



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Bullitt County**

Feb. 23-26, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	6
eleot Narrative	9
Improvement Priorities	12
Improvement Priority 1	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	14
Your Next Steps	15
District Capacity in Diagnostic Review	16
Team Roster	18
Appendix	19
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	21
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	25
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	27
Student Performance Data.....	30
School Name: Maryville Elementary School	30
School Name: Zoneton Middle School	32
Schedule	34

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	15
Building-Level Administrators	2
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	5
Board Members	5
Noncertified Staff	2
Students	8
Total	37

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:

Interviews, survey results and a review of artifacts consistently reflected an intentional effort to cultivate authentic partnerships among the district, community members and business leaders. Community involvement and investment are highly visible through the district's Community-Based Accountability (CBA) model, including the 40-member Community-Based Accountability Steering Committee composed of district and community stakeholders. This committee has worked collaboratively to develop and refine the district's accountability pillars (i.e., Student Learning, Fiscal and Operational Care, Life Readiness, Engaged and Well-Rounded Students, Community Collaboration and Engagement and Student Safety and Well-Being), providing a comprehensive framework that reflects shared ownership for student success. The district's "Graduate Profile", developed through this model, further articulated a collective vision for learners. Across stakeholder interviews, the district's core value, "Students Matter Most", was consistently referenced as a lens for decision-making and organizational priorities. Professional staff, board members and school-level personnel expressed an awareness of and commitment to achieving the district's vision and mission. Stakeholders consistently expressed a high level of trust in the superintendent's leadership, and board members communicated unified support for his direction and decision-making.

District leadership structures reflected a commitment to collaboration, professional growth and a responsiveness to stakeholder feedback. Stakeholder interviews revealed several members of the district leadership team bring prior experience as building principals, contributing practical insight and empathy in their support of school leaders. In addition, stakeholder interviews, the superintendent's presentation and a review of artifacts indicated the existence of several formalized collaborative structures, including the Personalized Principal Support Approach (PPSA), monthly principal leadership meetings, assistant principal meetings and leadership team sessions designed to strengthen coherence and alignment across schools. Stakeholder interviews and a review of evidence and artifacts revealed the district uses a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) protocol to guide improvement efforts, signaling an understanding of continuous improvement principles. Stakeholder interviews also indicated the district's communication systems were robust and multifaceted, including platforms such as Bacon Bits, Monday.com, Deputy Dispatch, Thrillshare, the Admin Hub, the Bullitt Beacon and social media outlets to ensure timely and transparent information sharing. Additionally, the communication department maintains a formal advisory panel to consistently gather stakeholder feedback and encourage participation in district priorities. A broader advisory team has also been formed to strengthen collaboration and support within the school community.

A review of evidence, stakeholder interviews and the superintendent's presentation further indicated that the district has established systems to support both instruction and professional development. Each school is assigned a designated instructional coach and a permanent school designated guest teacher (SDGT) to ensure continuity of instruction and provide job-embedded support for classroom teachers. The Teachable Honorable Reflective Innovative Versatile Enthusiasm (THRIVE) Academy is in place to support new educators, demonstrating a proactive effort to address teacher induction and retention. In response to stakeholder feedback gathered through established feedback loops and survey mechanisms, the district developed the Classified Connection Conference (C3), underscoring its commitment to the training, recognition and retention of classified



staff. Surveys are routinely used to gather input from multiple stakeholder groups, and evidence indicates the district responds to this feedback with programmatic adjustments.

Stakeholder interviews, the superintendent's presentation and artifact review indicated the district has established a professional learning community (PLC) structure with dedicated time intended to foster collaboration, strengthen instructional practices and support student achievement. District and school leaders described regularly scheduled opportunities for collaborative planning and discussion, reflecting the district's recognition of the importance of collective responsibility for student learning. The purpose and intent of PLC time is to review student data, align curriculum, discuss instructional strategies and plan interventions. These plans were clearly articulated by district and school leadership. However, while dedicated time and articulated expectations are in place, stakeholder interviews suggested implementation is not fully consistent across schools and grade levels. Conversations during PLCs vary in focus and depth and systematic protocols for examining student work, analyzing formative assessment data and monitoring the impact of instructional adjustments are not embedded districtwide. With greater clarity around non-negotiables, consistent use of data-driven protocols and ongoing monitoring of effectiveness, the district's PLC framework has significant potential to serve as a powerful lever for instructional coherence and improved student outcomes.

Collectively, these strengths illustrated a district deeply committed to stakeholder engagement, transparent communication, community collaboration and leadership development. While stakeholders acknowledged the presence of numerous systems and structures designed to promote organizational effectiveness, multiple interviews also suggested the next phase of growth involves ensuring consistent monitoring and evaluation of these systems to determine their overall impact. Nevertheless, Bullitt County Schools has established a strong foundation of community trust, collaborative leadership and clearly articulated core values upon which continued improvement efforts can be built.

Stakeholder interviews, a review of student performance data, classroom observations and artifact analysis indicated the district has begun important work toward strengthening continuous improvement; however, a clearly defined and consistently implemented process for monitoring, evaluating and refining programs and practices is not fully evident across the system. While district leaders have articulated a strong vision through the Graduate Profile and the development of authentic learning experiences, evidence suggested that continued work is needed to ensure consistent implementation and meaningful monitoring across all schools. Interviews and reviewed artifacts revealed limited documentation of systematic follow-up, progress checks or clearly defined success criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of these initiatives at the classroom level.

At the school level, particularly within the two comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) schools, there was little evidence that differentiated, targeted support had been provided beyond additional funding for professional development. Although this allocation of resources demonstrated intent to address identified needs, a structured process for determining the impact of those investments on instructional practice and student outcomes was not readily apparent. Furthermore, current data and stakeholder interviews indicate inconsistencies in how programs and systems are implemented and monitored, revealing a disconnect between district-level perceptions of implementation fidelity and the documented reality within schools.

High turnover rates in recent years have contributed to a significant number of new and inexperienced teachers at the identified CSI schools. While the THRIVE program has been established to support teachers new to the profession and the district, stakeholder interviews indicated the support provided has not fully met the needs of all participants, specifically those entering through alternative certification pathways. This context underscores the need for differentiated professional learning structures that are responsive to the varying levels of experience of staff members in the schools, including support for classified staff. Although stakeholder interviews indicated professional learning opportunities were offered, a comprehensive, data-informed professional learning plan aligned to school improvement goals and evaluated for effectiveness was not clearly evident.

Additionally, stakeholder interviews and a review of documents and artifacts show a clear and systematic process for reviewing and analyzing student academic performance data, including trend and subgroup data, for the



purposes of program evaluation and curriculum; however, instructional monitoring was not readily apparent. While learning environment data reflected generally positive student interactions and engagement, broader instructional evidence indicated variability in rigor, differentiation and clarity of learning expectations. Without a formalized structure for triangulating multiple data sources and routinely evaluating implementation fidelity, the district's ability to measure the effectiveness of initiatives and adjust practices in a timely manner is limited.

Moving forward, it will be critical for the district to develop and implement a comprehensive continuous improvement framework that clearly defines roles, timelines, measurable outcomes and monitoring processes at the district, school, classroom and student levels. Establishing a systematic approach to program evaluation, including the routine analysis of academic, perception and implementation data, will allow leaders to determine which initiatives are producing measurable gains, which require refinement and which may need to be reconsidered. By aligning curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional learning and resource allocation within a cohesive improvement cycle, the district can strengthen implementation fidelity, provide differentiated support to schools and staff and ensure that all students experience equitable, rigorous and consistently high-quality learning opportunities.



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 49 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	1.9	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	47%	27%	20%	6%
A2	2.4	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	8%	47%	37%	8%
A3	2.7	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	6%	29%	55%	10%
A4	1.6	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.	57%	29%	14%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.1				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.9	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	31%	47%	22%	0%
B2	2.1	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	20%	53%	24%	2%
B3	1.7	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	51%	35%	12%	2%
B4	1.9	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	37%	43%	18%	2%
B5	2.0	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	24%	51%	22%	2%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.5	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	10%	37%	47%	6%
C2	2.2	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	24%	37%	37%	2%
C3	2.5	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	12%	33%	45%	10%
C4	2.5	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	22%	18%	45%	14%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.4			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.2	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	29%	35%	24%	12%
D2	1.5	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	63%	24%	10%	2%
D3	2.5	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	8%	49%	31%	12%
D4	1.9	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	39%	43%	10%	8%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.5	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	59%	33%	8%	0%
E2	2.2	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	16%	53%	27%	4%
E3	2.1	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	22%	49%	27%	2%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	67%	27%	6%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.8			



F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.8	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	8%	18%	61%	12%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	2%	29%	59%	10%
F3	2.3	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	22%	33%	41%	4%
F4	2.3	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	12%	49%	35%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			

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.	59%	31%	10%	0%
G2	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	76%	14%	10%	0%
G3	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	88%	8%	4%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.3			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Teams for the two CSI schools conducted 49 formal classroom observations in core content areas. Classroom observational data revealed Well-Managed Learning as the highest-scoring learning environment, scoring a 2.5 on a 4-point scale. The highest-rated item for the schools was, “Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)”, which was evident/very evident in 73% of classrooms. Similarly, it was observed to be evident/very evident in 65% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” The teams observed that students were mostly respectful in classrooms and throughout the buildings. Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 69% of classrooms that “learners



demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” The teams observed evidence of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) in both buildings, including posted expectations and methods for rewarding students for positive choices. While an overall PBIS structure was in place, there is an opportunity to improve classroom routines, as it was evident/very evident in 45% of classrooms that “learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3).” It was also evident/very evident in 39% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)” further supporting the need for a continued focus on clear classroom expectations.

A supportive learning environment was inconsistently observed across classroom settings; however, students’ perceptions of a supportive learning environment were higher than those revealed in observational data. For example, 75% of elementary students and 67% of middle school students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “In the past 30 days, I had support when I needed it (18)”, while it was evident/very evident in 55% of the classrooms that “learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3).” This gap suggests that students perceive greater support than was consistently observed. In addition, it was evident/very evident in 39% of classrooms that “learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback) (C2).” These findings further support the need for the schools to strengthen classroom routines that make support visible and sustained to foster academic risk-taking in all settings

The teams also found connections between the Supportive and Active Learning Environments. For example, it was evident/very evident in 53% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1)”, yet it was evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)”, indicating that opportunities for students to collaborate, with or without a digital platform, were limited. Strengthening all opportunities for students to collaborate will support them to work toward shared goals, which in turn will support a stronger sense of community across classrooms.

Interviews revealed that the district has a one-to-one device initiative where all K-12 students are provided a device. Although each student has access to a device, leveraging the use of these devices for higher-level learning was minimally observed. It was evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms that learners use digital tools/technology to both “gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)” and “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2).” When using devices, students were often observed completing their i-Ready Assessment Suite pathways or low-rigor tasks.

The teams observed minimal student engagement in rigorous learning tasks, which was reflected in consistently low levels of active engagement across classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” This limits students’ exposure to rigorous tasks. It was evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)”, suggesting that the lack of higher-order learning opportunities contributes to reduced student engagement overall. It was also evident/very evident in 26% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” and evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1).” Together, these indicators reveal the need to strengthen Tier 1 instruction and feedback routines that emphasize cognitive demand and attainable challenges, as these are critical points to increasing sustained engagement and improved learning across classrooms.

Finally, the teams observed limited differentiation to support student learning. Student survey results revealed that 50% of elementary students and 66% of middle school students chose “do the same work as everyone else”



when asked, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” This perception was supported by observational data, as it was evident/very evident in 26% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)”, highlighting a need for more responsive practices to address the diverse learning needs of students in all classrooms.

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

Develop and implement a program evaluation process for internal stakeholders to monitor program effectiveness and organizational conditions. Prioritize district-wide initiatives and analyze verifiable improvement in student learning.

Standard 26: Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.

Findings:

Student performance data, as detailed in the appendix of this report, indicate the district has not implemented a program evaluation process to monitor program effectiveness and district initiatives to determine their impact on student learning. Student performance data across both identified CSI schools indicated inconsistent academic progress and a lack of sustained, systematic improvement. While there are isolated areas of growth, longitudinal trends revealed significant declines across multiple grade levels and content areas, with overall performance remaining below state averages in most areas.

At Maryville Elementary School, 3rd-grade performance on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) improved notably from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025, with the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished increasing by 30 percentage points in reading and 13 percentage points in math. Additionally, the percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 34 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025, and economically disadvantaged students showed an 18-percentage-point increase during the same period. However, these gains were inconsistent across grade levels. Fourth-grade reading decreased by 22 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024. Fifth-grade performance reflected more substantial and sustained declines, with decreases of 22 percentage points in reading and math and a 29-percentage-point decrease in editing and mechanics from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. Science, social studies and writing performance remained particularly low. In 2024-2025, 18% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in science compared to the state average of 37%. Similarly, 15% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies and on-demand writing, compared to the state average of 38% in each content area. Although some subgroup gains were noted in isolated grade levels, longitudinal data revealed that all reported subgroups experienced decreases in Proficient/Distinguished performance across multiple content areas from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. These fluctuations suggested that improvements have not been systemically embedded or sustained across grade spans.

Similarly, at Zoneton Middle School, modest gains were observed in select grade levels, including a 10-percentage-point increase in 6th-grade reading and a 7-percentage-point increase in 6th-grade math from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. Eighth-grade math increased by four percentage points, and 7th-grade science increased by one percentage point during the same period. However, these gains were overshadowed by broader declines across grade levels and content areas. KSA results remained below the state average in all grade levels and content areas for the past three years. Seventh-grade reading decreased by 12 percentage points, and 7th-grade math decreased by 16 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. Eighth-grade performance declined across multiple content areas, including reading, social studies, editing and mechanics and on-demand writing. Subgroup performance mirrored these patterns, with notable decreases among male, White and economically disadvantaged students in several content areas over the three-year period.



Across both schools, performance on the KSA remained flat, with little to no growth. Gains in isolated grade levels are not consistently replicated across cohorts or sustained longitudinally. Moreover, overall performance remains below state averages, indicating that current instructional programming and supports have not yet resulted in meaningful, systemic improvement.

Classroom observational data indicate that the district has not systemically implemented or monitored instructional practices through a coherent program evaluation process designed to ensure consistent academic impact. The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.9, while the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment received an even lower overall rating of 1.8. A positive culture was observed in some classrooms, as learners who “speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)” were evident/very evident in 73% of classrooms, and learners who “demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)” were evident/very evident in 69% of classrooms. However, instructional indicators more closely tied to academic rigor and monitoring were inconsistently demonstrated. Learners who engage in “differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” were evident/very evident in 26% of classrooms. Likewise, learners who engage “in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)” were evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms, and learners who “demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)” were evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms. The critical components of progress monitoring were largely absent. Learners who “monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” were evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms and learners who “understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)” were evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms. Although, learners who “actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)” were evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms, engagement alone was not consistently accompanied by clear expectations, rigorous tasks or student ownership of learning. Collectively, these data suggest that while many classrooms have behavioral expectations, there is limited evidence of a systematically monitored instructional framework to evaluate implementation fidelity, ensure alignment to high-quality practices and connect instructional initiatives to measurable improvements in student achievement.

Moreover, a review of stakeholder perception data revealed that 81% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “In the past 30 days, I used a variety of information for decision-making that affected my area of responsibility (21).” Additionally, 85% of families agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “The adults use many types of information to help children learn (9).” However, survey data is not fully substantiated by student performance outcomes or by evidence of a clearly articulated, documented and monitored data review process. Although multiple data sources are collected, interviews and artifact reviews consistently indicated the school lacks a formally documented system-wide process for the systematic collection, analysis and implementation of next steps tied to program effectiveness.

Leadership stability and staffing capacity emerged as significant contextual factors. Since 2022-2023, Maryville Elementary has experienced 41 teacher vacancies, with 48% of the teaching staff having zero to three years of experience. Zoneton Middle School has experienced 42 teacher vacancies during the same period, with 59% of teachers having zero to three years of experience. Exit interviews identified a lack of support and insufficient training as the primary reasons for departure, particularly among teachers and instructional assistants assigned to the CSI schools. Although the district has implemented support, such as the THRIVE program for new teachers and the C3 conference for classified staff, interviews revealed variability in implementation, inconsistent monitoring and a need to strengthen support for alternative certification educators.

Stakeholders consistently reported that, in terms of district processes, communication and core instructional supports, the assistance provided to the CSI schools was largely aligned with that provided to all schools, with the primary distinction being a dedicated director visiting once per week after identification. Interviews consistently described a disconnect between district-level initiatives and implementation at the school level. Apart from feedback loops, communication was described as funneling from district leadership to department leads to



principals, with no clearly defined process for ensuring information and expectations were consistently communicated and monitored at the teacher level. A need for stronger monitoring systems was cited multiple times by district leadership and school stakeholders.

A review of evidence and artifacts revealed little documentation of a systematic, longitudinal data analysis process to evaluate program effectiveness or guide curriculum and instructional decision-making. While program adoptions and initiatives were referenced, including high-quality instructional resource (HQIR) selections and professional learning structures, documentation did not demonstrate analysis or triangulation of longitudinal performance data to determine impact. Additionally, limited information was provided regarding differentiated, measurable support for the CSI schools.

Overall, the evidence suggested that while isolated efforts and pockets of improvement exist, the district has not implemented a coherent, systematic program evaluation and monitoring process capable of ensuring sustained academic growth across grade levels and student groups. Without a clearly defined, consistently monitored framework for analyzing longitudinal data, evaluating initiatives and aligning support to identified needs, improvement efforts are unlikely to result in stable, system-wide gains in student learning and academic performance.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Conduct a district-wide initiative inventory, identifying the purpose, target population, intended outcomes and alignment to district comprehensive district improvement plan (CDIP) goals.
- Establish clear evaluation criteria that includes alignment to CDIP goals, evidence of impact on student learning, implementation fidelity, cost effectiveness and equity of learning opportunities.
- Create and implement a balanced system for analyzing student academic performance data that is tied to programs and examines growth data, subgroup performance and multi-year trends.
- Use program evaluation data and feedback loops to identify overlapping or redundant systems and determine which should be refined, redesigned or discontinued to prioritize district initiatives and reallocate resources to differentiate support to identified CSI schools, strengthening their capacity to intentionally address student learning and performance outcomes.
- Develop a sustainability plan using measurable targets for prioritized programs and initiatives that include ongoing monitoring and continuous improvement cycles to ensure improved professional practice and student achievement.



Your Next Steps

The results of the Diagnostic Review provide the next step for guiding the improvement journey of the institution with their efforts to improve the quality of educational opportunities for all learners. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness. The feedback provided in the Diagnostic Review Report will assist the institution in reflecting on current improvement efforts and adapting and adjusting their plans to continuously strive for improvement.

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

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



District Capacity in Diagnostic Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the functioning and capacity of the district to determine its ability to manage an intervention in each school identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI). As outlined in 703 KAR 5:280, Section 4, the determination of the district's level of functioning and ability is based on an assessment of capacity in the following areas:

- The district demonstrates maintenance and communication of a visionary purpose and direction committed to high expectations for learning as well as shared values and beliefs about teaching and learning;
- The district leads and operates under a governance and leadership style that promotes and supports student performance and system effectiveness;
- The district establishes a data-driven system for curriculum, instructional design, and delivery, ensuring both teacher effectiveness and student achievement;
- The district ensures that systems are in place for accurate collection and use of data;
- The district ensures that systems are in place to allocate human and fiscal resources to support improvement and ensure success for all students; and
- The district ensures that a comprehensive assessment system, which generates a range of data about student learning and system effectiveness and uses the results to guide continuous improvement, is implemented.

Following its review of extensive evidence and in consideration of the factors outlined above, the Diagnostic Review Team submitted the following assessment regarding the district's capacity to the Commissioner of Education:

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district has the capacity to manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district requires intensive support in order to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district does not have the capacity to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the Bullitt County administration has the capacity to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI schools, Maryville Elementary School and Zoneton Middle School.

The superintendent and administrative team have established a culture for continuous improvement that is grounded in authentic problems to “inspire and equip students to succeed in life.” The stated core value of the district is that “Students Matter Most.” This is evident in the transformation plans for the district and all the schools across the district.

The district's various departments and divisions submitted evidence that demonstrated how they are addressing the Cognia Performance Standards for continuous improvement. The communication department maintains a formal advisory panel to consistently gather stakeholder feedback and participation with the district's priorities. Clear guidelines are in place to support and guide staff members in professional outreach, with students, parents and the greater community.



Interviews and a review of evidence revealed that the district has a commitment to fostering belonging, motivation and connectedness among students and staff. The district provides regular opportunities to recognize the outstanding efforts of both staff and students.

The district was recently recognized by the Kentucky Board of Education for its commitment to partner with local stakeholders to meet local goals and ensure student success. This collaborative effort led to the creation of the Community-Based Accountability (CBA) Steering Committee, a 40-member body that reflects the Bullitt County community. The outcome of this partnership has been in the “creation of a refined set of Community-Based Accountability Pillars for Bullitt County’s accountability system: Student Learning, Fiscal and Operational Care, Life Readiness, Engaged and Well-Rounded Students, Community Collaboration and Engagement and Student Safety and Well-Being.”

The district has demonstrated some differentiated support for its two identified CSI schools with additional funding and human resources. The district has invested over \$58,000 in staff training at Zoneton Middle School and over \$27,000 at Maryville Elementary School. Providing this additional professional learning, along with content-specific curriculum resources, support materials and digital tools, the district is working to ensure each of these schools have the resources and tools needed for continuous improvement. Additionally, the district has helped each school address their school’s climate and culture with the inclusion of the Character Strong” and Jostens Renaissance training to provide holistic support for all students.

An area that must be addressed is the expectation of the two CSI schools to fully implement all the district’s initiatives and programs with some of the most inexperienced and novice teaching staff within the district. Thus, prioritizing initiatives and programs for effectiveness in teaching and learning is critical for learning outcomes and retaining staff. It was revealed that exit interviews with staff who left both schools indicated they felt overwhelmed and left for less challenging environments. District leadership should facilitate opportunities for leaders at the CSI schools to identify and address barriers to increase and sustain student learning quickly.



Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Lynn Simmers	Lynn Simmers serves as the assistant superintendent of Southwest Allen County Schools in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Simmers' professional career spans 33 years, including experience as a teacher, assistant principal, curriculum coordinator, principal and assistant superintendent. Her interests include literacy and math instruction, analyzing statistical trends to promote improved student achievement and professional development related to instructional coaching, grading and assessment practices. Lynn has extensive experience in leading school and system accreditation visits and diagnostic reviews for Cognia.
Chris Mueller	Chris Mueller has over 40 years of experience as a teacher, administrator and Educational Recovery Leader (ERL). Chris has taught at the middle, high school and collegiate levels. While serving as an ERL, Chris worked with administrative teams and school leadership teams to facilitate turnaround efforts in Kentucky's central region. Additionally, he has been an associate lead evaluator in multiple Diagnostic Reviews. Also, he has led monitoring reviews in CSI schools for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). He is a certified facilitator for Jim Shipley & Associates in School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence (SIPPE). Chris serves as a university supervisor for alternative certification teaching candidates.
Stacey Davidson	Stacey Davidson has over 23 years of experience in education, including two years with KDE as an ERL supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching high school English and serving as chief academic officer, district assessment coordinator and professional development coordinator for two districts. Also, Stacey is a certified facilitator for SIPPE.
Erika Walker	Erika Walker has over 24 years of experience in education, serving as a teacher, district resource teacher and administrator. Her career includes teaching at both the elementary and middle school levels, as well as leading and supporting instructional improvement and system-level work.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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



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.	3
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.	3
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.	3

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	2
8. The governing authority demonstrates a commitment to learners by collaborating with leaders to uphold the institution's priorities and to drive continuous improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate minimal commitment to learners and rarely support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders seldom collaborate on the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate some commitment to learners and sometimes support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to focus the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions demonstrate a commitment to learners and support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to collaboratively further the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions are regularly reviewed to ensure an uncompromised commitment to learners and the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to consistently and intentionally collaborate to further the institution's improvement.	3

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
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.	3
10. Leaders demonstrate expertise in recruiting, supervising, and evaluating professional staff members to optimize learning.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members without consideration of contribution to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders rarely use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders seldom supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders sometimes use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders routinely use data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders regularly implement practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	Leaders intentionally and consistently identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders consistently use analyzed data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders implement and monitor documented practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	3

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

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
15. Learners' needs drive the equitable allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources.	Professional staff members rarely analyze learners' needs and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources. Resources are rarely allocated in alignment with documented learners' needs or to ensure equity for learning.	Professional staff members sometimes analyze learners' needs, current, and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are sometimes based on current or updated data.	Professional staff members routinely analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are routinely based on current data and at predetermined points in time.	Professional staff members engage in a systematic process to analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are consistently based on current data at any point in time.	3

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.	3
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.	3



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.	2
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	2

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

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

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

Student Performance Data

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

School Name: Maryville Elementary School

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	25	46	17	47	47	47
4th-Grade Reading	50	48	28	50	*	50
5th-Grade Reading	40	48	32	46	18	50
3rd-Grade Math	20	43	17	43	30	43
4th-Grade Math	31	42	26	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	40	41	23	41	18	43
4th-Grade Science	27	35	*	34	18	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	36	42	20	39	15	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	51	47	32	47	22	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	30	39	19	39	15	38

Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

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

School Name: Zoneton Middle School

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)
6th-Grade Reading	31	48	31	49	41	52
7th-Grade Reading	35	45	18	47	23	48
8th-Grade Reading	25	44	24	41	20	42
6th-Grade Math	13	38	17	42	20	41
7th-Grade Math	31	37	*	39	15	43
8th-Grade Math	14	36	18	37	18	40
7th-Grade Science	14	23	*	22	15	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	23	35	18	35	15	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	35	49	26	47	30	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	38	45	26	49	28	49

Middle 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	*	68	*	66	*	60
Percent Score of 60-80	*	24	*	23	*	26
Percent Score of 100	*	7	*	8	*	10
Percent Score of 140	*	2	*	3	*	3

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
5:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, Feb. 24, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8 a.m. – 3 p.m.	Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
3:30 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, Feb. 25, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8 a.m. – 1 p.m.	Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
1 p.m. – 3 p.m.	School Visits	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
3:30 p.m. – 7 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 26, 2026

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