Troy Jr. Sr. High School

Troy, Idaho

March 15 – 17, 2020

School Accreditation Engagement Review

227510

cognia™

Table of Contents

cognia™

Cognia Continuous Improvement System

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

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

Initiate

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

Improve

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

Impact

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

Cognia Performance Accreditation and the Engagement Review

Accreditation is pivotal to leveraging education quality and continuous improvement. Using a set of rigorous research-based standards, the accreditation process examines the whole institution—the program, the cultural context and the community of stakeholders—to determine how well the parts work together to meet the needs of learners. Through the Cognia Accreditation Process, highly skilled and

trained Engagement Review Teams gather first-hand evidence and information pertinent to evaluating an institution's performance against the research-based Cognia Performance Standards. Using these Standards, Engagement Review Teams assess the quality of learning environments to gain valuable insights and target improvements in teaching and learning. Cognia provides Standards that are tailored for all education providers so that the benefits of accreditation are universal across the education community.

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

Cognia Standards Diagnostic Results

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

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity Domain

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

Leadership Capacity Standards										Rating
1.1	The institution commits to a purpose statement that defines beliefs about teaching and learning including the expectations for learners.									Initiating
	EN:	1	IM:	1	RE:	2	SU:	2	EM:	2	
1.2	Stakeholders collectively demonstrate actions to ensure the achievement of the institution's purpose and desired outcomes for learning.									Initiating
	EN:	1	IM:	1	RE:	3	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:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.4	The governing authority establishes and ensures adherence to policies that are designed to support institutional effectiveness.									Impacting
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	3	
1.5	The governing authority adheres to a code of ethics and functions within defined roles and responsibilities.									Impacting
	EN:	4	IM:	4	RE:	4	SU:	4	EM:	4	
1.6	Leaders implement staff supervision and evaluation processes to improve professional practice and organizational effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.7	Leaders implement operational process and procedures to ensure organizational effectiveness in support of teaching and learning.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	2	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.8	Leaders engage stakeholders to support the achievement of the institution's purpose and direction.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	EM:	3	
1.9	The institution provides experiences that cultivate and improve leadership effectiveness.									Improving
	EN:	2	IM:	2	RE:	3	SU:	2	EM:	3	
1.10	Leaders collect and analyze a range of feedback data from multiple stakeholder groups to inform decision-making that results in improvement.									Improving
	EN:	3	IM:	3	RE:	3	SU:	3	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:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.2	The learning culture promotes creativity, innovation and collaborative problem-solving.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**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:**	4	**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.										Initiating
	EN:	2	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	2	
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.										Improving
	EN:	3	**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:**	3	**EM:**	3	
2.8	The institution provides programs and services for learners' educational futures and career planning.										Improving
	EN:	2	**IM:**	2	**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:**	2	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	2	**EM:**	3	
2.10	Learning progress is reliably assessed and consistently and clearly communicated.										Impacting
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	4	
2.11	Educators gather, analyze, and use formative and summative data that lead to demonstrable improvement of student learning.										Impacting
	EN:	4	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	4	**EM:**	3	

Learning Capacity Standards											Rating
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:**	2	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**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:	2	**IM:**	2	**RE:**	3	**SU:**	3	**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:**	3	**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:**	3	
3.5	The institution integrates digital resources into teaching, learning, and operations to improve professional practice, student performance, and organizational effectiveness.										Improving
	EN:	2	**IM:**	3	**RE:**	2	**SU:**	3	**EM:**	2	
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:**	2	**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.										Improving
	EN:	3	**IM:**	3	**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:**	3

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® Results

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

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

eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot Observations:	**11**	
Environments	**Rating**	**2018-19 Averages**
Equitable Learning Environment	**2.89**	**2.82**
Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs	2.27	2.34
Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support	3.45	3.30
Learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner	3.27	3.45
Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions and dispositions	2.55	2.18
High Expectations Environment	**2.75**	**2.71**
Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher	2.36	2.74

cognia™

eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot Observations:	**11**	
Environments	**Rating**	**2018-19 Averages**
Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable	3.00	2.95
Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work	2.27	2.43
Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing)	3.09	2.67
Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning	3.00	2.78
Supportive Learning Environment	**3.16**	**3.15**
Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful	3.09	3.07
Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback)	3.18	2.97
Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks	3.09	3.24
Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher	3.27	3.34
Active Learning Environment	**2.84**	**2.71**
Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate	3.00	2.77
Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences	2.82	2.41
Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities	3.18	3.12
Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments	2.36	2.45
Progress Monitoring and Feedback Environment	**2.45**	**2.63**
Learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored	2.64	2.43
Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work	2.73	2.93
Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content	2.55	2.90
Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed	1.91	2.25
Well-Managed Learning Environment	**2.75**	**3.20**
Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other	3.09	3.42
Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others	2.82	3.35
Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another	2.18	2.89
Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions	2.91	3.15
Digital Learning Environment	**2.42**	**1.79**

eleot® Observations		
Total Number of eleot Observations:	**11**	
Environments	**Rating**	**2018-19 Averages**
Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning	2.73	1.97
Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning	2.73	1.79
Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning	1.82	1.61

Assurances

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

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

Accreditation Status and Index of Education Quality®

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

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

Institution IEQ	313.00	**AIN 5 Year IEQ Range**	**278.34 – 283.33**

Insights from the Review

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

The Engagement Review Team identified several themes from the review that support the continuous improvement process for Troy Jr. Sr. High School. These themes present strengths and opportunities to guide the improvement journey.

There is a high level of staff engagement around a culture of success, service, and building relationships. Classroom observations confirmed that the Supportive Learning Environment scored highest in the eleot 2.0 ratings. Students feel supported by their teachers and their peers. All stakeholder groups used common words like "family" and "community" to describe the climate and culture of the school. This was also evidenced by surveys. Troy Jr. Sr. High School maintains a safe environment. New security cameras and magnetic card locks for doors were recently added.

Troy Jr. Sr. High School is a data-driven institution. The school's last engagement review indicated a need to become a data-driven school to drive student learning. The school does not have PLC (Professional Learning Community) groups per se but has data analysis teams. The teams meet once a month on a late-start day. The teams track and analyze student data in the areas of ISAT scores, SAT and ACT scores, and formative and summative assessments. This process has shown to be very successful. Troy Jr. Sr. High School ranks very high on Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT). Other data examined are graduation rate, go on rate, RTI (Response to Intervention) data, and discipline data.

Troy Jr. Sr. High School has high expectations for all students. The school adopted a new curriculum called Beyond Textbooks. Part of the framework for this curriculum is to give formative assessments each Friday in ELA, math and science. If students do not score at least a 70% on the assessment, they will go to "reteach" the following week. If they score above 70%, they go to "enrich" the following week. If a student is still struggling, the school runs a tutoring program after school. Besides instructional tutoring, the school provides a snack and transportation home. Again, this seems to be very successful with the school ranking very high on the ISAT scoring matrix. This is evidenced by stakeholder interviews, eleot observations and examination of state test scores.

The school is encouraged to update its purpose statement. In interviews with stakeholders and examination of the purpose statement, the need for updating is apparent. To accomplish this goal, Troy Jr. Sr. High School will have an administrative intern the coming year who has volunteered to lead the process for developing and adopting the purpose statement. The school is encouraged to have internal and external stakeholders composed of staff, students, parents and community members on the committee. The purpose statement should express the school's beliefs about learning. It should be measurable. Once the purpose statement is approved by the governing body, it

should become very visible in the school and become part of the school culture.

The school has numerous committees where student input could be added. The only committee where student input is currently heard is the student handbook committee. In interviews with student stakeholders, students expressed a desire to have more involvement and input on other school and district committees, such as the calendar committee, the facilities committee and technology committees. By being involved on committees, students will feel that their voice is heard, and they will feel more valued as a part of the school team. Besides interviews with stakeholders, survey information was also examined. Informal interviews were also used.

The Engagement Review Team hopes that the insights that have been identified will provide guidance for the next steps on the improvement journey of school. Troy Jr. Sr. High School is encouraged to continue efforts to enhance quality instruction and provide meaningful opportunities for all learners. The team would also like to commend the school for the mentioned areas of excellence with the hope these areas will continue to be supported.

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 Priorities 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 eleot certification to provide knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Engagement Review Team:

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Jerry Nelsen, Lead Evaluator	Jerry Nelsen is a retired secondary school administrator with 34 years in the educational field. He received his master's degree in education administration from the University of Idaho. Mr. Nelsen has experience as a teacher, vice principal, activities director, principal, interim superintendent, and school trustee. He has served on numerous engagement reviews. For the last 9 years, he has served as Lead Evaluator in Region II of Idaho state.
Dr. Sarah Hatfield	Sarah Hatfield is the current superintendent/K-6 principal at Highland Joint School District. Besides being the superintendent and principal, Sarah is also the federal programs director, special education director, and curriculum director. Sarah received her bachelor's degree from Eastern Oregon University and her master's in curriculum and development, along with her educational specialist and doctorate in education leadership from Northwest Nazarene University. She was a business teacher for 15 years before moving to Highland to become the K-12 principal in 2014.
Kendrick Jared	Kendrick Jared is a principal and athletic director at the Deary Jr/Sr High School. He is currently in his first year as an administrator. Previously he taught as a math teacher for four years.

References and Readings

AdvancED. (2015). Continuous Improvement and Accountability. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/continuousimprovement-and-accountability

Bernhardt, V., & Herbert, C. (2010). *Response to intervention and continuous school improvement: Using data, vision, and leadership to design, implement, and evaluate a schoolwide prevention program*. New York: Routledge.

Elgart, M. (2015). *What a continuously improving system looks like*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/what-continuously-improving-system-looks like

Elgart, M. (2017). *Meeting the promise of continuous improvement: Insights from the AdvancED continuous improvement system and observations of effective schools.* Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/sites/default/files/CISWhitePaper.pdf

Evans, R. (2012). *The Savvy school change leader*. Alpharetta, GA: AdvancED. Retrieved from http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/savvy-school-change-leader

Fullan, M. (2014). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kim, W., & Mauborne, R. (2017). *Blue ocean shift: Beyond competing*. New York: Hachette Book Group.

Park, S, Hironaka, S; Carver, P, & Nordstrum, L. (2013). *Continuous improvement in education.* San Francisco: Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/carnegie-foundation_continuous-improvement_2013.05.pdf

Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Teachers College.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory.* New York: George Braziller, Inc.