



# Mary Our Queen

Omaha, Nebraska

**October 13-16, 2020**

**School Accreditation Engagement Review**

232126

## Table of Contents

<b>Cognia Continuous Improvement System.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Initiate.....	3
Improve .....	3
Impact.....	3
<b>Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Leadership Capacity Domain .....	5
Learning Capacity Domain .....	6
Resource Capacity Domain .....	8
<b>Assurances.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality® .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Insights from the Review .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Next Steps.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Team Roster .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>References and Readings.....</b>	<b>16</b>

## Cognia Continuous Improvement System

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

The findings of the Engagement Review Team will be organized by the Levels of Impact within i3: Initiate, Improve, and Impact. The organization of the findings is based upon the ratings from the Standards Diagnostic and the i3 Levels of Impact.

### Initiate

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

### Improve

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

### Impact

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

## Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

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

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

## Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

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

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

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

## Leadership Capacity Domain

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

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The institution commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning, including the expectations for learners.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.3	The institution engages in a continuous improvement process that produces evidence, including measurable results of improving student learning and professional practice.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	1	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.7	Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	

## Learning Capacity Domain

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

Learning Capacity Standards										Rating
2.1	Learners have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities established by the institution.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
2.3	The learning culture develops learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.									Initiating
	EN:	2	IM:	1	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	
2.4	The institution has a formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with and have adults/peers who support their educational experiences.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.5	Educators implement a curriculum that is based on high expectations and prepares learners for their next levels.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	4	EM:	
2.6	The institution implements a process to ensure the curriculum is aligned to standards and best practices.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	
2.7	Instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the institution's learning expectations.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.									Initiating
	EN:	3	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
2.9	The institution implements processes to identify and address the specialized needs of learners.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
2.12	The institution implements a process to continuously assess its programs and organizational conditions to improve student learning.										Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	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.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	1	EM:	
3.2	The institution's professional learning structure and expectations promote collaboration and collegiality to improve learner performance and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
3.3	The institution provides induction, mentoring, and coaching programs that ensure all staff members have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	2	RE:	2	SU:	1	EM:	
3.4	The institution attracts and retains qualified personnel who support the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	
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:	4	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	
3.6	The institution provides access to information resources and materials to support the curriculum, programs, and needs of students, staff, and the institution.									Improving
	EN:	4	IM:	3	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	
3.7	The institution demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the institution's purpose and direction.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	
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:	4	IM:	3	RE:	1	SU:	1	EM:	



## Assurances

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

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

## Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

Cognia will review the results of the Accreditation Engagement Review to make a final determination concerning accreditation status, including the appropriate next steps for your institution in response to these findings. Cognia provides the Index of Education Quality (IEQ) as a holistic measure of overall performance based on a comprehensive set of standards and review criteria. A formative tool for improvement, it identifies areas of success as well as areas in need of focus. The IEQ is comprised of the Standards Diagnostic ratings from the three Domains: 1) Leadership Capacity; 2) Learning Capacity, and 3) Resource Capacity. The IEQ results are reported on a scale of 100 to 400 and provide information about how the institution is performing compared to expected criteria. Institutions should review the IEQ in relation to the Findings from the review in the areas of Initiate, Improve, and Impact. An IEQ score below 250 indicates that the institution has several areas within the Initiate level and should focus their improvement efforts on those Standards within the Initiate level. An IEQ in the range of 225-300 indicates that the institution has several Standards within the Improve level and is using results to inform continuous improvement and demonstrate sustainability. An IEQ of 275 and above indicates the institution is beginning to reach the Impact level and is engaged in practices that are sustained over time and are becoming ingrained in the culture of the institution. Below is the average (range) of all AIN institutions evaluated for accreditation in the last five years. The range of the annual AIN IEQ average is presented to enable you to benchmark your results with other institutions in the network.

<b>Institution IEQ</b>	<b>318.00</b>	<b>AIN 5 Year IEQ Range</b>	<b>278.34 – 283.33</b>
------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

## Insights from the Review

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

The Engagement Review Team would like to acknowledge and thank the pastor, administration, board, staff, parents, and students for the participation and insight that helped make this accreditation visit a success. The remote environment certainly has posed challenges, but the participation from all stakeholder groups at Mary Our Queen showed a commitment and passion for their school.

The team reviewed evidence, engaged in interviews and polls, and reviewed the website and social media outlets to help identify themes that will present strengths and opportunities to help guide Mary Our Queen (MOQ) in the continuous improvement journey. The most powerful theme, which is the school's greatest strength, to emerge is that MOQ is a mission-guided school whose stakeholders share a strong sense of commitment and passion through shared vision and core values. MOQ has a well-structured building and district leadership. This strength lends itself well to addressing the areas of opportunities for growth. These areas include the lack of documented formal processes to evaluate and monitor all program effectiveness and the lack of formal processes to engage students in tracking their own personal data.

**The school is a mission-guided school whose stakeholders share a strong sense of commitment and passion through shared vision and core values.** Mary Our Queen is guided by the mission statement and its faith traditions; these are ingrained in the culture and operations of the school. The evidence indicated a high degree of embeddedness among all stakeholder groups. A review of the mission documents, the school website, the school improvement team and leadership team reports, and focus group interviews validated this finding. The theme of being mission driven was easily apparent. Stakeholder interviews revealed that the mission guided decisions and focused the way the school communicated. It was evident that teachers and students are aware of the expectations for teaching and learning and are offered solid support by the administration, pastor, parents, and school board. Every decision is made through the lens of the school's mission and guiding beliefs.

A collaborative environment, built on trust, was touted by all stakeholder groups. Teachers indicated support was strong from leadership and other colleagues. This was evident in the formal and informal support they gave one another. One teacher shared that a teacher who was leaving MOQ to stay home with her baby spent time with the newly hired teacher to share the standards and expectations, because she cared so much about the community. Several of the teachers were alumnae of the school and were proud to be back supporting the community that gave them so much. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) were well used and documented. PLCs were used to conduct book studies, offer training on the implementation of standards, and to discuss student needs based on data. Parents expressed a deep longing to gather again as a community after the virus, stating the supportive community made their school "a special place." The Home and School organization postponed the annual Mustang March, a

fundraiser that builds school and community support, until spring in hopes of hosting the event in person. Students were challenged to make their school the kindest in the Archdiocese, and they were proud of their efforts and their school.

The school board is engaged in the creation and implementation of a strategic plan. They dedicate time at each meeting to discuss progress and evaluate next steps. They see the document as a living document and are not afraid to modify it as needed. The board understands its role and can articulate their code of ethics. The administration indicated the board is very helpful in the governance of the school.

The support for the mission of the school is evident through the addition of the Early Childhood Education and Youth Center. The building of this center was part of the school and parish strategic plan and took the coordinated efforts of the community. Not only did they finish on time, but they were able to exceed the goal of the capital campaign allowing them to build it. Many groups will benefit from use of the building including school clubs, Catechesis of the Good Shepherd, youth group, scouts, and others.

The Engagement Review Team encourages Mary Our Queen's School's leaders and staff to celebrate and continue to nurture this deeply embedded culture of faith, tradition, kindness, and respect.

**Mary Our Queen leadership provides a level of unprecedented support to the school community.**

The stakeholder interviews overwhelmingly showed support and admiration for the leadership of the school. The administrator worked first as a teacher and then moved into the principal position and has assumed that role for the past six years. The assistant principal has also been in her position for nine years. The leadership team worked to develop the job descriptions of both positions and the teachers feel there is clarity in the roles, and they feel supported by both administrators. The board celebrated the collaborative nature of school leadership and indicated the school and parish worked well together in support of the school. They indicated the pastor and principal communicate well with each other and share a common mission. They noted things never feel top-down because leadership is present in the community, open for discussion, willing to engage with any stakeholders, listens and honors the input of others. Parents told the Engagement Review Team they felt comfortable talking with the administration and teachers about any concerns they may have. Student surveys yielded high scores in "My teachers care about students" and "In my school, my principal and teachers want every student to learn." Parents indicated the administrative team has worked diligently to communicate with them, especially during this pandemic. They expressed gratitude and confidence in the direction of the school.

There is a well-defined teacher evaluation process at Mary Our Queen that includes both formal observations and informal walk-throughs. The teachers were able to articulate the process and spoke to the level of support from the administrative team. Several teachers noted the openness of the principal to meet with them to discuss either the formal observation or the informal walk-throughs.

The Engagement Review Team heard loudly and clearly that the administrative team was making a difference at MOQ and are the key to the positive morale and culture. They should be commended and continue to provide that level of unprecedented support.

**The Mary Our Queen staff is dedicated and engaged in the mission of the school and use data to help determine the needs of their students.**

They have high expectations and work to deliver a curriculum that challenges the students they serve. Stakeholder groups interviewed were proud to share that many of their students earned academic scholarships to local Catholic high schools; this is repeated year-after-year. Administrators shared they speak to high school teachers who willingly share students educated at Mary Our Queen are well-prepared for the rigor of Catholic high schools. The curriculum is monitored and adjusted on a continuous cycle and training is provided to staff through PLC work to ensure fidelity of implementation as evidenced by their work with Marzano and in implementing the new

religion standards. Professional development and PLC work supported teachers in use of updated standards and new strategies. Teachers and administrators shared that a team of ten attended a Marzano training prior to implementation and then conducted a book study in PLC groups to ensure the entire staff was ready to implement the elements of effective teaching as outlined by Marzano. PLC groups were also used to ensure all staff were ready to implement the new religion standards created by the Archdiocese of Omaha and piloted, then adopted, at MOQ. The standards are created at the Archdiocesan level by a team of educators and include assessments that are both formative and summative. As the middle school moved to the 1 to 1 model, training was necessary so that the devices were adequately used to support teaching and learning. Both the professional learning and the acquisition of devices was done through budgeted allocations that were protected. The Student Assistance Team meets regularly, and multiple forms of data are collected and used to assess the progress of students. Teachers shared that they used Fountas and Pinnell, STAR testing (formerly, they used NWEA MAP), blended learning software, Archdiocesan assessments, and classroom formative and summative assessments to track student progress. Student writing is also monitored over time through the use of portfolios that are designed to show the progression of writing proficiency.

The Engagement Review team recommends the continued use of data to drive instructional decisions in the classrooms and to continue to make use of the professional development opportunities to grow as educators.

Student interviews showed learners were eager to perform well. They had a difficult time articulating how they knew they were performing well, other than feedback from the teacher. When asked how they knew they had grown academically, they referenced more skills they had learned, "I didn't know how to solve equations, and now I do," rather than formal processes to show growth. They also referenced their grades as a reflection of growth, "I have an A in that class."

MOQ should consider creating a process where students are engaged in goal setting and progress monitoring, so they feel more personally accountable for their performance. Even at a young age, students can color in apples for the number of sight words they know to show progress. This process can be integrated with the career aptitude assessment given in middle school and may help students set long-term goals. Consider using the blended learning applications students are familiar with to offer a way for students to track and share their personal growth.

**Mary Our Queen lacks formal processes to evaluate and monitor program effectiveness beyond core academic data.** The school routinely uses data to inform decisions made at both the leadership and classroom level. However, longitudinal data was not available to support many of the programs that were in place at the school. The strongest example of longitudinal data existed in the strategic planning process. The school board discussed progress toward the long-range goals set during each meeting and worked to monitor progress. In some areas, data was collected, but longitudinal data did not exist. For example, PLC minutes were taken but not used longitudinally. Teacher observation is another area where data is collected annually, but not used beyond the current school year.

Collecting and analyzing longitudinal trend data and then using it to monitor and adjust all programs in the school will result in developing and sustaining the institutional memory. Furthermore, data collection, analysis, and evaluation will also allow Mary Our Queen to identify areas where it is not meeting the needs of all of its students and make adjustments to its curriculum as well as to identify needs in the overall effectiveness of its organization.

Mary Our Queen is encouraged to review the team's findings, insights, and recommendations and to consider them as they develop their school improvement goals and processes for the future.

## Next Steps

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

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

## Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<p><b>Chris Nelson, Lead Evaluator</b></p>	<p>Chris Nelson is proud to have worked in education for nearly 30 years. All her teaching and administrative experiences have been in the schools of the Archdiocese of Omaha. Chris' teaching experience spanned 17 years and included all grades from 2nd-8th. She served as an administrator for 10 years in Omaha Catholic schools, served one year at the Archdiocesan level, and was appointed as executive director of the Omaha Catholic School Consortium in May of 2018 where she served for two years. Her current position is director of education for the Consortium schools and Facilitator of Leadership Development at the Archdiocese of Omaha. The Consortium is a collaboration of six local Catholic schools. Chris has served as lead evaluator, team member and has successfully led two schools through the Cognia process as the chair of their school improvement teams. Chris has also served and chaired many Frameworks visits.</p>
<p><b>Jennifer Dunn</b></p>	<p>Jennifer Dunn is currently the K-12 Principal at St. Francis of Assisi Catholic School in Humphrey, Nebraska. She has been in education since 2001 when she began her career as a fourth-grade teacher. She has also taught kindergarten, first grade, and second grade. Her first year as a school administrator was in 2010. She obtained her B.S. degree in elementary education from Creighton University in 2001, her M.Ed. in educational leadership from Doane College in 2010, and she completed the Catholic School Leadership Certificated Program from Creighton University in 2014. Professionally, Ms. Dunn has been involved with engagement reviews for Catholic and public schools across the state of Nebraska since 2012.</p>
<p><b>Lynn Schultz</b></p>	<p>Mrs. Lynn Schultz is currently the principal at St. Bernadette Catholic School. She will be starting her eighth year as principal and her 30th year in education in the 2020-2021 school year. In addition to her principal position, she has also spent several years as a special education teacher, special education central office administrator and special education liaison for preschool special needs students all in the public-school setting. She holds a Bachelor of Science in education, a master's degree in learning disabilities, and a certificate in administration for PK-12. In addition, she is a member of ASCD. Lynn recently was a part of her own school's Cognia accreditation process. They received their accreditation in July of 2017. She has also participated on one review team for a K-12 parochial school.</p>

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Kaylee Wallace</b>	<p>Ms. Kayleen Wallace is completing her 11th year as the school administrator at Saint Joan of Arc School in Omaha, Nebraska. Saint Joan of Arc School is a small Catholic elementary school located in the center of Omaha. Prior to accepting the position at Saint Joan of Arc School, Ms. Wallace was the school administrator at Mary Our Queen Elementary School also in Omaha, Nebraska. Ms. Wallace spent 22 years at Mary Our Queen School, 12 years in the classroom and 10 years as principal. Ms. Wallace received a Bachelor of Science in English and secondary education from the College of Saint Mary. She received a Master of Education from Creighton University in school administration. In 2014, Ms. Wallace received the Metro Administrator of the Year Award from the Omaha.</p>

## References and Readings

- AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/continuousimprovement-and-accountability>
- Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention program*. New York: Routledge.
- Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/what-continuously-improving-system-looks-like>
- Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/sites/default/files/CISWhitePaper.pdf>
- Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/savvy-school-change-leader>
- Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing*. New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education*. San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from [https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation\\_continuous-improvement\\_2013.05.pdf](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.



