



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:  
Atkinson Academy**

Feb. 9-12, 2026

# Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
  - Performance Standards Evaluation .....2
  - Insights from the Review .....3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results .....6**
  - eleot Narrative .....9
- Improvement Priorities .....11**
  - Improvement Priority 1 .....11
    - Potential Leader Actions:.....12
  - Improvement Priority 2 .....13
    - Potential Leader Actions:.....14
  - Your Next Steps .....15
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review .....16**
- Team Roster .....18**
- Appendix .....19**
  - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....19
    - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning .....19
    - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....21
    - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning .....23
    - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....25
  - Student Performance Data.....28
  - Schedule .....40

# Introduction

The Cognia Diagnostic Review is conducted by a team of highly qualified evaluators who examine the institution’s adherence and commitment to the research aligned to Cognia Performance Standards. The Diagnostic Review process is designed to energize and equip the leadership and stakeholders of an institution to achieve higher levels of performance and address areas that may be hindering efforts to reach those desired performance levels. The Diagnostic Review is a rigorous process that includes an in-depth examination of evidence and relevant performance data, interviews with stakeholders and observations of instruction, learning and operations.

Standards help delineate what matters. They provide a common language through which an education community can engage in conversations about educational improvement, institution effectiveness and achievement. They serve as a foundation for planning and implementing improvement strategies and activities and for measuring success. Cognia Performance Standards were developed by a committee composed of educators from the fields of practice, research and policy. These leaders applied professional wisdom, deep knowledge of effective practice and the best available research to craft a set of robust standards that define institutional quality and guide continuous improvement.

When this institution was evaluated, the Diagnostic Review Team used an identified subset of the Cognia Performance Standards and related criteria to guide its evaluation, looking not only for adherence to standards, but also for how the institution functioned as a whole and embodied the practices and characteristics of quality. Using the evidence they gathered, the Diagnostic Review Team arrived at a set of findings contained in this report.

As a part of the Diagnostic Review, stakeholders were interviewed by members of the Diagnostic Review Team about their perspectives on topics relevant to the institution’s learning environment and organizational effectiveness. The feedback gained through the stakeholder interviews was considered with other evidence and data to support the findings of the Diagnostic Review. The following table lists the numbers of interviewed representatives of various stakeholder groups.

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	1
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	4
<b>Certified Staff</b>	20
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	7
<b>Students</b>	40
<b>Parents</b>	6
<b>Total</b>	81

## Performance Standards Evaluation

Diagnostic Reviews are based primarily on the evaluation of evidence that reflects an institution’s ability to meet the expectations as defined by the essential Diagnostic Review Standards, which are a subset of the Cognia Performance Standards. These standards define the elements of quality that research indicates are present in an institution that is continuously improving. The standards provide the guideposts to becoming a better institution. The Diagnostic Review Team applies a four-level rubric to determine the degree to which the institution demonstrates effective practices that reflect the expectations of each standard. The rubric scale is designed to

indicate the current performance of the institution. The Diagnostic Review Team's findings and the rubric for each standard are in this report's appendix.

## Insights from the Review

The Diagnostic 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. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

### Strengths and Continuous Improvement

Atkinson Academy serves 468 students in kindergarten through grade five, with 436 students qualifying for free or reduced-price meals, 339 students identified as racial or ethnic minorities and 86 students receiving exceptional child education (ECE) services. School leadership reported that the school has been designated a Choice Zone and receives an additional week of professional learning annually to support staff capacity-building and instructional improvement. Also, Atkinson Academy is identified as a comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) school, underscoring the importance of focused and sustained improvement efforts.

The principal is currently in her fourth year leading the school, following two years of service as assistant principal, providing continuity, institutional knowledge and a deep understanding of the school community. The principal reported receiving ongoing support through district leadership structures and coaching, which she stated was instrumental in building her leadership capacity and instructional systems. Survey data supported the improvement of instructional systems, as 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the last 30 days, I followed a process where I tried and assessed different strategies to improve my practice (23)."

The school's non-negotiables are to be positive, professional and collaborative, which are collectively called the "Committed Big 3" in daily practices. The Diagnostic Review Team found the school climate to be warm, welcoming and student-centered. Multiple staff members shared the belief that this is the "best school in the west", reflecting high levels of staff pride, morale and commitment. These observations align with data from the leadership team on improved adult behaviors, including a significant increase in teacher attendance, which contributes to greater instructional consistency and continuity for students and to higher-quality collaboration. Survey data indicated collaboration occurs, as 83% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)."

The school has demonstrated measurable improvements in student attendance and behavior. Student attendance increased from approximately 82% at the same point last year to 90% this year, signaling successful efforts to address barriers to engagement and improve schoolwide attendance. Additionally, the school has achieved a 50% reduction in out-of-school suspensions, a result of the multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for behavior, the implementation of Character Strong, the use of Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) and bi-weekly student support team (SST) meetings focused on analyzing behavioral data and identifying targeted supports. Survey data indicated an improved culture and climate, as 80% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)." Moreover, 85% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)."

In 2023-2024, the school became a targeted support and improvement (TSI) school. As a result, the school volunteered for a Two-Day Review that yielded two clearly defined improvement priorities. Improvement Priority 1 was to plan and implement a support system centered on specially designed instruction and intentional co-teaching to enhance individualized learning opportunities and differentiation for all students and monitor implementation and outcomes to improve teaching and learning. Improvement Priority 2 was to adjust, implement and monitor the continuous improvement process to enhance teacher effectiveness based on a strategic, intentional walkthrough focus, data analysis, coaching and feedback. In response, the leadership team identified literacy and the implementation of an MTSS process as the school's two primary "big rocks" for the current school



year. Although MTSS structures were implemented in Nov. 2025, stakeholder interviews indicate that the lowest-performing students (i.e., Tier 3) require enhanced support. Interview data indicated that stakeholders recognized the need to improve services for this cohort of learners. Leadership team member interviews indicated a need to move the work forward; however, team members reported insufficient capacity to prioritize it this school year due to commitments to other initiatives.

The leadership team described the implementation of the “Principal’s Playbook” as a central tool for executing and monitoring the strategies identified in the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP). The “Principal’s Playbook” provides a structure to monitor the school’s improvement efforts, particularly for high-quality Tier 1 instruction, small-group literacy instruction called All Block, bi-quarterly common formative assessments (CFAs), individualized coaching cycles for each teacher and walkthroughs with short-cycle monitoring and feedback. The “Principal’s Playbook” places particular emphasis on monitoring instruction aligned to the five essential grade-level Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) that the school identified for each quarter to serve as priority learning targets and the foundation for Tier 1 instruction. It also prioritizes the implementation of What I Need (WIN) time (i.e., commonly referred to as WIN/Eagle Time) to ensure interventions are provided to students based on identified needs. Stakeholder interviews identified the “Principal’s Playbook” as an asset, noting that it helps the leadership team track implementation and maintain alignment between daily practice and CSIP priorities.

The leadership team also outlined the school’s instructional systems and approach to data analysis. A schoolwide data board has been implemented to organize and analyze data used to tier students. The team reported that the current focus is on improving Tier 1 core instruction and refining Tier 2 supports, with plans to expand and formalize Tier 3 systems in the upcoming school year. The district’s data analysis tool is used to identify students who require Tier 2 interventions. These standards also drive the development of CFAs. The school uses Expeditionary Learning Education and Illustrative Mathematics as its high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) to align core instruction for reading and math, respectively.

Targeted reading interventions are delivered through Reading Inspires Students to Excel (RISE) and Skills Block intervention time structures. RISE provides 45–60 minutes of daily, small-group instruction focused on phonics, comprehension, word study and writing. WIN/Eagle Time, embedded within the master schedule, provides Tier 2 interventions based on an analysis of student performance data, including the CFA results that guide student placement and grouping.

Survey data indicated strong stakeholder confidence in the school’s progress monitoring efforts. Ninety-two percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I used a variety of information to determine learners’ progress (20).” Eighty-four percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had many ways to show my teachers what I learned (19)”, and 96% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child had their learning measured (19).”

However, evidence from stakeholder interviews and document reviews suggests that a more systematic and consistent approach to data analysis is needed to fully leverage instructional systems. While data are used, schoolwide data analysis is not yet embedded as a standing agenda item in weekly administrative team meetings. Leadership identified more frequent use of data as a key next step to deepen coherence, ensure regular monitoring of instructional impact and enhance the alignment between data review, instructional adjustments and improved student outcomes.

Interview data indicated that the school leadership team is refining the teacher observation, coaching and feedback system. Leadership has implemented an observation process with face-to-face feedback. Teachers are tiered based on observational data to differentiate levels of support and coaching. Professional learning is planned based on observational data of teachers’ needs and the collective instructional priorities of the school. Teachers are given a list of optional professional learning opportunities. The Diagnostic Review Team found the school’s observation, coaching and feedback system has yet to yield results that ensure effective instruction and improved student outcomes.



Interview data outline that the school was receiving support from Solution Tree to implement professional learning community (PLC) meetings with greater fidelity. Furthermore, staff participate in extended planning sessions twice per month, providing protected time for collaboration, lesson design and data analysis. Survey data revealed that 93% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22).” In the same way, 80% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners’ needs (5).” Stakeholder interviews indicate that all teachers have an opportunity to participate in teacher-driven professional learning to improve instructional practices, but several of these opportunities are optional and not all teachers participate.

Preliminary academic outcomes indicate signs of early progress on the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment. The principal’s presentation provided an overview of the school’s data board, outlining that MAP assessment data show increases in schoolwide performance, with reading scores improving from the 27th to 32nd achievement percentile and math scores from the 26th to 30th achievement percentile. While these gains are early, they reflect positive progress driven by more consistent instructional practices, targeted interventions and improved use of data to inform instruction. However, classroom observations revealed that it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” and “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).”

In summary, the school demonstrates a positive and collaborative school culture, improved attendance and behavior outcomes and early indicators of academic growth. Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data continues to highlight the need for sustained improvement in student achievement. Classroom observations, a review of the evidence (e.g., MTSS data board, small group planning documents) and stakeholder interviews identified the need to continue strengthening MTSS implementation to ensure learners’ academic needs are accurately identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions. The findings also highlight the need to improve data-driven decision-making systems so that instruction is consistently monitored and adjusted to deepen individual students’ understanding of the curriculum and strengthen learner-centered instructional practices.

# Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

Cognia’s 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 Performance Standards. The tool provides useful, relevant, structured and quantifiable data on the extent to which students are engaged in activities and demonstrate knowledge, attitudes and dispositions that are conducive to effective learning. Classroom observations are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes.

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot-certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 24 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.3	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	75%	17%	8%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	29%	71%	0%
A3	3.2	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	17%	50%	33%
A4	1.7	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.	54%	21%	25%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.2</b>				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.7	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	38%	58%	4%	0%
B2	1.9	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	17%	79%	4%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	50%	46%	4%	0%
B4	1.8	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	29%	67%	4%	0%
B5	1.9	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	21%	71%	8%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.4	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	8%	42%	50%	0%
C2	2.4	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	4%	50%	46%	0%
C3	2.5	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	54%	42%	4%
C4	3.1	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	21%	46%	33%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.6</b>			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.7	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	42%	46%	13%	0%
D2	1.8	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	46%	33%	21%	0%
D3	2.1	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	13%	63%	25%	0%
D4	1.5	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	63%	21%	17%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.8</b>			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.3	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	79%	13%	8%	0%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	4%	63%	29%	4%
E3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	33%	54%	13%	0%
E4	1.3	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	71%	29%	0%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.0	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	4%	21%	46%	29%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	4%	25%	58%	13%
F3	2.5	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	17%	17%	67%	0%
F4	2.3	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	21%	33%	42%	4%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.6</b>			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	96%	0%	4%	0%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	92%	4%	4%	0%
G3	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	96%	0%	4%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.1</b>			

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team identified strengths during observations of classrooms and common areas. Overall, most interactions between students and teachers were respectful and positive. Classroom observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 83% of classrooms that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." Additionally, 85% of students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, "The adults treat us with respect (2)." Stakeholder interviews revealed positive changes in the school's climate and culture. The team encourages the school to continue leveraging this change to increase opportunities in the Well-Managed and Supportive Learning Environments. For example, staff and students were frequently observed engaging in positive interactions. Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 79% of classrooms that "learners

demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)", and in 75% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)."

Survey data revealed that 69% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)", and 96% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)." However, the team observed that instruction was mostly whole-group and teacher-led. Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." The team observed few instances of student collaboration either with or without technology, as it was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)", and it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)."

The team observed students engaged in tasks at low cognitive levels. Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)" and that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)."

The team observed students exhibiting compliant behaviors in most classrooms, and it was evident/very evident in 71% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)"; however, it was evident/very evident in 46% of classrooms that "learners use class time with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)." The team found it evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1)." These observations indicate that, although the focus has been on improving systems and culture related to behavioral expectations, continued growth is needed to maximize active student engagement and ensure student academic outcomes.

The team seldom observed high levels of student engagement and meaningful academic discourse across classrooms. Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 25% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." Moreover, it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that "learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)." Survey data supported observational data. For instance, 53% of students selected "complete worksheets" and 57% chose "listen to teachers talk" when students were asked, "Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?" This observational and perception data identifies a need for professional learning and coaching to support educators in providing an engaging learning environment and rigorous coursework.

The team rarely observed students completing meaningful tasks using digital devices. The Digital Learning Environment received the lowest overall average rating of 1.1 out of 4.0. In 4% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)" and that "learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)." This observational data underscores the need to integrate digital tools to ensure students are actively engaged in higher-order thinking and problem solving, thereby enhancing their learning experiences.

# Improvement Priorities

Improvement priorities are developed to enhance the capacity of the institution to reach a higher level of performance and reflect the areas identified by the Diagnostic Review Team to have the greatest impact on improving student performance and organizational effectiveness.

## Improvement Priority 1

Monitor and adjust the walkthrough, coaching and feedback system to identify and address individual teachers' needs, improve professional practices, strengthen instructional rigor, increase student engagement and embed high-yield instructional and formative assessment strategies.

**Standard 21:** Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner centered practices.

### Findings:

A comparison of KSA data from the past three years revealed a decline in student performance. The percentages of 3rd-, 4th- and 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 reading decreased from 24%, 32% and 19%, to 18%, 6% and 15% in 2024-2025 respectively. The percentages of 3rd-, 4th- and 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading and 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math, social studies and editing mechanics were below the state average in 2024-2025.

When the team asked stakeholders what contributed to the decline in KSA achievement data, many shared that the school lacked organizational structures and processes necessary for continuous improvement. Stakeholders reported that since the previous Two-Day Review in 2023-2024, the school leadership team monitoring process (i.e., "Principal's Playbook") has been redesigned to support continuous improvement. Stakeholders also reported that the school leadership team has been more engaged in the instructional process for continuous improvement (e.g., classroom walkthroughs occurring more frequently). Stakeholder interviews revealed that feedback has been tiered and varied based on teacher growth opportunities and has ranged from positive 30-second feedback to scheduled face-to-face feedback. The Diagnostic Review Team observed a need for more constructive feedback regarding the use of high-yield instructional strategies, differentiated instruction and more rigorous learning experiences. While preliminary success has been identified in organizational structures related to coaching and feedback as evidenced by artifacts and observations (e.g., "Walkthrough Schedule", "Principal's Playbook"), the Diagnostic Review Team found the school's observation, coaching and feedback system has yet to yield results to ensure effective instruction and improved student outcomes.

Observational data revealed it to be evident/very evident in 46% of classrooms that "learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)", and in 67% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)." These findings indicate a need for consistent implementation and monitoring of an instructional process to maximize instructional time.

Observational data also revealed it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)" and in 33% of classrooms, that "learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)", demonstrating a need for a continuous monitoring system and feedback process. Additionally, stakeholder surveys identified that 86% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)." Survey data further revealed that 80% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the last 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12)." Likewise, 78% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me think in new ways (15)." The review team recognizes the principal's growth mindset as she revealed that one of the school's next steps is to support Tier 1 instruction to improve engagement, rigor and instructional delivery. These findings suggest that



greater clarity in assessment practices and more consistent feedback structures are necessary to ensure that rigorous instruction is intentionally monitored and meaningfully experienced by all learners.

A comprehensive review of the evidence revealed that the school would benefit from refining its current instructional monitoring and support systems to improve student outcomes. The existing walkthrough tools should be revised to more effectively and consistently track instructional rigor, student engagement and the implementation of key instructional and assessment methods. The school leadership should prioritize and ensure a clear alignment with the KAS across all Tier 1 classrooms. Walkthrough and coaching data require a deeper analysis to systematically identify individual teacher growth opportunities and determine differentiated supports. Providing timely, actionable and differentiated coaching and professional learning aligned to identified areas for growth will enhance instructional practice. Further, establishing a process to monitor the impact of coaching and feedback through follow-up observations and ongoing analysis of student performance data would help ensure that instructional adjustments lead to measurable academic improvement.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Review and refine walkthrough tools to ensure instructional rigor, student engagement and high-yield instructional and formative assessment strategies are monitored.
- Analyze walkthrough and coaching data to identify individual teachers' needs and appropriate support.
- Provide timely, actionable and differentiated coaching, feedback and professional learning aligned to identified needs.
- Monitor the effectiveness of coaching and feedback with follow-up observations and analysis of student performance data.

## Improvement Priority 2

Refine, monitor and adjust the MTSS system to effectively address the Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 needs of each student to improve academic outcomes.

**Standard 27:** Learners' diverse academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.

### Findings:

Atkinson Academy has established foundational structures to support MTSS this school year, including bi-weekly SST meetings, a district data analysis tool, Tier 2 RISE and Skills Block interventions and the identification of quarterly priority standards to improve Tier 1 instruction. The leadership team identified literacy and MTSS as the school's primary improvement "big rocks," and initial systems have been implemented to support data-informed decision-making.

Survey data indicated stakeholders recognize and value these supports. Seventy-nine percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had support when I needed it (18)", and 96% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child received support based on their needs (21)." Furthermore, 78 % of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10)." These data points suggest that systems for identifying and delivering support are present and increasingly understood by stakeholders. However, a deeper review of evidence indicated that the MTSS framework is not implemented with sufficient clarity, coherence or consistency across all tiers to yield sustained academic growth. Seventy-three percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)." In the same way, survey data indicated that 69% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Interviews revealed that continued work is required to enhance the MTSS process to meet the needs of all students. Additional work is required to make the MTSS system efficient and effective to provide student support. This evidence underscores the need to strengthen the clarity, coherence and consistent implementation of MTSS so that differentiated instructional support is planned effectively and experienced by every learner in daily classroom practices, resulting in measurable and sustained academic growth.

Stakeholder interviews further revealed that, although structures exist, the school lacks a fully systemic continuous improvement process, particularly regarding how instructional adjustments are made in response to student data. The Diagnostic Review Team observed WIN/Eagle Time to be whole group instruction with little evidence of differentiation. The team observed Skills Block intervention time to lack structure, rigor and high-quality learning tasks. Several stakeholders cited limited clarity and direction around how to consistently modify instruction to meet diverse learners' needs, especially for students performing below grade level. Classroom observation data aligned with these findings. Learners "who engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)" were evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms, indicating inconsistent implementation of differentiated Tier 1 practices. Similarly, learners who "demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)" were evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms, suggesting variability in student mastery and instructional responsiveness.

While attendance has improved from 82% to 90% and out-of-school suspensions have significantly decreased due to implementation of the behavioral MTSS systems, academic intervention monitoring processes appear less defined. Leadership acknowledged that Tier 3 supports for the lowest-performing students require further development; however, competing priorities have limited full implementation this school year. Moreover, structured data-review cycles to evaluate the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and make timely instructional adjustments are inconsistently embedded in leadership routines.

Overall, Atkinson Academy demonstrates positive conditions for enhancing MTSS, including an improved school climate, strong stakeholder belief in support systems and foundational intervention structures. However, evidence suggests that the MTSS framework would benefit from greater coherence and systematic monitoring. Tier 1



instruction is inconsistently characterized by rigorous, differentiated practices aligned to grade-level KAS, which limit the school's ability to reduce the number of students requiring supplemental intervention. Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are rarely progress-monitored using multiple data sources (e.g., MAP, CFAs, classroom formative and summative assessments) to evaluate student responses and adjust supports in a timely manner. Leadership team structures lack consistent data-review cycles focused on evaluating intervention effectiveness and making instructional adjustments. A more coherent and systematically monitored MTSS framework will assist in ensuring students' needs are accurately identified, targeted supports are delivered with fidelity and instructional responses lead to measurable academic growth.

Recent reading achievement data highlights a continued and concerning decline in student performance across grade levels and student groups. The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025. The most significant decrease was observed among 5th-grade African American students in reading, whose performance dropped from 22% to 8% scoring Proficient/Distinguished from 2022-2024 to 2024-2025, while economically disadvantaged students declined from 20% to 14% scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading.

Similar downward trends are evident in 4th-grade reading, with 32% of students in the all-students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 and decreasing to 6% by 2024-2025. Overall, 3rd-grade students in the all-students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading dropped from 24% to 18% from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025, and economically disadvantaged students declined from 25% to 18%.

Collectively, these data signal a need to strengthen Tier 1 instruction, implement targeted interventions and ensure consistent progress monitoring to reverse current trends and accelerate literacy achievement for all learners.

These consistent declines across grade levels and student groups indicate the need for tighter implementation and monitoring of the MTSS framework. Establishing coherence in data analysis, intervention design, progress monitoring and instructional adjustments will be essential to reversing current trends and improving overall student outcomes.

#### **Potential Leader Actions:**

- Provide targeted support, professional learning and coaching to help teachers use data in the identification and implementation of interventions in each tier.
- Use multiple data sources (e.g., MAP, CFAs, classroom formative, summative assessment data, progress monitoring) to identify student needs and inform tier placements and needed interventions.
- Design and deploy data review cycles to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
- Adjust interventions promptly in response to current student performance data.
- Refine the data analysis protocol that emphasizes naming and claiming students for intentional reteaching and intervention.

## Your Next Steps

The results of the Diagnostic Review provide the next step for guiding the improvement journey of the institution with their 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 Diagnostic Review Report will assist the institution in reflecting on current improvement efforts and adapting and adjusting their plans to continuously strive for improvement.

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

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.
- Develop plans to address the Improvement Priorities identified by the Diagnostic 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.



# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the principal's capacity for leadership of school turnaround. The recommendation of the principal's ability to lead the intervention in the school is based on an assessment of Standard 10: School Improvement from the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) approved by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and adopted by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB).

KRS 160.345(7)(a)(6) requires the audit team to make an assessment and recommendation to the superintendent regarding the principal's capacity to lead the turnaround efforts in the school. The superintendent will make any necessary determination regarding the principal or other certified staff pursuant to KRS 160.346(8)(c).

Following its review of extensive evidence, the Diagnostic Review Team submitted the following assessment regarding the principal's capacity to lead turnaround in a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement to the Commissioner of Education:

- The team has chosen not to reflect on the principal's capacity to lead the school's turnaround efforts.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school and should be reassigned to a comparable position in the district.

## Leadership Capacity Narrative

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

The principal is in her fourth year leading Atkinson Academy, having served as an assistant principal for two years. Prior to her arrival, the principal gained school improvement experience in another district school identified as CSI. The experience has provided insight into establishing systems and overall school improvement. The principal has established and documented clear roles and responsibilities for all certified staff. The school's safety plan is established, digitally accessible for all staff and presented to the staff annually. This effort is reflected in family perception surveys, as 93% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)."

The principal has high expectations regarding culture and climate as evident in the principal's presentation documenting the school's non-negotiables: "Committed Big 3: positivity, professionalism, and collaboration", which are posted throughout the school. The principal celebrates student and staff success through video announcements, posting in the hallways and published in "The Beak", the school's newsletter. The principal publishes daily announcements containing pertinent information, recognition and absences. Furthermore, the school is well invested in its behavior system with a documented and implemented MTSS process for behavior and attendance, a behavior motto: "safety, ownership, attitude, responsibility and respect" (S.O.A.R.R.) and a positive action center (PAC) for de-escalation. These efforts have positive effects. The principal reported that to date this year, the percentage of students with in-school removal for behavior has decreased by 2.1 percentage points, and an out-of-school suspension has decreased by almost half. Similarly, the principal presentation revealed a reduction in out-of-school suspension by 50%, student attendance increased from 82% to 90% and the



staff's daily attendance rate is 92.3%. The team observed many classrooms where students know and follow classroom rules and expectations.

The principal embodies a growth mindset for the school and herself as she routinely seeks feedback from faculty and staff through surveys and plus/deltas, attends one-on-one coaching sessions with a consultant through Solution Tree and receives district support from her executive administrator. Many stakeholders expressed a belief that the principal models the "Committed Big 3" in daily actions by attending extended planning sessions and collaborative team meetings to support teachers' professional growth and instructional planning.

The principal has established systems for walkthroughs, coaching and feedback and PLCs to guide the school through a continuous improvement process and build teacher capacity. However, the system has not yielded significant improvements in student performance. Additionally, the principal employs an Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) to review academic, behavioral, attendance and instructional data to guide decisions throughout the school. However, the principal needs to develop a strategic process in the design, deployment and monitoring of the MTSS Tier 3 interventions and utilize the coach and feedback system to improve Tier 1 instruction.

# Team Roster

The Engagement Review Team is a group of professionals with varied backgrounds and professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Diagnostic Review Team members complete Cognia training and elect certification to ensure knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Diagnostic Review Team.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Lateshia Woodley</b>	Lateshia Woodley has over 20 years of experience in education. She was an alternative school student and has dedicated her life to working with promise students and school transformation initiatives. Lateshia has been a teacher, school counselor, school improvement specialist, assistant principal, principal and assistant superintendent. Since 2008, she has worked as a turnaround leader, driving positive changes in some of the lowest-performing schools. She is an international presenter, award-winning author, Technology, Entertainment, Design (TEDx) featured presenter, an Education Week Leader to Learn From and a self-proclaimed lead dream builder.
<b>Tim Huddleston</b>	Tim Huddleston is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) assisting TSI schools. He also has experience supervising university students. With 33 years in education across elementary to collegiate levels, Tim has held roles as a classroom teacher, assistant principal, principal, university supervisor and school improvement specialist. For the past decade, he has coached school improvement efforts at both the school and district levels, bringing extensive expertise in data analysis, curriculum, instruction, assessment and school turnaround systems.
<b>Jennifer Hutchison</b>	Jennifer Hutchison brings 27 years of experience to education. She currently serves as chief of schools in a large urban district in Kentucky. In this capacity, Jennifer has been instrumental in helping schools successfully exit CSI and TSI, significantly enhancing the learning environments for students, educators and families. Her diverse background includes previous roles as a special education teacher, curriculum coach, assistant principal and principal.
<b>Dana Graham</b>	Dana Graham, with 24 years of experience in elementary education, brings expertise as a primary and intermediate teacher, instructional coach, assistant principal and ERL. Her career includes service in both high-performing and CSI schools, where she has supported targeted improvement efforts for students and staff. Also, she has held key building positions, including intervention coordinator, instructional coordinator, building assessment coordinator and community liaison. As an ERL, she currently supports continuous school improvement through collaborative leadership, data-informed practices and a sustained focus on improving student outcomes.

# Appendix

## Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

### Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

A good institution nurtures and sustains a healthy culture for learning. In a healthy culture, learners, parents, and educators feel connected to the purpose and work of the institution as well as behave in alignment with the stated values and norms. The institution also demonstrates evidence that reflects the mission, beliefs, and expectations of the institution (e.g., student work; physical appearance of the institution; participation in institution activities; parents' attendance at institution functions).

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
1. Leaders cultivate and sustain a culture that demonstrates respect and fairness for all learners and is free from bias.	Leaders rarely model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members seldom implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders occasionally model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders regularly model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders consistently model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	3
2. Learners' well-being is at the heart of the institution's guiding principles such as mission, purpose, and beliefs.	Staff members seldom demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions may not be based on its stated values.	Staff members occasionally demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members routinely demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented, and are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members continually demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented and regularly reviewed for consistency with its stated values.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
3. Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.	Leaders establish conditions that rarely result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders seldom collaborate with stakeholders. Institutions choose areas of focus that are rarely based on data about learners.	Leaders establish conditions that occasionally result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus that are sometimes based on data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that regularly result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders routinely collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that consistently result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders consistently collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions implement a formal process to choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	2
5. Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners.	The institution's operating practices rarely cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members may or may not interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, or consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members rarely work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's operating practices somewhat cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members generally interact with respect and cooperation, periodically learn from one another, and somewhat consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members sometimes work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members regularly interact with respect and cooperation, often learn from one another, and routinely consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members often work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration and are monitored for fidelity of implementation. Professional staff members consistently interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, and consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members intentionally and consistently work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	2
6. Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.	Professional staff members receive few or no resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members rarely receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive some resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members periodically receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members consistently receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. A formal structure ensures that professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	2

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

The ability of a leader to provide leadership for learning is a key attribute of a good institution. Leaders who engage in their own learning while tangibly supporting the learning process for learners and teachers have a significant positive impact on the success of others. Leaders must also communicate the learning expectations for all learners and teachers, continuously, with consistency and purpose. The expectations are embedded in the culture of the institution, reflected by learners', teachers', and leaders' behaviors and attitudes toward learning.

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	2
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	3
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	2

## Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

A good institution ensures that learners are engaged in the learning environment. Learners who are engaged in the learning environment participate with confidence and display agency over their own learning. A good institution adopts policies and engages in practices that support all learners being included in the learning process.

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
17. Learners have the support and opportunities to realize their learning potential.	Professional staff members give little or no consideration to individual learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Academic and non-academic opportunities are limited and standardized according to grade levels or a predetermined sequencing of courses. Learners frequently encounter a variety of barriers when accessing academic and non-academic offerings that would be well-suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are rarely challenged to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members consider varying learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access to some variety in academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners may encounter barriers when accessing some academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are sometimes challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members know their learners well-enough to develop and provide a variety of academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access and choice in most academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners rarely encounter barriers when accessing academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members develop relationships with and understand the needs and well-being of individual learners. Academic and non-academic experiences are tailored to the needs and well-being of individual learners. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards maximal levels of achievement and self-efficacy without barriers or hindrances by schedules or access to academic and non-academic offerings.	2
18. Learners are immersed in an environment that fosters lifelong skills including creativity, curiosity, risk taking, collaboration, and design thinking.	Learners engage in environments that focus primarily on academic learning objectives only. Little or no emphasis is placed on non-academic skills important for next steps in learning and for future success. Learning experiences rarely build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration or design-thinking.	Conditions within some aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in some experiences that develop non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Some learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions within most aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Collectively, the learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions across all aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in ongoing experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. A formal structure ensures that learning experiences collectively build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
21. Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices.	Instructional activities are primarily designed around curriculum objectives with little or no focus on learner needs and interests. Professional staff members rarely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their individual potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on needs and interests typical of most students. Professional staff members infrequently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Most learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members routinely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members consistently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	1
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	2

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

A good institution positively impacts learners throughout their journey of learning. A positive impact on the learner is reflected in readiness to engage in and preparedness for the next transition in their learning. Growth in learning is also reflected in learners' ability to meet expectations in knowledge and skill acquisition.

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	2
25. Leaders promote action research by professional staff members to improve their practice and advance learning.	Leaders rarely create a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution or learning environments. Professional staff members seldom engage in action research to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in few or no learning opportunities for professional staff members about action research.	Leaders occasionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, sometimes engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in some learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders regularly create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, routinely engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders intentionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, consistently engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities customized for professional staff members about action research.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders seldom use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders sometimes use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use analyzed current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use a formal, systematic process for analyzing current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	2
27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.	The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices.	The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	2
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	2
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	2
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	2

# Student Performance Data

An asterisk in a performance data chart indicates that the corresponding student performance level data have been suppressed for public reporting.

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	24	46	16	47	18	47
4th-Grade Reading	32	48	16	50	6	50
5th-Grade Reading	19	48	21	46	15	50
3rd-Grade Math	12	43	*	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	*	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	*	41	13	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	*	42	*	39	11	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	*	47	16	47	11	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	*	38

### Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading from 16% to 18% from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-, 4th- and 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 24%, 32% and 19% in 2022-2023 to 18%, 6% and 15% in 2024-2025, respectively.
- The percentage of 3rd-, 4th - and 5th-grade students in reading, 5th-grade students in math, 5th-grade students in social studies, and 5th-grade students in editing mechanics scoring Proficient/Distinguished was below the state average during the 2024-2025 school year.

### Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	*	26	*	29	22	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	*	35	*	35	54	35
Percent Score of 100	*	24	*	23	16	22
Percent Score of 140	*	14	*	13	8	13

#### Plus

- The percentage of EL students who received 0 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment was below the state average during the 2024-2025 school year.

#### Delta

- The percentage of EL students who received 60-80 points for progress on ACCESS was 54% compared to the state average of 35% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 100 points for progress on ACCESS was 16% compared to the state average of 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 140 points for progress on ACCESS was 8% compared to the state average of 13% in 2024-2025.

### Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 3rd-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	24	16	18
Female	35	24	22
Male	*	*	15
White	31	*	32
African American	*	*	14
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	25	*	18
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

#### Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students in the all student group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 24% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 35% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 25% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.

### Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 3rd-Grade Math

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	12	*	*
Female	16	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	23	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

#### Delta

- In 2022–2023, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 12% for all students, 16% for females, 23% for White students and 13% for economically disadvantaged students.

### Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 4th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	32	16	6
Female	20	21	8
Male	39	*	*
White	41	36	*
African American	21	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	18
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	18
Economically Disadvantaged	29	16	6
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

#### Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade students in the all students and female groups scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 32% and 20% in 2022–2023 to 6% and 8% respectively in 2024–2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 41% in 2022-2023 to 36% in 2023-2024.
- In 2024–2025, the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 6% for all students, 8% for female students, 18% for EL students, 18% for EL plus monitored students and 6% for economically disadvantaged students.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 4th-Grade Math**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Math (2022-2023)</b>	<b>Math (2023-2024)</b>	<b>Math (2024-2025)</b>
All Students	*	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 4th-Grade Science**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Science (2022-2023)</b>	<b>Science (2023-2024)</b>	<b>Science (2024-2025)</b>
All Students	*	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	19	21	15
Female	28	*	18
Male	*	29	13
White	*	*	33
African American	22	18	8
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	20	20	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	12

#### Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

#### Delta

- From 2022–2023 to 2024–2025, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 19% to 15% for all students, from 28% to 18% for female students, from 22% to 8% for African American students and from 20% to 14% for economically disadvantaged students.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 29% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- In 2024–2025, 33% of 5th-grade White students and 12% of 5th-grade students with disabilities (IEPs) scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Math**

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
<b>All Students</b>	*	*	13
<b>Female</b>	*	*	*
<b>Male</b>	*	*	10
<b>White</b>	*	*	33
<b>African American</b>	*	*	8
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	*	*	*
<b>Asian</b>	*	*	*
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	*	*	*
<b>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</b>	*	*	*
<b>Two or More Races</b>	*	*	*
<b>English Learners</b>	*	*	*
<b>English Learners plus Monitored</b>	*	*	*
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	*	*	13
<b>Students with Disabilities with IEP</b>	*	*	8

Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students and students with disabilities with IEP scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 8% in 2024–2025.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Social Studies**

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	11
Female	*	*	13
Male	*	*	10
White	*	*	20
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

Delta

- In 2024–2025, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 11% for all students, 13% for female students, 10% for male students, 20% for White students and 11% for economically disadvantaged students.

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	*	16	11
Female	*	14	15
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	27
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	17	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

### Delta

- From 2023–2024 to 2024–2025, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics declined from 16% to 11% for all students.
- In 2024–2025, 15% of female students, 27% of White students and 11% of all students scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade On-Demand Writing**

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
<b>All Students</b>	*	*	*
<b>Female</b>	*	*	*
<b>Male</b>	*	*	*
<b>White</b>	*	*	*
<b>African American</b>	*	*	*
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	*	*	*
<b>Asian</b>	*	*	*
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	*	*	*
<b>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</b>	*	*	*
<b>Two or More Races</b>	*	*	*
<b>English Learners</b>	*	*	*
<b>English Learners plus Monitored</b>	*	*	*
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	*	*	*
<b>Students with Disabilities with IEP</b>	*	*	*

# Schedule

## Monday, Feb. 9, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Principal Interview	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Tuesday, Feb. 10, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, Feb. 11, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, Feb. 12, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m. – 12 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

