend Middle/Senior High School effectively meets students' specialized needs and ensures a caring adult is available for each student. Several programs specifically deal with addressing the specialized needs of students. The Care Team is teachers who give up one day a week to meet during lunch to discuss students' social/emotional needs. The student mentoring program involves students assigned or requested by an adult staff member to be their mentor. The mentor teacher meets with the student each semester. The mentor teacher also meets with the student's parents. Grade checks, four-year planning, course selections, and career planning are a few topics discussed. The school has a strong Response to Intervention (RTI) program. These programs complement a strong Special Education program to prevent students from slipping through the cracks. Through interviews and examination of artifacts, the team found a high level of staff engagement contributing to an overall culture of success, service, and building relationships. Students feel supported by their teachers and peers. All stakeholders used the terms "family, community, safe, and caring" as descriptors of the school's environment. The team recommends building on this climate and the support for specialized student needs to a more individualized instructional delivery for all students.

Horseshoe Bend Middle/Senior High School lacks a formal mentoring and coaching process for new and veteran staff. Due to the comparatively small number of staff, informal pairing provides some guidance in knowledge and skill. However, this process does not consistently provide sustained results. Adopting a formalized policy concerning mentoring and coaching will ensure that new and veteran staff function effectively as part of the group and that documentation exists as to the progress of new employees toward the desired goals and expectations. This process would assist with quality and fidelity in achieving the school's purpose and goals.

Collection and analysis of external stakeholder input and stakeholder engagement are limited. Horseshoe Bend Middle/Senior High School incorporates mainly internal stakeholder input shared by all stakeholder groups. The use of parent survey information and incorporating external stakeholders on established committees would help garner information internally and externally. Further, it will better inform decision-making, support the school's purpose and direction, and improve student achievement and organizational effectiveness.

An additional reference that is not incorporated in the themes is the need for policy updates. The district uses the MSBT Model that provides policy revisions four times each year. While some policies regarding the evaluation process were updated in 2017, interviews revealed several updates are needed to meet legal requirements.

In closing, the staff and administration are encouraged to study these themes, standard ratings, and other information reported here to create an action plan. By building upon strengths and prioritizing opportunities for improvement outlined in this report, Horseshoe Bend Middle/Senior High School can successfully continue the improvement journey. It is the intention of the team that the insights offered in this report will provide possible next steps to guide the school's 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
Jerry Nelsen, Lead Evaluator	Jerry Nelsen is a retired secondary school administrator with 34 years in the educational field. He received his master's degree in education administration from the University of Idaho. Mr. Nelsen has experience as a teacher, vice principal, activities director, principal, interim superintendent, and school trustee. He has served on numerous engagement reviews. For the last eight years, he has served as Cognia lead evaluator.
Jackie Johnson	Jackie Johnson is the K-12 principal at the Garden Valley School District in Garden Valley, Idaho. She has served her district for 14 years in various roles including teaching elementary school, K-12 academic counselor, curriculum director, and assistant principal. She earned her undergraduate degree in elementary education at Eastern Oregon University in LaGrande, Oregon. She then earned her master's degree and endorsement in gifted and talented education while majoring in curriculum and instruction. She earned an additional endorsement in K-12 school administration at the University of Idaho. She is currently working toward her education specialist degree with a superintendent certification through the University of Idaho. She has assisted the school accreditation team at her local district.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Wayne Rush	<p>Wayne Rush has most recently served as the superintendent for the Emmett Independent School District in Idaho, a comprehensive district with 2600 students. He has had a varied career that included thirteen years as a superintendent and six years with the J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation. While with the Foundation, he designed and oversaw a statewide professional development effort in the integration of technology into teaching and learning, along with other foundation initiatives focused on technology and Career Technical Education. Wayne has also been the Chairman of the Board for the Idaho Digital Learning Academy. He served as Idaho's tech prep state coordinator for the Division of Professional-Technical Education, working with high school reform efforts and connecting high schools with postsecondary education. His career also included working for the University of Idaho as the Alumni Director and the College of Agriculture as the assistant to the director of academic programs.</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.

