Ogden Preparatory Academy

Ogden, Utah

February 1-3, 2022

School Accreditation Engagement Review 230558



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 | 13 |
| Team Roster | 14 |
| References and Readings | 15 |





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.

| الأنتناهي | rship Ca | pacity | Standar | ds | | | | | | | Rating |
|-----------|--|---|---|-----------|--------------|------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1.1 | | | commits earning, i | | | | | | efs abou | t | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 1.2 | | | ollective | | | | | | ievemer | t of | Improving |
| | EN: | 3 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 1.3 | eviden | | engages ding mea actice. | | | | | | | | Improving |
| | EN: | 3 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 1.4 | | | authority suppor | | | | | ence to p | oolicies t | hat | Improving |
| | EN: | 3 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 2 | |
| 1.5 | | | authority nd respo | | | ode of et | hics and | function | ns within | | Improving |
| | EN: | 3 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 1.6 | | | nent stat actice ar | | | | | cesses t | o improv | ⁄e | Improving |
| | EN: | 3 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 2 | |
| 1.7 | | | | | | | Leaders implement operational processes and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | impacing |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 4 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 2 | impacting |
| 1.8 | Leader | - | e staker | • | | | | | | | Improving |
| 1.8 | Leader | s engag | e staker | • | | | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Leader purpos | s engag e and di 3 stitution | e stakeh | nolders t | o suppo | rt the ac | hieveme | nt of the | institution | on's | |
| | Leader purpos EN: The ins | s engag e and di 3 stitution | e stakeh rection. | nolders t | o suppo | rt the ac | hieveme | nt of the | institution | on's | Improving |
| | Leader purpos EN: The inseffectiv EN: Leader | s engage and di 3 stitution reness. 4 s collect | e staker rection. IM: provides | 3 experie | RE: nces tha | at cultiva | SU: te and ir SU: k data fr | nt of the 3 nprove le 3 om mult | EM: eadershi EM: iple | on's 3 p | Improving |



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.

| Learni | ing Capa | acity Sta | andards | | | | | | | | Rating |
|--------|--|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| 2.1 | | | | | unities to | | | and achi | eve the o | content | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 4 | |
| 2.2 | The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation, and collaborative problem solving. | | | | | | | oblem- | Impacting | | |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 2.3 | The lea | • | ulture de | velops l | earners' | attitudes | s, beliefs | , and sk | ills need | ed for | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 2.4 | | nships w | | | icture to ilts/peers | | | | | | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 2.5 | | | ement a ers for th | | um that i levels. | s based | on high | expecta | ations an | d | Improving |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 2 | |
| 2.6 | | | impleme best pra | | ocess to | ensure | the curri | culum is | aligned | to | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 2.7 | | | onitored learning | | justed to ations. | meet in | dividual | learners | ' needs | and | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 4 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 2.8 | | stitution reer plar | | prograr | ns and s | ervices | for learn | ers' edu | cational | futures | Improving |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 2 | |
| 2.9 | | stitution of learne | | nts proc | esses to | identify | and add | dress the | e special | ized | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 2.10 | | ng progre unicated | | liably as | sessed a | and cons | sistently | and clea | arly | | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |



| Learni | ing Capa | ng Capacity Standards Rating | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|--|
| 2.11 | | Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to the demonstrable improvement of student learning. | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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. | | | | | | | | | |
| | EN: | 4 | 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.

| Resou | rce Cap | acity St | andards | ; | | | | | | | Rating |
|-------|--|--|-----------------------|------------|-----|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------|--------|-----------|
| 3.1 | | | | | | | earning to | | | arning | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 3.2 | collabo | ration a | | giality to | | | and expe | | | е | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 3.3 | ensure | all staff | membe | rs have t | | vledge a | nd coach nd skills | | | | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 4 | |
| 3.4 | | | attracts a pose an | | | fied pers | sonnel w | ho supp | ort the | | Improving |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 2 | |
| 3.5 | operati | ons to ir | _ | orofessio | | | eaching, dent per | | • | | Impacting |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 4 | RE: | 4 | SU: | 3 | 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. | | | | | | Impacting | | | | |
| | EN: | 4 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |
| 3.7 | long-ra | The institution demonstrates strategic resource management that includes long-range planning and use of resources in support of the institution's purpose and direction. | | | | | | es | Improving | | |
| | EN: | 3 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |



| Resou | ource 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | EN: | 3 | IM: | 3 | RE: | 3 | SU: | 3 | EM: | 3 | |

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.

| Assuran | ces 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 341.00 | 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.

The Cognia Accreditation Engagement Review for Ogden Preparatory Academy (OPA) Charter School was conducted in February 2022 during the coronavirus pandemic. The on-site review occurred remotely to engage in the school's mission: "To provide a challenging curriculum where academic excellence, character development, and individual growth are nurtured in a safe and happy environment that involves the active participation of students, teachers, parents, and community members. OPA displays an extremely positive, nurturing environment for students to grow and learn as they develop the skills necessary to become tomorrow's leaders. There are strong academic expectations and experiences, bilingual exposure, leadership roles, and commitment to community. Since 2003, stakeholders and most importantly students have gained confidence and a sense of selfworth to prepare them to face the challenges in a competitive world. The review focused on leadership, learning, and resource capacities. During the review, the team identified the following themes.

Ogden Preparatory Academy Charter School educators develop and share adaptive leadership models with wide survey data and feedback loops. Ogden Preparatory Academy Charter School's core mission and vision statements are used as the foundation of all continuous improvement planning with diverse leadership opportunities from multiple stockholders who share openly and transparently. The teams show trust and dedication to follow through with ownership in the common vision of engagement from the focus group conversations. Artifacts like the plans, data analysis tools and more demonstrate the depth of their survey tools and how teams frequently meet to analyze the data points and put them to action. As one school leader shared, "If a decision is going to be made, we survey students, teachers, and parents to get input and keep everyone engaged."

All school goals and individual goals are aligned with the school improvement plan and charter in impressive ways to gather and act upon data with a self-correcting feedback loop. As leaders shared in their focus group, "Our contribution as leaders is focused on data collection and disaggregation by looking at core competencies and asking how can we make them better? We want to make all these data analysis systems to benefit kids. We're revisiting everything after the pandemic and how the world has changed around retention and shortages struggles. We've made great strides to support our teams in analyzing data and giving teams opportunities to move based on it all."

Surveys from stakeholder groups like students, teachers, and families seek overarching advice and appeal topics as well as specific details like questions such as, "The school vision and direction are clear to me." These surveys are given twice each school year, once in the fall and once in the spring. Survey results are analyzed in multiple ways: individually by building supervisors, by the





administrative team, and by the Board. A review of the survey questions is also part of the administrative evaluation process showing how built-in these routines have become.

The teams analyze a variety of survey data at monthly and quarterly strategic meetings. They also report up to the board regarding progress related to action items generated from survey discussions. Most surveys are generated internally through a platform called Qualtrix. OPA also partners with other platforms such as the West Ed CALL survey, provided by the Utah State Board of Education. Survey analysis and action steps are listed on meeting notes from monthly strategic meetings and quarterly meetings. Some steps are also transferred to the project management system called Trello. OPA uses a variety of survey tools to provide policymakers and leaders with fresh and relevant data.

The school's Executive Summary revealed the leadership program called "The Leader in Me," a school-wide initiative based on Steven Covey's "7 Habits of Highly Effective People." This initiative also ties in with students having respect for themselves and others. The leadership aspect fits with both the mission of character development and the vision of developing leaders. Administrators stated, "This program helps build a positive culture and revolves around 7 Habits. Teachers weekly are given a lesson to do. Students and teachers use the common language and it's become ingrained in the school culture with a lighthouse team to set wildly important goals and track those in the Eagle News." Wildly important goals narrow the focus to most important work on what teams want to significantly improve. The ambition teams identify the most important objective that will not be achieved unless it gets special attention.

Overall, school leaders noted, "We give staff and students the opportunity to lead, and all of our programs foster empowerment. Our team leadership model transition helps empower teachers and involve them more." Documents reviewed by the team revealed the programs train teachers to build leadership roles within their classrooms and throughout the school. In grades K-6, students are explicitly taught the 7 Habits and practice using them in and out of the classroom. Teacher representatives serve on the Lighthouse team, which selects and implements school goals and coordinates the implementation of the Leader in Me. With these programs and approaches, the review team encourages the institution to continue to find and deepen experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.

The cohesive school culture and inclusive environment provide equity and opportunities for each learner. Proud of the diversity, Ogden Preparatory Academy Charter School serves a demographic where 74% are classified as Hispanic; 62% qualify as economically disadvantaged; 29% receive language services and 12% receive special education services. OPA achieves rich cultural inclusion with students who receive the resources they need so they are prepared for success. The board members reflected on the strong community, "We're so proud of the community we have with all stakeholders. Our big thing is that we're so inclusive of students. We keep inclusion at the top of the list."

Celebrating strong language skills is a huge deal at OPA. Evidence provided to the Engagement Review Team indicated that given the diverse backgrounds and needs of students, OPA provides several different ways for students to experience bilingual education. At the elementary building, parents place students into one of two language paths with either Spanish exposure or intensive. In exposure, students learn the language through research-based methods, for example, having the teacher speak in Spanish for all or most of the instruction. In the intensive program, students learn grade-level content typically science or social studies in the language of Spanish. Approximately 25% of each grade is in the intensive program and 75% of each grade is on the exposure path.

Access to incredible life experiences is also a key part of the equity work at OPA. As the only junior high school in the state whose students compete in triathlons to students who participate in the school





science fair, there are so many activities that students and families can attend: art nights, literacy nights, Day of the Dead celebration, Cinco de Mayo celebration and more. Students have had many opportunities to travel locally, around the country, and overseas before COVID. Board members said, "Our population doesn't often have an opportunity to get out of the region or state so we do as much as we can." A sampling of just some of the field trip opportunities students have gone on in the last few years include North Fork Environmental Center, Mars Desert Research Station, the Oregon coast, and even Spain for students in the 9th grade to travel and study for a week at the University of Salamanca.

Additionally, students have also contributed to the community through a variety of community service projects. Students often do several fundraisers per year for community organizations and charities such as Heifer International, Leukemia and Lymphoma Society, Ogden Rescue Mission, and Lantern House Homeless Shelter. Students have also adopted a section of the Ogden River Trail. The school is encouraged to continue school-wide opportunities for learners to have equitable opportunities to develop skills and achieve the content and learning priorities.

Educators prepare and execute dynamic lessons with rigor and innovation demonstrated in student projects and assessments. To ensure creativity, innovation, and collaborative problemsolving in student learning and part of the improvement plan, employees at OPA develop and complete individualized professional education pathways to guide their growth throughout the year. The instructional staff at OPA work in grade-level professional learning communities called Collaborative Teacher Teams (CTTs). At least quarterly, these teams engage in organized data dives that feed up to administration. Administration reviews the data dives and subsequent plans for each team and works to support improvement in instruction and student learning.

Teams also support high standards with common curriculum maps that include the school-endorsed curriculum, common assessments, and benchmarks with plans for interventions. Maps are stored in team drives and can be accessed by team members, administration, new hires, and others. Teachers take time throughout the year to improve these maps using guided protocols. The maps feature common, research-based curriculum programs like Reading Wonders and Reveal Math. They also show intervention programs such as iReady and Waterford, all aligned with the Utah Core. Teachers shared, "All our curriculum is standards-aligned with project-based learning. We look at standards and design units around the standards. Assessments are project-based with a variety of standards that fall into a unit that you design. These are living documents as we might need re-teaching and changes and we have lots of choices and freedom with our curriculum as long as we meet the standard."

A core part of the high assessment outcomes to improve each student's trajectory is the School Transformation Team (STT). The STT is composed of leaders across various grade levels and subject areas. These leaders meet with the administration at least monthly to discuss a variety of topics from scheduling to student achievement. Members of the STT feed down to their grade or departmental teams and then provide feedback up to administration. These processes ensure that instruction is monitored and adjusted to meet individual learners' needs and the institution's learning expectations.

One additional creative local program among many is the Latinos in Action (LIA), a service-based program that allows students to explore Latino heritage while serving their school community. Since 2016, LIA students participate in an elective class and are held to high academic standards. Students tutor elementary students in reading and math, and they also create community events such as Trunk or Treat with real-world relevant service-learning based opportunities to make the world better.





With all these opportunities, OPA is encouraged to continue to develop and monitor the formal structure to ensure learners develop positive relationships with educators and peers who support their educational experiences.

High satisfaction in a positive school culture results in high support for educators with cheerful relationships. The OPA culture and guiding beliefs showcase incredibly strong examples in the way a school operates. The supportive and cheerful culture encompasses all the attitudes, expected behaviors, and values that impact how the school operates effectively.

One example of the positive culture is the Responsibility-Centered Discipline (RCD) approach designed to help students learn to take responsibility for their actions, behavior, and academic success. At OPA, RCD is based on four expectations: Be Safe; Be Prepared; Be Responsible; and Be Respectful. The students become well versed in these expectations in every area of the building. The program establishes clear expectations because it is an integral RCD concept to have clear expectations in place. Leadership teams noted, "RCD discipline program pushes responsibility to students. We've seen an uptick in discipline, but teachers were ready to jump right back in as we returned to in-person learning. We have great classroom procedures because RCD lays clear expectations and framework."

To build the future-focused culture, Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) targets students in the academic middle who have the motivation and potential to go to college even while facing financial, socio-economic, or personal barriers. AVID has allowed OPA to address several important groups in the school, including ethnic minorities, English Language Learners, and students who qualify for the free and reduced lunch program. AVID allows OPA to fulfill its vision and mission of holding all students to a challenging curriculum while still addressing the specific needs of the school population. AVID strategies are taught and implemented school-wide; this means all teachers learn AVID's best practices and use them in their classrooms. Leaders shared, "AVID is school-wide; it impacts our entire instruction, leadership, culture, and systems. We seek to eliminate the opportunity gap and prepare all for post-secondary success with equity, access to accelerated courses. We collect the best practice instructional strategies and use them consistently. Culturally, AVID conveys a strong message of individual capability and preparing for that. Systems wide, we get a lot of data to review around AVID."

The school-to-home connections at OPA are remarkable. Families noted, "We volunteer a lot. Teachers care about students. We are very involved in the school because they meet kids' individual needs. We chose OPA and continue to do so because of the opportunities it gave our children." Another shared, "We've been very happy. I recommend it all the time. I talk up OPA with my friends and random people."

One area of potential growth could be narrowing the number of programs or initiatives. Rather than having several with mixed results, the school could focus on fewer with more depth. Teachers noted, "We could maybe focus on one or two of those things more often and not get tied down into so many programs. Communication and working on fewer things at a time might improve things." Teams also noted, "It's sometimes hard to apply all of the professional learning. Some teachers need some other steps between the professional development and expectation of application. In order for it to make impactful change, we need personalized support, maybe one-on-one to help get it going." The institution is encouraged to provide programs that ensure all staff members and stakeholders have the knowledge and skills to improve student performance and organizational effectiveness.

In conclusion, the insights identified by the Engagement Review Team celebrate major successes along with the rest of the findings from the review as part of the school's continuous improvement





process. These details provide the next steps to guide the improvement journey in its efforts to improve quality and opportunities for each learner.

Much success has been achieved for the students and stakeholders, and greater success awaits as the school continues its quest toward improvement. Considerations of the information contained in this report, including the element and Cognia Improvement Standards ratings along with the suggestions for further study, will support these efforts to make the school even better.

Next Steps

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

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



Team Roster

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

| Team Member Name | Brief Biography (Lead Evaluator Only) |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Lucas Shivers, Lead Evaluator | As Manhattan-Ogden USD 383 director of elementary education in Kansas, Dr. Shivers channels his life-long passion for positive student and staff development to build the core values of student-centered learning, responsible character development, and adaptive leadership to facilitate growth for every student as a champion and advocate for innovative instruction. |
| | As a former fourth, fifth, and sixth grade teacher in Topeka, Abilene, and Shawnee Mission, Dr. Shivers has shared opportunities and leadership experience in curriculum, instruction, assessment, special education, student engagement, and systems of interventions. |
| | He earned a dual Bachelor of Science degree at K-State in elementary education and agricultural communications, with a minor in leadership studies. He completed a master's degree in educational administration and building-level leadership from Emporia State in 2007. In 2012, he finished an Ed.D. in educational leadership and policy studies from KU to empower data-driven, research-based leadership for school districts to succeed with instruction and learning for diverse student needs. |
| | During the pandemic, he led a team of 50 educators and 900 students in a K-6 remote learning year with rigorous and dynamic instruction. He has served on multiple Cognia Review Teams across the US. |
| Anne Bills | Assistant Director |
| Mootaz Koriem | Dean of Students |



References and Readings

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



