



Salmon River High School

Riggins, Idaho

February 15-17, 2021

School Accreditation Engagement Review

230914

Table of Contents

Cognia Continuous Improvement System	3
Initiate	3
Improve	3
Impact.....	3
Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review	4
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.....	12

Cognia Continuous Improvement System

Cognia defines continuous improvement as "an embedded behavior rooted in an institution's culture that constantly focuses on conditions, processes, and practices to improve teaching and learning." The Cognia Continuous Improvement System (CIS) provides a systemic, fully integrated solution to help institutions map out and navigate a successful improvement journey. In the same manner that educators are expected to understand the unique needs of every learner and tailor the education experience to drive student success, every institution must be empowered to map out and embrace their unique improvement journey. Cognia expects institutions to use the results and the analysis of data from various interwoven components for the implementation of improvement actions to drive education quality and improved student outcomes. While each improvement journey is unique, the journey is driven by key actions.

The findings of the Engagement Review Team are organized by the ratings from the Cognia Performance Standards Diagnostic and the Levels of Impact within the i3 Rubric: Initiate, Improve, and Impact.

Initiate

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

Improve

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

Impact

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

Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal in leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the Cognia Accreditation Process examines the whole institution—the program, the cultural context, and the community of stakeholders—to determine how well the parts work together to meet the needs of learners. Through the accreditation process, highly skilled and trained Engagement Review Teams gather first-hand evidence and information pertinent to evaluating an institution's performance against the research-based Cognia Performance Standards. Review teams use these Standards to assess the quality of learning environments to gain valuable insights and target improvements in teaching and learning. Cognia provides Standards that are tailored for all education providers so that the benefits of accreditation are universal across the education community.

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

Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity Domain

The capacity of leadership to ensure an institution's progress toward its stated objectives is an essential element of organizational effectiveness. An institution's leadership capacity includes the fidelity and commitment to its purpose and direction, the effectiveness of governance and leadership to enable the institution to realize its stated objectives, the ability to engage and involve stakeholders in meaningful and productive ways, and the capacity to implement strategies that improve learner and educator performance.

Leadership Capacity Standards											Rating
1.1	The institution commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	2	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
1.3	The institution engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
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:	2	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	

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:	3	EM:	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4	
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:	3	SU:	2	EM:	4	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.6	The institution implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
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:	2	EM:	3	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	3	
2.12	The institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	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 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:	2	EM:	3	
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:	2	EM:	3	
3.3	The institution provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	3	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	4	
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	2	EM:	4	
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:	2	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.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	

Resource Capacity Standards										Rating
3.8	The institution allocates human, material, and fiscal resources in alignment with the institution's identified needs and priorities to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	

Assurances

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

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

Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

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

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

Institution IEQ	313.50	CIN 5 Year IEQ Range	278.34 – 283.33
------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

Insights from the Review

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

Given the coronavirus pandemic, this review was facilitated remotely. The Engagement Review Team (team) identified several themes representing the strengths and opportunities for improvement to help Salmon River High School grow in its continuous improvement journey.

Salmon River High School has a culture of mutual respect, grit, and perseverance. Interviews with staff, students, and parents indicate a strong connection exists between students and staff. These relationships are ingrained into the school's culture. In interviews, all stakeholders referred to the school as a family. The school is small (35 students). During interviews, one staff member stated, "No one slips through the cracks." Interview data showed the school has plans to establish an advisory period for 2021-2022 to enhance its culture. School leadership indicated that the advisory period would include goal setting, students monitoring their progress, and career exploration. All students reported there is a caring adult in the building with whom they can talk. Parent and staff member interviews revealed that the small community is an extension of the school. The school's culture requires teachers to know their students, have a strong work ethic, and hold students accountable. Parents shared that they appreciated teachers' knowledge and compassion for students. The accreditation review team encourages the school to fully implement and monitor its advisory program planned for 2021-2022.

The school has not developed a robust system that involves multiple stakeholders to collect and analyze data and use findings for decision-making. Interview data showed that school leadership looked for ways to use data more effectively, especially longitudinal data. The principal collects an abundance of data, but those data are not analyzed or used to inform instructional decisions. The school follows a state-adopted curriculum that is aligned to state standards. While teachers use formative assessment data for progress monitoring, the school lacks a coordinated school-wide system with agreed-upon data checkpoints. Interviews with staff members and leadership suggest that discussions about using data to drive school improvement (such as strategies, goals, and objectives) occur informally rather than in a collaborative setting. The Accreditation Engagement Review Team encourages the school to explore formalized methods of gathering, analyzing, and using data to drive instruction to include the input of stakeholders.

The school demonstrates a commitment to prepare students for post-secondary opportunities. The school does an excellent job of developing attitudes for success. The school is formalizing its advisory program and including a career planning segment where all students create a digital portfolio that follows them until graduation. The school has a robust Career Technical Education program that adjusts to student needs. Students entering ninth grade meet with the counselor to prepare their four-

year plan. Seniors participate in a semester-long class on career exploration. Seniors attend face-to-face and virtual college and career fairs. The Accreditation Engagement Review Team encourages the school to continue its work to provide students with an abundance of information about post-secondary opportunities.

The governing body adheres to a written code of ethics. The board is a member of the Idaho School Board Association (ISBA). Board members participate in training and conferences sponsored by the ISBA. The board has adopted a comprehensive hiring policy with criteria. Most staff members have over five years of experience working at the school. The school has published a long-range strategic plan developed collaboratively by the school board and an external consultant. The process included a study of facilities, enrollment, and resources. The school has a one-to-one Chromebook initiative. Staff members use Google Classroom as a learning management system. All staff members have participated in professional development about using Google Classroom. Students use digital textbooks to learn.

In closing, the Accreditation Engagement Review Team identified areas the school could leverage for continuous improvement. The school is encouraged to use the findings in this report to guide its continuous improvement journey by building on strengths and prioritizing areas of need.

Next Steps

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

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

Team Roster

The Engagement Review Teams are comprised of professionals with varied backgrounds and expertise. To provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes, all Lead Evaluators and Engagement Review Team members are required to complete Cognia training. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
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 ten years, he has served as a Cognia Lead Evaluator.
Justin Alsterlund	Justin Alsterlund joined Cognia in 2018 and serves as the principal at Wendell High School. Mr. Alsterlund is currently in his tenth year in education and holds endorsements in physical education/health and school principal for Pre-K-12 grades in Idaho. Mr. Alsterlund has held numerous jobs in the educational field, including being a paraprofessional, physical education/health instructor, football coach, track/field coach, and basketball coach.
Dee Fredrickson	Dee Fredrickson is the PK-12 principal and special programs director at Meadows Valley School District. Before becoming a principal, she was a special education instructor. Ms. Fredrickson has been a member of the Idaho Mastery Education Network since 2017.

References and Readings

- AdvancED. (2015). *Continuous Improvement and Accountability*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/continuous-improvement-and-accountability/>.
- Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a school-wide prevention program*. New York: Routledge.
- Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/what-continuously-improving-system-looks/>.
- Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/CISWhitePaper.pdf>.
- Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <https://source.cognia.org/issue-article/savvy-school-change-leader/>.
- Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing*. New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education*. San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation_continuous-improvement_2013.05.pdf.
- Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Teachers College.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory*. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

