



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Blake Elementary**

Feb. 2-5, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation2
 - Insights from the Review3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results5**
 - eleot Narrative8
- Improvement Priorities11**
 - Improvement Priority 111
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....11
 - Improvement Priority 212
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....13
 - Your Next Steps13
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review14**
- Team Roster16**
- Appendix17**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings17
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning17
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning19
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning21
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning23
 - Student Performance Data.....27
 - Schedule40

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 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.

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	2
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	11
Certified Staff	13
Noncertified Staff	8
Students	14
Parents	6
Total	57

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:

The Diagnostic Review Team highlighted inclusivity and culture as significant strengths at Blake Elementary, where belonging respect and a strong sense of pride are prioritized. Comprised of approximately 48% English learners (ELs), representing 18 different languages and designated as high-density, the school receives additional staffing, including English Language Development (ELD) teachers and instructional assistants. Evidence from interviews and the principal overview presentation indicate that the master schedule was intentionally redesigned to provide EL support at every grade level through both push-in and pull-out instructional models. Agreement of this strength is evident in stakeholder survey data. Eighty-nine percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)." Additional stakeholder survey data affirmed respectful interactions and a welcoming climate for all. Ninety-seven percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults make us feel welcome (1)." Similarly, 98% of families agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults treat us with respect (2)" and 93% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." Survey data also indicate that Blake Elementary has established positive relational and collaborative conditions that support improvement efforts. Eighty-six percent of educators selected "welcoming" when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture? (24)." Ninety percent of families selected "respectful" and 82% chose "welcoming" when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?" Elementary students reported mostly positive learning conditions, as 75% chose "safe" and 72% selected "friendly" when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?"

Additional observational evidence supports the positive culture at Blake Elementary. In 92% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." Furthermore, the schools' dedication to culture was evident through daily observed interactions and the implementation of The Ron Clark Academy (RCA) House System, which equally contributes to a sense of pride and belonging among students, staff and parents. Parent interviews indicated that families feel valued and included in the school community. The addition of parent leaders and the implementation of the house system have further strengthened school culture and family engagement.

Interview data consistently highlighted the principal's visibility, growth mindset and empathetic leadership as a foundational strength. The principal is widely viewed as demonstrating a growth mindset and fostering a positive, nurturing environment. This leadership approach supports collaboration, trust and a shared commitment to continuous improvement and was evident in the principal overview presentation and interviews.

The Diagnostic Review Team also noted areas for continuous improvement. One area is the refinement of systems and processes related to communication, professional learning community (PLC) structures and the implementation fidelity of high-quality instructional resources (HQIR). Strengthening these systems would support more consistent instructional practices and sustained improvement efforts. Observations and stakeholder interviews further revealed that, while behavior supports (e.g., a strong multi-tiered system of supports [MTSS], culture support, systems thinking) are in place, they lack clarity and consistent application. Student performance data indicated the need for a continuous improvement process focused on learners' needs. Student performance



data for all available grade levels and content areas were below the state averages for the 2024-2025 school year.

Sixty-eight percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, “At my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6).” While district-level support was evident in interviews and artifacts, a more consistent, systematic professional development plan is needed. Opportunities exist to strengthen ongoing professional learning aligned with school improvement priorities, particularly through sustained support from subject-matter experts and the consistent use of a streamlined observation process and instructional monitoring tools in both language arts and mathematics. Student performance data indicated a steady decline in both areas. Similarly, opportunities exist to strengthen systems for monitoring and adjusting Tier 1 instruction to ensure consistent implementation and effectiveness across classrooms. Observational data indicated that it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Additionally, in 42% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3).” While structures such as PLCs were in place and evident in artifacts, teacher interviews and informal observations indicated clearer expectations and processes for using data to inform instructional adjustments would enhance instructional coherence and student outcomes. Although effective collaborative practices exist, the absence of consistent vertical planning limits alignment and continuity across grade levels. Establishing structured opportunities for vertical collaboration would strengthen curriculum alignment, instructional coherence and shared accountability for student learning.

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 to 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	1.8	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	46%	25%	29%	0%
A2	2.8	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	4%	25%	58%	13%
A3	3.2	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	8%	63%	29%
A4	1.8	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%	17%	8%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.4				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.3	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	17%	42%	42%	0%
B2	2.5	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	8%	38%	54%	0%
B3	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	67%	25%	8%	0%
B4	2.4	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	17%	29%	54%	0%
B5	2.0	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	33%	29%	38%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.1			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.7	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	8%	29%	50%	13%
C2	2.6	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	13%	25%	54%	8%
C3	2.9	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	4%	17%	63%	17%
C4	3.0	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	17%	71%	13%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.8			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.4	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	17%	29%	50%	4%
D2	2.1	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	33%	38%	17%	13%
D3	2.4	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	8%	54%	29%	8%
D4	1.6	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	63%	17%	17%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.1			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.7	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	46%	42%	13%	0%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	13%	46%	38%	4%
E3	2.4	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	8%	50%	38%	4%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	71%	25%	0%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

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.	0%	17%	63%	21%
F2	2.9	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	4%	17%	63%	17%
F3	2.2	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	33%	25%	29%	13%
F4	2.7	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	0%	54%	25%	21%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.7			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	54%	42%	4%	0%
G2	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 24 formal observations in core content classes and numerous informal observations in common areas throughout the school. The resulting data provided the team with insight into instructional practices, progress monitoring, student expectations and learning environments. Overall average ratings ranged from a low of 1.2 on a 4-point scale in the Digital Learning Environment to a high of 2.8 in the Supportive Learning Environment. Overall averages across learning environments showed a slight increase compared with the prior Two-Day Review in 2023-2024.

Several strengths emerged from observational data. A positive culture was clearly conveyed through the principal's presentation. Evidence was also observed when staff members greeted students during morning arrival and in the positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) expectations (i.e., Be Safe. Be Respectful. Be Responsible) displayed throughout the school. Observational evidence reflected these expectations in practice as it was evident/very evident in 92% of classrooms that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." Additionally, in 80% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)."

Another strength identified was the staff's commitment to learners' well-being. Interview analysis indicated that when teachers were asked to identify the school's best attributes, they most frequently named the students. Survey data further supported this finding when 93% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." Student survey results showed that 81% agreed/absolutely agreed that the adults "treat us with respect (2)." Family survey results showed 97% agreed/absolutely agreed that the adults "care about children's well-being (7)."

Classroom observations reinforced these perceptions. In 84% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)." Similarly, in 84% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)."

Student interview responses were overwhelmingly positive. Students expressed their love for the school and conveyed that teachers treat them fairly and keep them safe. When they were asked to speak about what they loved about the school, they named numerous choice options for extracurricular activities, including a skateboarding club, robotics team and the student technology leadership.

While most indicators showed a slight improvement since the 2023-2024 Two-Day Review, the team identified areas for continued growth, including the consistent implementation of high expectations and the use of differentiated instructional practices to meet the needs of all learners.

Opportunities for improvement identified by the Diagnostic Review Team include the limited academic rigor, use of exemplars and clear expectations for high-quality work. Observational data indicated that in 8% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." Survey data aligned with this finding as 78% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)." Additionally, observational data showed that in 29% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)."

The team observed that core instruction was frequently below grade-level expectations and did not support individual learning needs. Educator survey data indicated that 60% agreed/absolutely agreed that they "deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)." Student survey data further revealed that 66% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." These data points suggest opportunities to strengthen the alignment between instructional planning, grade-level expectations and instructional adjustments.

Many classroom observations reflected a predominance of whole group instruction with minimal use of small groups being implemented with fidelity as well as limited opportunities for students to collaborate or discourse. In 37% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." Stakeholder interviews supported these findings, with educators noting the need to increase student engagement during Tier 1 instruction. Additionally, in 21% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)." While students conveyed excitement for choice in their extracurricular activities, they did not echo the same about classroom instructional activities.

Another area identified for improvement was the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment. Observational data results showed that in 13% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Furthermore, when students were asked how they were graded, many were unable to explain the grading criteria. This finding aligns with observational data. In 4% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).”

A final area identified for improvement was the Digital Learning Environment, which earned an average overall rating of 1.2. Observational data results indicated that in 0% 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 “communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).”

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

Establish a continuous improvement process that standardizes expectations for data review, communication and professional practice and ensures instructional strategies are implemented with the consistency and rigor necessary to improve and sustain student achievement across the school.

Standard 7: Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.

Findings:

The principal's presentation and supporting artifacts demonstrated an emerging focus on systems and schoolwide frameworks. The presentation emphasized the development of systems and included documentation on PBIS as an embedded practice, informed by the RCA House System. Additionally, a two-year PBIS Reboot was identified as a strategic effort to stabilize school culture to support effective instruction. Attendance and behavior data were referenced as key components of this system. In addition, MTSS and Student Support Team (SST) data, artifacts and interview notes indicated these components were a strength within the system. Despite these efforts, evidence indicated that a cohesive sense of shared identity and a unified system that works effectively for all stakeholders has not yet been fully established. While structures are emerging, greater alignment between systems, instructional practices and learner needs is required to ensure consistency and sustainability across the school.

The sustained decline in student performance across all grade levels and content areas on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) provides a compelling rationale for implementing strategic monitoring measures to support continuous improvement. From 2023-2024 to 2024-2025, 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 20% to 11% while 5th-grade reading scores dropped from 18% to 7% over the same period, signaling systemic gaps in instructional coherence and progress monitoring. These trends are mirrored among multilingual learners (MLs). In 2024–2025, 19% of EL students demonstrated expected progress (100 points) on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS), remaining below the state average of 22%.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Develop and refine an improvement process to include timelines, consistent goal setting, data review cycles and monitoring tools.
- Refine existing systems to build structures for communication, expectations and accountability for learners and educators.
- Design a systems approach to build continuity across teams with consideration for input from the leadership team and educators.
- Monitor all systems consistently and effectively in a timely, cyclical and documented process.



Improvement Priority 2

Establish and monitor a framework that leverages coaching cycles and data-driven PLC protocols to standardize high-leverage Tier 1 strategies and deepen learners' knowledge.

Standard 22: Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.

Findings:

The Diagnostic Review Team observed inconsistencies in monitoring instructional practices. Classroom observational data indicated that learners who “engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” were evident/very evident in 29% of classrooms. While a few learners were observed receiving instruction tailored to meet their needs, these practices were not consistently observed across the school. Sixty-six percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” While small groups, centers and Creative Day (i.e., offered once per quarter with science, technology, engineering and math [STEM] activities) were noted in the artifacts, during teacher interviews, the principal presentation and observations, the team found little evidence of schoolwide adoption of universal, high-leverage Tier 1 strategies. A few informal assessment practices were used in classrooms. Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 42% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise their work (E2).” The team found a lack of consistently implemented intentional instructional practices and Tier 1 universal strategies. Collectively, these data indicate a need for strengthened instructional practices to more effectively deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding. Interview data indicated that students wanted their teachers to teach differently to better meet their needs. Survey data support this claim, as 60% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, “At my institution we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8).” Similarly, 66% of students agreed/absolutely agreed, “In the past 30 days I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” These responses were among the lowest reported in the survey data.

Observational data revealed mixed levels of instructional rigor and learner engagement. For example, it was evident/very evident in 54% of classrooms that “learners engaged in activities that were challenging but attainable (B2)” and 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).” However, practices that support learner ownership and clarity of learning were limited. It was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” In 4% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).”

Feedback practices also were inconsistently observed, as it was evident/very evident in 42% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)” and that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3).” These findings indicate that feedback and formative assessment practices are present but not consistently leveraged to adjust instruction in real time.

Student performance data support the need to strengthen how instruction is monitored and instructional delivery is adjusted to deepen student learning and proficiency. Across all grade levels and content areas, achievement trends on the KSA remain below state averages since 2022-2023, reflecting variability in the consistent use of formative assessment data, student work analysis and decision-making for Tier 1 instruction. Interviews with teachers confirmed that weekly PLC meetings are scheduled, though staff reported that these meetings often function more as team check-ins than as structured opportunities to analyze student learning data and adjust instructional practices. This finding further supports the need to strengthen systems for monitoring instruction and responding to individual learner needs.



However, survey responses suggest variability in the extent to which students consistently experience instructional monitoring and adjustment. When asked, “Which four phrases best describe how your teachers know you are learning? (24)”, 69% of students selected “give a grade.” Fewer students reported regularly using formative practices that support instructional adjustment during learning, as 7% of students selected “use rubrics” and 13% chose “use checklists” when asked the same question. Collectively, these perceptions indicate that while structures and conditions are in place, greater coherence and consistency are needed to ensure instructional practices are monitored and adjusted to deepen learning and address individual student needs across classrooms. Also, 78% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners’ needs (5).” This suggests a disconnect between intent and consistent implementation. Informal interviews further supported these findings. While students reported having multiple choices in extracurricular activities, this sense of choice was not consistently reflected in classroom instructional practices. In interviews, students reported no comparable opportunities to have a voice or choice in instruction, indicating a need to strengthen learner-centered practices.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Identify key data-related terminology within the PLC protocol to help educators engage in strategic conversations that advance student learning using student work artifacts, formative assessments and observational data.
- Develop and implement a PLC structure that includes support for teachers in analyzing formative and summative assessments to determine instructional adjustments and strategies for Tier 1 implementation.
- Implement consistent coaching cycles, ensuring the effective use of instructional strategies and high-quality instructional resources across all classrooms to reach all learners.
- Provide a job-embedded professional development plan for instructional delivery using HQIR to support staff to differentiate instruction through formative assessment data, including small group instruction and scaffolding tasks based on learners’ needs.

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 with 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 (CSI) 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.

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 demonstrates leadership and commitment focused on improving the effectiveness of the school for students, staff, families and the community. Evidence indicates a focus on strengthening instructional rigor and establishing schoolwide structures to support improvement. Artifacts include the "FY25–26 Blake Elementary Work Plan", district monitoring tools and the principal presentation document, which are aligned to instructional priorities. The principal demonstrates a growth mindset in her leadership approach, fostering a positive climate and culture. Stakeholder interviews indicate improvements in school climate with systems, such as the house system, contributing to a sense of belonging, school pride and positive student and staff engagement.

The principal promotes shared leadership by providing opportunities for staff leaders to apply their skills and assume leadership roles through established team and committee structures that support inquiry, planning and implementation. PLCs, the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) and other school-based committees provide opportunities for leadership and professional growth. The "Blake Elementary Roles and Responsibilities" document outlines defined leadership roles across instructional, behavioral and operational areas. Evidence indicates that staff members participate in leadership activities aligned to these roles.

Staff collaborate during grade-level planning times and team structures. Survey data indicate that 68% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)." Opportunities for vertical collaboration and peer observation for professional growth represent areas for further development within the school's leadership structures. These findings indicate that collaboration structures are in place, though the depth and consistency of formal processes vary across teams.

The principal uses multiple sources of data to guide planning, implementation and monitoring of improvement efforts. These sources include state and district assessment data, classroom assessments, walkthrough

documentation and stakeholder perception surveys. Survey results indicate that 93% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I used a variety of information to determine learners’ progress (20).” During the principal’s presentation, the principal described an assessment landscape used to monitor student performance and instructional implementation. Evidence indicates that instructional systems and expectations for implementation require further clarification and refinement.

The primary area for improvement identified by the team relates to strengthening coherence and strategic design across systems that support improvement efforts. While multiple leadership teams and initiatives are present, evidence indicates missed opportunities to intentionally connect these efforts to a cohesive, interdependent system. Team leaders do not consistently meet with the principal to align priorities, review data across systems and monitor the collective impact of instructional, behavioral and support initiatives. This is associated with variation in instructional implementation across classrooms, as reflected in educator and student survey data related to instructional adjustment.

Overall, evidence indicates that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround process. Leadership structures, data systems and collaborative teams are established and in use. Increased coherence and strategic alignment across leadership teams and initiatives would support more consistent implementation of improvement efforts and monitoring of impact.

Team Roster

The Diagnostic 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 eleot 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
Leah Barley	Leah Barley is a 25-year veteran educator in South Carolina, serving as teacher, reading specialist, instructional coach, MTSS facilitator and district administrator. In her current role as Lead Transformation Coach with the South Carolina State Department of Education, she leads a team of Transformation Coaches across 12 school districts and leads improvement initiatives in CSI schools. Barley is a certified trainer for Crucial Conversations and a two-time National Board-certified educator.
Denva Smith	Denva Smith brings over 27 years of experience in education, serving in various roles including teacher, reading interventionist, instructional coach and district administrator. As an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), she leads improvement initiatives in CSI schools, state-managed districts and targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools. Smith is a certified trainer for Jim Shipley Systems & Associates and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL).
Tracey Kline	Tracey Cline is currently serving in her fourth year as an ERL with the KDE where she supports CSI schools. With 26 years of experience, Tracey has served in many roles across several districts in Kentucky, such as elementary teacher, reading interventionist, literacy consultant, K-12 instructional coach and elementary principal.
LaTressa Graham	LaTressa Graham is an educational leader with experience supporting student success, equity and community engagement. She currently serves in multiple leadership capacities in public education, with a strong focus on MLs and students from historically underserved backgrounds. Graham leads student enrollment and intake processes and has specialized expertise in supporting MLs and their families. In addition, she is a certified School Staff Test Administrator for the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery, entrusted with secure test administration and compliance with Military Entrance Processing Station protocols. Graham was named Educator of the Year by the Area Chamber of Commerce.
Brad Brunswick	Brad Brunswick brings 14 years of experience in education, serving as a teacher, teacher leader and dedicated member of various curriculum, instruction and assessment committees to promote school improvement. As an English language arts (ELA) Content Specialist II with Cognia, he assists with the development, review and refinement of high-quality ELA assessments.

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.	2
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.	1
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.	1

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.	1

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.	1
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.	1

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.	1

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	1

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
				learner performance with stakeholders.	

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	13	46	20	47	11	47
4th-Grade Reading	18	48	11	50	16	50
5th-Grade Reading	26	48	18	46	7	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	*	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	*	43	6	44
5th-Grade Math	14	41	7	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	11	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	13	42	*	39	5	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	23	47	12	47	6	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	16	39	11	39	*	38

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 20% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025 and remains below the state average of 47%.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 18% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025 and remains below the state average of 50%.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics declined from 12% in 2023-2024 to 6% in 2024-2025.

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished at all grade levels and in all content areas was below the state averages in 2024-2025.

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	35	26	39	29	37	30
Percent Score of 60-80	36	35	34	35	38	35
Percent Score of 100	20	24	21	23	19	22
Percent Score of 140	9	14	7	13	5	13

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of ELs receiving 100 points for progress in 2024-2025 was 19%, which is below the state average of 22%.
- The percentage of ELs who received 100 points or more for progress decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 and remains below state averages.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	13	20	11
Female	11	21	*
Male	15	*	9
White	21	*	*
African American	*	*	6
Hispanic or Latino	19	14	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	19	10	*
English Learners plus Monitored	19	10	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	17	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading in 2024-2025 was 6%.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
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 Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	18	11	16
Female	29	10	18
Male	*	*	14
White	17	*	29
African American	*	*	7
Hispanic or Latino	23	13	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	15	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	18	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	11	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 7% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 29% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	6
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	10
White	*	*	17
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	*	*	6
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 6% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 6% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	11
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	12
White	*	*	29
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	*	*	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 12% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	26	18	7
Female	30	21	*
Male	22	*	*
White	44	19	*
African American	10	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	26	15	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	16	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	29	16	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 26% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 29% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	14	7	*
Female	*	8	*
Male	17	*	*
White	28	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	7	*
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	5	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2023-2024.

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	13	*	5
Female	18	*	*
Male	*	*	7
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	22	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	7
Economically Disadvantaged	13	*	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2024-2025.

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	23	12	6
Female	30	18	*
Male	17	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	14	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	19	7	6
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	13	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	19	*	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2024-2025 and was below the state average.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 6% in 2024-2025.

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)
All Students	16	11	*
Female	24	11	*
Male	*	*	*
White	22	*	*
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	15	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2023-2024.

Schedule

Monday, February 2, 2026

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

Tuesday, February 3, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 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, February 4, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:45 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	Hotel Conference Room	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, February 5, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members