



Americas
Mid-Atlantic DoDEA

Fort Bragg, North Carolina

February 22 - March 5, 2020

System Accreditation Engagement Review

214922

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	5
Resource Capacity Domain	6
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® Results.....	7
Assurances.....	9
Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®.....	9
Insights from the Review	10
Next Steps	16
Team Roster	18
References and Readings	27



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 (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 system commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning including the expectations for learners.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the system's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	4	
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:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	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.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	3	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the system's purpose and direction.										Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	3	
1.9	The system provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	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.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
1.11	Leaders implement a quality assurance process for its institutions to ensure system effectiveness and consistency.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	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: 4 IM: 4 RE: 4 SU: 2 EM: 4	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.	Initiating
	EN: 2 IM: 2 RE: 2 SU: 2 EM: 2	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs and skills needed for success.	Impacting
	EN: 4 IM: 4 RE: 4 SU: 3 EM: 4	
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: 3 SU: 2 EM: 3	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.	Impacting
	EN: 4 IM: 4 RE: 3 SU: 4 EM: 4	
2.6	The system implements a process to ensure the curriculum is clearly aligned to standards and best practices.	Impacting
	EN: 4 IM: 4 RE: 4 SU: 4 EM: 4	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the system's learning expectations.	Impacting
	EN: 4 IM: 4 RE: 4 SU: 4 EM: 4	
2.8	The system provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.	Initiating
	EN: 3 IM: 2 RE: 1 SU: 1 EM: 2	
2.9	The system implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.	Impacting
	EN: 4 IM: 4 RE: 4 SU: 4 EM: 4	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.	Impacting





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

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:	3	RE:	4	SU:	4	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:	4	SU:	4	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.										Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	1	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	2	
3.4	The system attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the system's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	2	
3.5	The system integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	3	
3.6	The system provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the system.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	3	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





Resource Capacity Standards										Rating	
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
3.8	The system allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the system's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® Results

The Cognia eProve™ Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) is a learner-centric classroom observation tool that comprises 28 items organized in seven environments aligned with the Cognia Standards. Classroom observations are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes. Trained and certified observers take into account the level of embeddedness, quality, and complexity of application or implementation; number of students engaged and frequency of application. Results from the eleot are reported on a scale of one to four based on the students' engagement in and reaction to the learning environment. In addition to the results from the review, the average results from all reviews for the previous year are reported to benchmark your results against. The eleot provides useful, relevant, structured, and quantifiable data on the extent to which students are engaged in activities and/or demonstrate knowledge, attitudes, and/or dispositions that are conducive to effective learning.

The insights eleot data provide an invaluable source of information for continuous improvement planning efforts. Although averages by eleot Learning Environment are helpful to gauge quality at a higher, more impressionistic level, the average rating for each item is more fine-grained, specific and actionable. Institutions should identify the five to seven items with the lowest ratings and examine patterns in those ratings within and across environments to identify areas for improvement. Similarly, identifying the five to seven items with the highest ratings also will assist in identifying strengths within and across eleot Learning Environments. Examining the eleot data in conjunction with other institution data will provide valuable feedback on areas of strength or improvement in institution's learning environments.

eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot Observations:		691
Environments	Rating	2018-19 Averages
Equitable Learning Environment	3.05	2.82
Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs	2.69	2.34
Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support	3.47	3.30
Learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner	3.50	3.45
Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions and dispositions	2.55	2.18
High Expectations Environment	2.98	2.71





eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot Observations:		691
Environments	Rating	2018-19 Averages
Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher	3.05	2.74
Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable	3.18	2.95
Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work	2.77	2.43
Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing)	2.94	2.67
Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning	2.97	2.78
Supportive Learning Environment	3.39	3.15
Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful	3.35	3.07
Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback)	3.29	2.97
Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks	3.44	3.24
Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher	3.47	3.34
Active Learning Environment	3.02	2.71
Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate	3.12	2.77
Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences	2.83	2.41
Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities	3.34	3.12
Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments	2.76	2.45
Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment	2.91	2.63
Learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored	2.82	2.43
Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work	3.19	2.93
Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content	3.15	2.90
Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed	2.46	2.25
Well-Managed Learning Environment	3.36	3.20
Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other	3.53	3.42
Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others	3.52	3.35
Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another	3.14	2.89





eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot Observations:		691
Environments	Rating	2018-19 Averages
Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions	3.27	3.15
Digital Learning Environment	1.97	1.79
Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning	2.22	1.97
Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning	1.90	1.79
Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning	1.78	1.61

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 provides 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	351.61	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 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 themes from the review that correlate to the continuous improvement process for enhancing the goals for the system. These themes present strengths and opportunities to guide the improvement journey and are offered within the context of a clear understanding on the part of the team of the school system’s recent journey. The Americas Mid-Atlantic school system did not exist as a school system three years ago but actually as several school systems, each under the leadership of a superintendent. Since that time, the systems have been restructured into one school system consisting of 26 schools located in three states (North Carolina, Virginia, New York), Cuba, and Puerto Rico, nine military commands under the leadership of one superintendent and four community superintendents. The system encompasses nine commands representing Army, Marine, Coast Guard, and Navy bases. Additionally, this Engagement Review is the first for the school system in the systems accreditation model.

The Americas Mid-Atlantic DoDEA developed and maintains a solid and targeted focus on student learning. Conversations with over 1500 stakeholders, observations in more than 691 classrooms, and a thorough review of evidence indicate that there are a number of processes, conditions, and organizational practices in place to support this finding. The school system has in place a clearly aligned curriculum supported by an aligned assessment system. A predominance of performance standard scores was rated at the i3 Impacting Level, and results from the Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (eleot 2.0) indicate student learning is a priority. Scores in every environment for the system exceeded the Cognia AIN average scores and also exceeded the average scores for all systems in DoDEA (Department of Defense Education Activity) schools. The success of its endeavors can be attributed to a number of themes identified by the Engagement Review Team and outlined briefly in this report. Given the significant number of standards rated at the impacting level, this theme-approach will provide information for the school system in an integrated manner to inform their continuous improvement efforts moving forward.

Using data to change teaching and organizational practice is the lifestyle of the system. Formalized processes are in place to collect, analyze, and inform future direction. Conversations with leaders in the system indicate that there are a number of data cycles where information is gathered and analyzed, and decisions are made based on that analysis. School administrators complete Quarterly Impact Reports that are submitted to the system’s administration to provide information from each school regarding the data gathered from observations of student learning using the DoDEA Learning Walk-Through Tool (LWT). The Engagement Review Team observed SMART (Specific,





Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound) goals in action on every campus by administrators, teachers, and, in many cases, students. Schools have continuous improvement plans aligned to the DoDEA Blueprint and the system's improvement plan with identified valid metrics to determine the successful implementation of goals and objectives. Conversations with teaching staff indicate that they are more data-informed as a result of the practice of data review in their Focused Collaboration groups. A system Data Committee with representatives from each site meets monthly to look at relevant data, including student performance, eleot data, and attendance trends. The Data Committee partners with other committees to collect, analyze, monitor, and report system progress in each of the Mid-Atlantic District Framework areas. The committee's strategic purpose is defined as "to move from having data to using data to monitor progress, measure impact, and modify instruction for student success." A system-wide committee structure reviews data to inform decisions in every aspect of the work. System administration reports that the data derived from the use of the Focused Collaboration Observation Tool (FCOT) are showing growth in achieving higher levels of collaboration among participants. Results from internal reviews using eleot and data from the LWT indicated the need for increased use of technology in support of student learning. As a result, additional professional development was provided, and the system has seen an increase in student use of technology in support of student learning. The Digital Learning Environment score demonstrated during the review is above both the Cognia AIN and the DoDEA average, indicating that this practice is having an impact. Stakeholder feedback is gathered through various Google Forms and the DoDEA Customer Satisfaction Survey. Schools are also beginning to use social media as a way to gather feedback. These data are analyzed to identify areas of focus. The school system has fully implemented a continuous improvement framework rooted in Cognia's System and School Quality Factors Diagnostics. These tools have provided a data gathering/analysis process for the school system. Every school, as well as the school system, has engaged in at least two cycles of evaluating these factors. The system has implemented a process for measuring the data gathered from these diagnostics and identified both "celebrations" and "opportunities for improvement." These data provide a set of "next steps" in the continuous improvement process. It is also a major component of the quality assurance processes in place in the system. Continuous School Improvement (CSI) Committees are operating across the system using data to support their efforts. Committees include those charged with Professional Learning, Instructional Practices, Stakeholder Connect, Communication, Digital Learning, Focused Collaboration, and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS). The philosophy of operation and cycle for data impact is summarized by the system as the "what," "so what," and "now what." Sustaining this commitment and "lifestyle" is critical for continued success in meeting the system's vision and mission.

Quality assurance practices ensure accountability and ultimately move the system to higher levels of student success. The school system established and engages in a thorough, reflective, and inclusive internal review process to assure that all schools are meeting standards to address the priorities of the school system and DoDEA in general and to identify areas of support. A regular schedule of on-site team visits has been implemented. These site visits are announced and are conducted by integrated teams from the schools and the system at least annually, and often more frequently. These events are patterned, much like the Engagement Review from Cognia. Administrators at each campus provide an "in brief," which summarizes academic data in terms of the three questions (what, so what, and now what) that includes DoDEA Summative Data, data from the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS), School Quality Factor (SQF) data, school formative assessment data, and the District Math Assessment information. They further highlight celebrations, as well as initiatives that are a result of their SQF data analysis. Specific expectations are identified and monitored as to the types and format of evidence to be supplied to the team in anticipation of this internal review and include evidences around professional learning, implementation of the school





improvement plan, instructional components, and evidence in support of School Quality Factors. During the on-site review, the team conducts eleot observations in every classroom and reports that data back to the school for additional review and study. Following this intensive on-site review, each school receives an After Action Report (AAR), which outlines the “big takeaways” and provides for the schools a Learning Standards report with powerful practices, as well as recommendations and the eleot score reports. During the 2018-2019 school year, the “big takeaways” that were identified based on the data from this process included the following three areas of focus: differentiation, progress monitoring, and effective use of digital learning tools. At the system level, AAR meetings were held with all of the Instructional Support Specialists (ISS) and the community superintendents. The ISS team analyzed the academic, internal review and SQF data and provided data-driven recommendations for system focus. The community superintendents, as a result, analyzed the information and determined system priorities for the following year (2019-2020), as well as changed the indicators for emphasis in the Learning Walk-Through process. Interviews with school leadership indicate that this quality assurance process provides them with data that are actionable and the support to implement changes in practice at the local level. Throughout any given year, quality assurance is measured through the gathering of data reported in the Quarterly Impact Report. This report not only contains data around the number of walk-throughs conducted but also includes themes identified from these learning visits, the progress of the school’s SMART goals, as well as progress on the goals identified across the system for specific attention. Evidences abound as to the implementation of these formalized quality assurance processes. Interviews with administrators and teachers attest to the value of these processes. Charts and graphs indicate the data and also indicate areas of improvement. In addition to the formal internal review process, schools review progress made on the measure of the School Quality Factors. They have done this in two cycles so far, and as a result of their response, they identify, chart, and measure areas to “glow about” and areas to “grow.” Quality assurance is further defined and assured through the implementation and training around sets of District Expectations for Administrators and system ISSs. Continuing this internal review process/feedback cycle will move the system to higher levels of performance and will maintain the momentum that has been created and is thriving already.

Collaboration is the norm and is the opportunity for those who can do something with data - actually to do something with data. The system has implemented with a high degree of fidelity, the Focused Collaboration initiative, as outlined by DoDEA. Clear expectations are provided that include administrator’s role in the meetings and process, the time expectations to be allocated weekly, the expectations for documentation, and taking of minutes and guidelines around the collection and review of the data. The expectation is that these collaboration meetings become more and more teacher-directed; therefore, administrators may function as facilitators, co-facilitators, and eventually only participants. ISS staff members are also expected to attend, assist, and participate in these sessions. In effort to identify themes across all schools, Team Zulu posed questions to every administrator regarding the implementation and the impact of this initiative. Although there was some variation (within the guidelines) about the actual schedule (day/time), the team found that this initiative is fully functional and operational in every setting. As in any large system, there is a continuum of how well it is operating across all groups, but interviews indicate that it is making an impact on student learning system wide. To further the impact of these collaboration activities, administrators conduct data collection through the Focused Collaboration Observation Tool (FCOT) and enter this information into the Focused Collaboration Observation Database. They are expected to conduct an observation of at least one Focused Collaboration team weekly. The results of these observations are again analyzed at the school and system level to identify areas of support and areas of celebration. The information gained supports the professional learning program in the school and system and assists in identifying areas of need. Guidance for quality implementation is provided through the Journey to





Excellence model. Feedback from the protocol revealed a need to develop additional professional learning for leaders on writing SMART goals and working through the four critical questions to complete the focused collaboration cycle. The Focused Collaboration Committee, in coordination with the Center for Instructional Leadership (CIL), developed sessions for Summer Leadership on SMART goals and working through the stages of Focused Collaboration. The “Journey to Excellence” poster and SMART goal guide were tools developed for leadership training. Feedback called for the development of a simplified format for the Agenda and Minutes Tool. The CIL led the work to simplify the tool for use in SY 2019-2020 across the Americas Region. Interviews with administrators at all levels indicate that the formal processes in Focused Collaboration, as well as collaboration in general, improved because of the analysis of over 400 of these agendas. Teachers interviewed indicated that they had seen changes in their practice and the offering of relevant and meaningful professional learning opportunities. Information gathered and analyzed indicates that the system is showing growth at higher stages of collaboration among faculty and staff. A continued focus on clarity around expectations for Focused Collaboration, a review of its effectiveness in changing teaching practice, and ultimately measuring the impact on student learning will further the system’s initiative with greater buy-in from all participants.

Students are using technology to enrich their learning opportunities and experiences.

Interviews and observations across 691 classrooms indicated students were engaged in improving their learning through the use of technology. A review of the Digital Learning Environment score indicates a high observation score. Interviews indicate that a clearer focus on quality implementation of technology tools by students was needed through data from the Learning Walk-Throughs and the implementation of eleot observations by the internal review teams. Support for classroom teachers is provided by a network of educational technologists (ETs) who provide support in the use of technology for instructional purposes. The system conducts an annual summit, and they have documented several critical results of such practices that include the development of professional learning networks (PLN), increased planning and implementation of co-planning/co-teaching opportunities in the classrooms, and the provision of professional learning opportunities to increase digital learning. They have also begun the development of a system Digital Learning Plan. This online plan provides support for all users through “connections” to DoDEA expectations, instructional expectations, including the DoDEA Blueprint, standards from the International Society for Technology Education (ISTE), and the SAMR (Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, Redefinement) model. Connections are further provided to professional learning and a number of resources. Data gathered and analyzed by the system through the LWT indicate growth over time in the implementation and use of digital/multimedia tools (Indicator 3). Summer training was provided to administrators on engaging instruction, progress monitoring, and incorporating digital tools into instruction. The train-the-trainer type model is implemented, and administrators provide this support to their faculty and staff. DoDEA schools are always well-resourced with the most current and appropriate equipment. The system demonstrated support in ways that promote high levels of appropriate use by students to enhance their learning. The system created and implemented quality assurance practices, focused its efforts and capitalized on the power of collaboration, and are highly data-informed in their decision-making practices. Clearly, the system uses data in all instructional decisions; however, data are not always used to evaluate programs and services.

Program evaluation, as a prevalent theme for improvement, is not fully realized as a practice in the system. The emphasis of program evaluation appears to focus primarily on curriculum and assessment – truly critical components of the system’s instructional mandate. The Engagement Review Team identified several areas where effective program evaluation would enhance the system’s ability to meet the standard at a higher level and impact student success to a greater degree. Given the overall high levels of performance by the school system with respect to the Standards’





ratings and the overall Index of Education Quality (IEQ), these areas are offered as areas of relative limitation and a focus for future efforts in continuous improvement. Quality program assessment is underway to evaluate curricular alignment to standards, the evaluation of standards, assessment, and Depth of Knowledge (DOK) of the assessments as well as the implementation of instructional delivery. Several key areas are identified for further study as a result of the Engagement Review Team's assessment of Standards specific to these areas. The school system fully implements DoDEA's College and Career Ready Standards (CCRS). Parent interviews, however, indicate that the services provided to students in assisting them with preparing them for educational futures and career planning are somewhat inconsistent. Some parents indicated that their children were not having meetings with counselors to prepare for college. Interviews during the in-brief indicate that the career and futures steps are new and have not expanded K-12 yet. Informational meetings for students on college processes and options were not perceived by parents as frequent or effective. It appears that the ASCA (American School Counselor Association) model is followed, but a program evaluation does not appear to be found. The AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) program is available only to a limited number of students across the system. Given the ever-changing school experiences of military-connected families, a consistent program of support is critical. The system should consider, as one of its program evaluation expectations, a regular review of practices and programs in place across all schools to address this need. Instructional practices observed across the 230+ hours of instruction indicate that students are exposed to high levels of learning; however, comments from the team members and students indicate that a stronger focus on innovative, creative problem-solving activities is needed. Scores from the Active Learning Environment (eleot) indicate "above benchmark" scores. The area of relative weakness appears to be "Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks, and/or assignments." Although apparent in some schools, such practices were inconsistently observed. Some examples of project-based learning were observed; in some centers, students were involved in problem-based activities. Schools are using data to make instructional decisions and allow for more collaborative opportunities for students, but schools are not always geared toward creativity, innovation, or problem-solving. No evidence of a focus on creativity/innovation for students was found in collaborative minutes or during interviews with team members. Emphasis is on implementation - the lessons themselves have not been analyzed to ensure consistent emphasis on creativity, innovation, and problem-solving. These lesson elements were found throughout the system (pockets of excellence) but not consistently throughout the system. This is an appropriate next step for the school system. The school system has established a solid foundation for student learning that is supported by clearly aligned instructional practices, as well as clearly aligned assessment practices. Next, for consideration, is a review (program evaluation) of grading practices. The effective implementation of Focused Collaboration has resulted in an improvement in grading consistency within collaboration teams. However, the Engagement Review Team did not find consistent grading scales or practices across grades, schools, or system wide. A call for program evaluation is needed to solidify the foundation further and to communicate student performance system-wide with fidelity. The implementation of supervision practices is an additional program evaluation task that would serve the system to a greater degree in its quest to provide quality learning opportunities for every student. The data gained from the Learning Walk-Throughs are analyzed and providing some information about learning environments. Teachers are not systemically developing SMART goals for themselves. The new teacher observation form (DPMAP) is being implemented and may yield information to support change in practice. A thorough review of supervision expectations and practices (a program evaluation) would provide additional support for future planning efforts.

Continued efforts to define and increase parent engagement will assist the system in meeting its mission of educating, engaging, and empowering military-connected students to succeed in





a dynamic world. The school system has identified goals to increase the level and opportunities for parents to be engaged in the educational experiences of their children. Stakeholder opportunities abound, including parent conference opportunities, parent workshops, communication venues, and individual opportunities for feedback. School advisory boards exist to provide feedback to the leadership teams at the schools. Parents provide feedback through instruments that are approved and used by the schools. Parents report, in conversations, that they don't often get feedback as a result of any input they have given. They do not see the results of any climate or Google form data they have provided. The School Quality Factors Diagnostics completed by every school has identified this improvement in stakeholder involvement (primarily parent involvement) as an area of future focus. It was difficult for the Engagement Review Team to determine if data analyses about climate or other feedback from stakeholders were included in improvement plans either at the system or school levels as decisions were being made about school improvement areas. Community board members as stakeholders also reported confusion among stakeholders about board roles in advising community superintendents and the system. Data analyses about social media were mentioned by system leaders as being considered, but up to this point, no systematic process for collecting results about communication with stakeholders has been identified. Some parents report receiving school-level information, but some parents reported not knowing or receiving information about the schools' or the system's performance on student achievement. Because of the plethora of communication options available, various stakeholders reported various ways of receiving communications from school leaders and the system; however, several parents and students reported being "out of the loop" with receiving notification of events. In its quest to assure increased parent engagement and a resulting positive impact, the system may wish to consider defining its expectations for parent involvement/engagement. Further defining the metrics for parent engagement will allow them to determine whether their efforts are successful and assist them in becoming data-informed with respect to this area.

A formalized systemic induction, mentoring, and coaching process will enhance the ability of professional staff in the delivery of quality teaching. Although the professional staff in the system demonstrate less change and turn-over than in many of the other DoDEA school systems, it is critical for student learning that new teachers and teachers new to the DoDEA system be afforded a consistent, high-quality process of induction, mentoring, and coaching. Such a formalized program will assure that they clearly understand the teaching and learning expectations for the school/system, that they have a clear understanding of where to seek support, and that they understand what it means to live and teach within the culture of DoDEA. Interviews at the school level indicate that these processes occur formally and informally and are often delivered either as a result of some specific assignment or occur because of new friendships developed in the process. A clearly defined program will assure that in every school setting, new staff quickly acclimate and are provided support system-wide and perhaps avoid future misunderstandings or confusion.

Local relationships between the schools and military leadership can be further developed to enhance the mutual partnership so critical for DoDEA school success. Interviews with commands in every military base where schools are housed in the system indicate some inconsistency in communication. Team Zulu conducted conversations with 14 military leaders across all branches of the military represented in the system. In some cases, these leaders referred to their regular and consistent engagement and communication with school leaders and system leaders. In other cases, this did not appear to be a regular and consistent practice. The partnership for success between the schools and the military presence is critically dependent upon regular, frequent, and personal communication.

The Engagement Review Team, in its findings, identified a number of celebrations. These





celebrations exist because of the dedicated and hard work of the leaders and instructional staff. Formalized processes for continuous improvement have been developed and implemented and are a result of the high commitment to continuous improvement embraced by the leaders. The system engages in an effective continuous improvement process; demonstrates a genuine commitment toward challenging students with equitable opportunities for all; and ensures alignment of long-range planning and resource management to the system’s key priorities. Building on the system’s strong foundation of effective operational practices and supporting a highly efficacious system dedicated to student learning, a focus on meeting the needs of military-connected families and sustainable program evaluation initiatives and practices will continue to enhance a culture of challenge, support, and success for all learners.

The parents and students of the Americas Mid-Atlantic District are privileged to be part of a family that supports each other in the development and success of the whole child. Much success has been achieved, and greater success awaits as the institution continues its quest towards improvement. Serious considerations of the information contained in this report, both data (classroom observations, element ratings, and Standard ratings), as well as suggestions for further study, will support the school system in its improvement efforts. Using tools provided by Cognia, including the Cognia Performance Standards with Key Concepts (Systems) and the i3 Rubric, in conjunction with the element ratings contained in this report for each Standard, will enable the school system to chart a path for continuous improvement.

DoDEA eleot® System Scores by Environment	Americas Mid-Atlantic	DoDEA Average Seven Systems	AIN 2018-2019
Date	2020	NA	2019
Equitable Learning	3.05	2.93	2.82
High Expectations	2.98	2.93	2.71
Supportive Learning	3.39	3.30	3.15
Active Learning	3.02	3.00	2.71
Progress Monitoring	2.91	2.88	2.63
Well Managed Learning	3.36	3.34	3.20
Digital Learning	1.97	1.82	1.79
Overall Average Score	2.96	2.89	2.72
Number of Observations/Hours	691/230.3	4278/1426	1.2 million

Next Steps

Upon receiving the Accreditation Engagement Review Report the institution is encouraged to implement the following steps:





- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.
- Develop plans to address the areas for improvement identified by the Engagement Review Team.
- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.
- Celebrate the successes noted in the report
- Continue the improvement journey





Team Roster

The Engagement Review Teams are comprised of professionals with varied backgrounds and professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members complete Cognia training and elite certification to provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team ZULU	Brief Biography
<p>Dr. W. Darrell Barringer, Lead Evaluator</p>	<p>Darrell Barringer's educational career spans over 44 years. On June 30, 2012, he retired from Lexington School District One in Lexington, South Carolina, after working there for 34 years. During his career, he served as an elementary school principal for 29 years and had the privilege of opening two new schools. In addition to the principal role, he taught grades 2-6 and served as an assistant principal. He has also served with SACS since 1983, having chaired teams in over 40 countries, as well as in the United States of America. His service has included schools, systems, digital learning institutions, corporations, and the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools. Dr. Barringer's B.A. is in biblical education from Columbia International University, and his M.Ed. (elementary education), his Ed.S. (administration), and Ph.D. (elementary education) are from the University of South Carolina. Dr. Barringer joined the Cognia family on July 1, 2012, as the director for Cognia South Carolina and later became vice president for volunteer services. He retired from Cognia in September 2019 but continues to serve as a Lead Evaluator and volunteer.</p>
<p>Dr. Maria Ojeda, Associate Lead Evaluator</p>	<p>Maria Ojeda is the vice president for Cognia Global Services. She received her bachelor's degree in education from the University of Puerto Rico, a master's degree in Preschool Motor Learning from Virginia Tech University, and a doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of New Mexico. As a retired professor from the College of Education at the University of Puerto Rico UPR), Dr. Ojeda has been an educator for over 25 years. She served both as a preschool and elementary teacher, a principal at the University of Puerto Rico Laboratory Elementary School, an associate dean of Academics for the University of Puerto Rico, and an executive assistant to the University of Puerto Rico Chancellor. She is the author of four books, 35 articles and chapters in books, and created movement-based curriculum materials for pre-service teachers and students. Dr. Ojeda worked extensively in Latin America, the Caribbean, Europe, Asia, and the Middle East as a Lead Evaluator, consultant, and presenter. Dr. Ojeda's topics include child development, perceptual-motor development, active learning, play, curricular planning, and decision-making, alternative assessment, and data-driven instruction.</p>





Team Alpha	Brief Biography
Maureen Ryff, Captain	Mrs. Maureen Ryff is a retired secondary school social studies instructor and administrator. Mrs. Ryff holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in American history and French and a master's degree in political science from the University of Wyoming. Her administrative endorsements include principal for grades K-12 and curriculum director. Mrs. Ryff taught social studies and French for 30 years at the middle and high school levels and served as a high school principal for ten years. She earned several awards for excellence in education. She serves on the Wyoming Board of Directors for the Wyoming Academic Decathlon. She is a Cognia Lead Evaluator Mentor. She served on numerous school and system Engagement Review Teams in the United States and overseas.
Carmen Pough Banks	Carmen Pough Banks is an educator who taught at the secondary and post-secondary levels and retired from the SC Department of Education. Mrs. Banks served as a secondary teacher, as well as a post-secondary adjunct professor. Mrs. Banks has a master's in education degree and has strong curriculum development experience. She is known for her successful work with adult learners. As a career educator and seasoned presenter, she continues to provide staff development and coaching for selected schools within the state. Her experiences include developing and monitoring a system of external review audits for schools designated as below average; monitoring statewide teams performing on-site visits and reviews of schools designated as unsatisfactory; conducting training for teams performing external and internal audits using three focus areas (leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, and professional development); and working with federal and state legislation translated into operational procedures. She has been an accreditation specialist for Cognia for ten years, serving as a team member, Lead Evaluator, and Early Learning Lead Evaluator.
Dr. Michael Bugenski	Mike Bugenski is a Lead Evaluator with Cognia and is a former teacher, central office administrator, ESA administrator, adjunct university professor, and former Cognia Michigan State Director. He worked for four educational service agencies in Michigan as a strategic planning consultant and an instructional coach to schools. He also served as the associate director for the Michigan School Administrator Association and directed a state-wide professional development program training prospective superintendents and principals across Michigan. He is completing his 50th year as an educator with degrees from Michigan State University and Eastern Michigan University. He led reviews for Cognia in the Middle East, Europe, China, and 27 states in the U.S.



Team Alpha	Brief Biography
Dr. Michelle Howard-Brahaney	<p>Michelle Howard-Brahaney served as the superintendent for the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA)'s Europe South District since September 2018. The Europe South District consists of 16 elementary, middle, and high schools spread across Italy, Spain, Turkey, and Bahrain. Hailing from Ottawa Lake, Michigan, Dr. Howard-Brahaney started her career as a middle school teacher for students with emotional and learning impairments. In 1999, she became a school administrator for the Monroe County Intermediate School District. In 2009, Dr. Howard-Brahaney was named the assistant superintendent for Special Education and Early Childhood Services, leading a department of nearly 500 staff. Dr. Howard-Brahaney holds a bachelor's degree in elementary and special education, a master's degree in special education, and an educational specialist degree in administration from Wayne State University. In 2016, she received her Doctor of Philosophy in theory and social foundations of education from the University of Toledo, Ohio. While working towards her degrees, Dr. Howard-Brahaney served as an adjunct professor at the University of Toledo and Bowling Green State University, Ohio, teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in the College of Education.</p>

Team Bravo	Brief Biography
Dr. Tina Mondale, Captain	<p>Tina Mondale serves as a Field Consultant for Cognia in the Pacific US region, as well as a lead evaluator for digital learning, school, and school systems. She received her B.S. in elementary education, a master's degree in curriculum and instruction, and an Ed.D. in educational leadership. Dr. Mondale served as a classroom teacher at the elementary and secondary levels before receiving her administrative credential. She created and delivered professional development for teachers and administrators in her role as an instructional technology specialist at the Southern Oregon Education Service District. As part of a 13-district team, she developed and served as the first principal of Oregon Online, a regional 9-12 online program. Most recently, Dr. Mondale served for 12 years as a school improvement director in Southern Oregon overseeing curriculum, professional development, federal programs, and school and district improvement. Dr. Mondale works with districts across the state as a systems improvement coach. She served as a team member and Lead Evaluator for NW Accreditation/Cognia for 12 years.</p>



Team Bravo	Brief Biography
Paul Bielawski	Paul Bielawski is a Field Consultant and Lead Evaluator with Cognia Michigan, working with schools and school districts on accreditation and school improvement. He has degrees from Albion College and the University of Michigan with advanced training in the areas of curriculum, foundations, history, evaluation, and policy. Mr. Bielawski retired following a career of 37 years with the State of Michigan in areas including grants, technology, curriculum, school improvement, assessment, policy, accountability, and data collection and reporting. In his state role, he spent many years engaged in the work of Cognia in Michigan. In his consulting role, he focuses on policy and data analysis related to school improvement.
Mary Anne Hipp	Mary Anne Hipp, currently a Louisiana resident, is a retired Catholic school administrator with 53 years of educational experience across the United States. She holds graduate degrees in music education, K-8 education, and education supervision and administration. Ms. Hipp has been a Cognia system Lead Evaluator across the United States for the past ten years and currently serves as a Cognia mentor for Lead Evaluators. Her Cognia work has also included serving in the Dominican Republic and on the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) teams in Germany, Spain, and Italy.
Kelly Knipe	Kelly Knipe has over thirty years in the education profession and is currently the senior director, Europe-Africa Region, of Global Services with Cognia. The senior director works closely with the regional vice president to develop and implement effective strategic plans encompassing Cognia services, products, compliance, policies, and regulations and provides technical assistance, professional development, and delivery. Ms. Knipe has been a bilingual/ESL instructor from the elementary grades through high school in three different states in the U.S. and taught citizenship classes and GED classes in local adult education programs for several years. Ms. Knipe served as a teacher trainer for the Cadre of Teacher Trainers with the Dallas Independent School District. She worked with pre-entry university students in the English Language Institute at Oklahoma State University and taught Survival English to Saudi nationals. After 25 years in public education, Ms. Knipe transitioned to the private sector to join Cognia, where she has worked since July 2017.





Team Bravo	Brief Biography
Dr. Julia Williams	Julia Williams, Ph.D., is a professor of education at the University of Minnesota Duluth. She holds a doctorate in educational leadership, a master's degree in curriculum and instruction, and a B.S. in secondary English education. Her areas of specialty include assessment, continuous improvement processes and planning, and program evaluation. She is a licensed secondary principal and district superintendent. Dr. Williams' research and publications include studies of schools and the integration of leadership, staff development, student achievement, and supervision. She served as primary investigator and evaluator on grants awarded by the National Science Foundation and the US Department of Homeland Security. Over the past 25 years, Dr. Williams served as a Lead Evaluator for over 100 reviews for schools, systems, digital schools, corporations, corporation systems, and other categories across the Cognia organization. She had been a member of the Minnesota State Council for many years. She served as a member of the Commission on Schools and serves as a Cognia Lead Evaluator Mentor for systems, schools, and corporations.

Team Charlie	Brief Biography
Dr. Mark Mathern, Captain	Mark Mathern retired as the associate superintendent of curriculum and instruction, Natrona County School District, Casper, Wyoming, after 32 years as a classroom teacher, school principal, and district administrator. He works with the North Central Association and Cognia on school improvement efforts and has led staff development sessions for other educational organizations. Since 2015, he has been a Lead Evaluator for schools and systems in over a dozen states, the Middle East, and DoDEA. Currently, he works with Cognia as a Lead Evaluator Mentor. Dr. Mathern has a B.A. from North Dakota State University in classical languages, an M.A. from the University of Wyoming in educational administration, and an Ed.D. from Seton Hall University.
Sharon Bell	Sharon Bell currently serves as director of Volunteer Services within the Certification Division of Cognia. Prior to joining Cognia, she served as a classroom educator at the elementary and middle school levels in Oklahoma and Kansas. Mrs. Bell served as the associate state director of Cognia Kansas for twelve years prior to moving to the regional level. She holds masters' degrees in educational leadership and curriculum and instruction from Emporia State University. In addition, she is certified as a school improvement specialist from the University of Nebraska.





Team Charlie	Brief Biography
Dr. Cynthia Cash-Greene	Cynthia Cash-Greene, Ed.D., served as a professional educator for over 35 years, of which 25 years were served in administration. Administrative positions include superintendent in both rural and urban districts, area superintendent, principal, assistant principal, educator associate with the SC Department of Education, director of personnel, and Educator Quality. Currently, Dr. Cash-Greene serves as Chief Instructional Officer with Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 in Orangeburg SC. Dr. Cas-Greene served as a member of the South Carolina Cognia Council for the past six years. She also served as Lead Evaluator, Associate Lead Evaluator, and team member in Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.
David Dinges	David Dinges has been with DoDEA 20 years and currently serves as the DoDEA HQ continuous improvement and accreditation specialist. Prior to joining DoDEA HQ, he was the Americas Southeast District ISS for Assessment and Accountability. Mr. Dinges served as principal and successfully led two DoDEA schools in Germany and Korea to win National Blue Ribbon Awards from the U.S. Department of Education. He also taught elementary and middle school students in Grafenwoehr, Germany, Iwakuni, Japan, Ft. Meade, Maryland, and Stephenville, Maryland. Mr. Dinges grew up in an Army family and, as a military child, spent his childhood years living overseas. He is a graduate of Vicenza American High School, a DoDEA school in Italy. He earned a bachelor's degree in political science from McDaniel College (formerly Western Maryland College). Mr. Dinges is an army veteran and served as a military intelligence analyst. He subsequently earned a master's in education administration from the University of Phoenix.
Holly Wingard	Holly Wingard, a Lead Evaluator for Cognia, currently leads teams throughout the United States and the Middle East. Though retired from Spartanburg School District Three in South Carolina, she remains active, serving as a consultant for systems preparing for Engagement Reviews and as a facilitator for systems in the development of strategic plans. Ms. Wingard worked in both a large urban school district and a small rural system. She worked as a teacher, counselor, and gifted and talented coordinator. During her 34 years in education, she also worked with the accountability department and served on administrative teams. Ms. Wingard earned a Bachelor of Arts in sociology from the University of Georgia and a Master of Education in student personnel from the University of South Carolina. Her master's plus thirty includes courses taken from the University of South Carolina, Converse College, and The Citadel in counseling, administration, and teacher evaluation. Ms. Wingard served on Diagnostic Review Teams in South Carolina and led monitoring reviews. She is also a Cognia Improvement Consultant for North Carolina.



Team Delta	Brief Biography
<p>Jill Bramlet, Captain</p>	<p>Jill Bramlet is a Field Consultant for Cognia and serves as an instructional leadership coach in the Denver, CO area. She serves as a Lead Evaluator and team member for Cognia on system and school Engagement Review Teams throughout the United States and worldwide. Her professional career includes serving as an elementary principal for 17 years in rural Wyoming and teaching kindergarten and elementary special education. In addition, she has served as an executive coach and project coordinator for the Wyoming Center for Educational Leadership, district coach for the Wyoming Department of Education, and executive director for the Wyoming P-16 Education Council.</p>
<p>Donna Mathern</p>	<p>Donna Mathern is a life-long educator. Attending the University of Wyoming, she earned a B.A. in education and an endorsement in school administration. She has a Master of Education from Lesley College. She retired from Natrona County School District in 2010 while serving her 11th year as the elementary principal of Evansville School. There, she worked extensively on the implementation of a standards-based math program and had two articles published about the journey in NCTM's 'Teaching Children Mathematics.' Prior to her elementary experience, she was an assistant principal at a high school for seven years and social studies department chairperson for ten years. She taught junior high social studies in Cheyenne and Casper Wyoming for 20 years. After retirement, she completed six years as the state facilitator of student teaching and functioned as the supervisor for student teachers for Valley City State University. She is a past member of the Board of Directors for McREL and is president of the Board of Directors for the St. Mark's Preschool. She served as a Cognia Lead Evaluator, Associate Evaluator, and a team member in the United States and for Department of Defense schools. She is also an educational consultant for a professional development organization.</p>



Team Delta	Brief Biography
Jenna Mauriello	<p>Jennifer Mauriello joined the DoDEA Pacific South District in the winter of 2016 as the instructional systems specialist for assessment and accountability. In April of 2016, Mrs. Mauriello had the privilege of leading the Pacific South District through the first DoDEA Systems Accreditation Review with Cognia; she will lead the district through their second external review in the winter of 2021 with Cognia. Prior to working in the Pacific South District, Mrs. Mauriello worked in the DoDEA South Carolina/Ft. Stewart/DoDDS Cuba School System as the instructional systems specialist for continuous school improvement. For five years, in Kaiserslautern, Germany, Mrs. Mauriello served as the secondary mathematics ISS. Before beginning her career with DoDEA, Mrs. Mauriello worked in the public school system in Rockdale County, Georgia, as a system academic coach for mathematics grades K-5, a school-based mathematics instructional coach at Conyers Middle School, as well as an 8th-grade safety-net and advanced mathematics teacher. Mrs. Mauriello earned both her bachelor's and Master of Education degrees at Georgia College and State University with an emphasis in middle grades mathematics and language arts. Her career passion is focused on school improvement, and her experience in the Georgia Public School System, DoDEA Europe, DoDEA Pacific, and DoDEA America allows her to bring a unique perspective to the position of instructional systems specialist.</p>
William Nelson	<p>William Nelson joined Cognia in 2017 and currently serves as the Senior Director for Volunteer Services. Mr. Nelson's professional career includes experiences as a teacher, department head, administrator, and director of data, assessment, and research for a high school district. Mr. Nelson specializes in data analysis and accountability for teachers and schools. In 2012, he developed a college and career readiness index for graduates and implemented a growth-related evaluation system for teachers based on assessment data. Mr. Nelson served as a Cognia team member and Lead Evaluator for schools, systems, corporations, early learning institutions, and digital learning teams.</p>
Jorma Young	<p>Jorma Young is Acting Chief of the Center for Instructional Leadership in the Department of Defense Education Activity Europe. His 22-year career includes being an executive leadership coach, consultant, classroom teacher, and central office and school administrator, within a local education agency and at the state and region levels. Mr. Young's teaching and leadership experience encompasses the K-12 continuum of elementary, middle, and high school. After earning a bachelor's degree in secondary social sciences at the University of South Florida, Mr. Young received his master's degree in educational leadership from the University of South Florida and a master's degree in management information systems from Nova Southeastern University.</p>





Americas Mid-Atlantic DoDEA System Review by Team and Location

Alpha	Fort Bragg	Camp Lejeune	West Point
	Bowley Elementary School	Bitz Intermediate School	West Point Elementary School
	Irwin Intermediate School	Heroes Elementary School	West Point Middle School

Bravo	Fort Bragg	Camp Lejeune	Quantico
	Devers Elementary School	Delalio Elementary School	Quantico Middle/High School
	Poole Elementary School	Johnson Primary School	Crossroads Elementary School

Charlie	Fort Bragg	Camp Lejeune	Puerto Rico
	Gordon Elementary School	Brewster Middle School	Ramey Unit School
	Albritton Middle School	Lejeune High School	Antilles Middle School

Delta	Fort Bragg	Camp Lejeune	Puerto Rico
	Hampton Elementary School	Tarrawa Terrace Elementary School	Antilles Elementary School
	Shughart Elementary School		Antilles High School
	Shughart Middle School		

Zulu	Fort Bragg	Camp Lejeune	West Point, Quantico, and Puerto Rico
	All Schools - Overview	All Schools - Overview	All Schools - Overview
	Sampson/Guantanamo Bay Full Review	Dahlgren School/Virginia Full Review	





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.



