Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:

Byck Elementary

Feb. 23-26, 2026

cognia™

Table of Contents

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	2
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	7
Certified Staff	6
Noncertified Staff	7
Students	37
Parents	4
Total	66

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

Evidence indicates that Byck Elementary has established a strong relational foundation characterized by a sense of belonging among students, staff and families. Survey results demonstrated consistently high levels of care, safety and respect. Ninety-two percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)" and 91% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults show that they care about us (7)." Family responses reflected similarly strong perceptions, with 100% who agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults make students feel welcomed (1)" and "care about children's well-being (7)." These findings align with interviews and artifacts describing a family-oriented culture, strong community connection and shared pride reflected through Cougar PRIDE (Positive, Responsible, Integrity, Display, Effort), a framework that establishes common behavioral and character expectations. A review of artifacts and observational data indicates that Cougar PRIDE is embedded in shared language, daily routines and visible schoolwide messaging that emphasizes positive words and actions, responsibility, integrity, self-control and effort, reflecting a clearly articulated cultural framework across the school community.

The school demonstrates a sustained commitment to supporting the social, emotional and behavioral needs of learners. Evidence shows that structured systems (e.g., counseling services, social and emotional learning programming, a full-time mental health practitioner, coordinated supports) are designed to remove barriers to learning. Screening and program evidence indicate that most students report feeling safe, connected and supported, reinforcing a culture where student well-being contributes to readiness for learning.

Leadership structures and improvement frameworks are established to guide the work. Artifacts show alignment between the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP), ongoing monitoring processes and clearly identified focus areas related to coaching, student behavior and instructional planning. The school's vision emphasizes maximizing instructional time, aligning learning to Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) and strengthening student ownership of learning, reflecting intentional efforts to improve teaching and learning through defined priorities.

Systems to support data-informed decision making are present. Evidence demonstrates the use of universal screeners, diagnostic assessments, progress monitoring and collaborative data analysis within professional learning community (PLC) meetings. These processes reflect a commitment to examining student performance and adjusting supports in response to identified needs.

While a relational culture is evident, variability in communication, collaboration and collective ownership across stakeholder groups suggests the need for greater coherence in professional practice. Interviews and artifacts reflect differing perceptions regarding clarity of expectations, consistency of systems and shared responsibility for student success. In some instances, staff described uneven communication and limited follow-through on feedback, suggesting that collaborative structures do not consistently drive unified action. Survey data further reflect this variability. Although stakeholders widely described the school as welcoming and caring, educator responses indicate that instructional consistency is still developing. For example, 61% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive

(9)." This suggests that nearly 4 in 10 educators do not perceive instructional practice as consistently meeting the needs of all learners.

Although improvement structures are in place, the implementation of instructional practices is not consistently observed across classrooms. Classroom observational data reflect limited consistency in cognitively rigorous, learner-centered instruction. It was evident/very evident in 12% 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)." While systems such as coaching cycles, internalization protocols and walkthrough feedback are in place, translation of these systems into consistently rigorous, standards-aligned and engaging Tier 1 instruction varies.

PLCs and a review of data processes provide structures for collaborative inquiry; however, evidence suggests these structures inconsistently result in aligned instructional responses or shared accountability for student outcomes. Variability in how teams analyze data, internalize high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) and adjust instruction indicates that collaboration has not matured into a unified instructional approach consistently experienced by all learners.

Collectively, the evidence suggests that while relationships, leadership priorities and improvement structures are established, greater consistency in collaborative professional practice and stronger alignment of instructional expectations across classrooms are necessary to ensure that all learners experience rigorous, engaging and standards-aligned daily instruction. Strengthening leadership calibration, deepening collective ownership and ensuring consistent translation of systems into high-quality classroom practice will be critical for accelerating student growth and improving performance outcomes.

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 17 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	1.2	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	76%	24%	0%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	6%	18%	76%	0%
A3	2.6	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	6%	24%	71%	0%
A4	1.4	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.	71%	18%	12%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.0				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
B1	1.6	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	47%	47%	6%	0%
B2	1.9	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	29%	47%	24%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	65%	24%	12%	0%
B4	1.7	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	41%	47%	12%	0%
B5	1.8	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	24%	71%	6%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.7**				

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
C1	2.4	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	18%	29%	53%	0%
C2	2.1	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	35%	24%	35%	6%
C3	2.4	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	18%	35%	41%	6%
C4	2.5	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	24%	6%	65%	6%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.3**				

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
D1	2.0	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	24%	53%	24%	0%
D2	1.6	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	47%	47%	6%	0%
D3	2.5	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	6%	35%	59%	0%
D4	1.6	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	59%	18%	24%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.9**				

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
E1	1.3	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	76%	18%	6%	0%
E2	2.1	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	29%	35%	35%	0%
E3	2.1	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	24%	41%	35%	0%
E4	1.2	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	82%	12%	6%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.7**				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
F1	2.6	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	6%	29%	65%	0%
F2	2.5	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	12%	29%	59%	0%
F3	2.0	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	29%	41%	29%	0%
F4	2.3	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	18%	35%	47%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.3**				

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
G1	1.6	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	53%	29%	18%	0%
G2	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	82%	12%	6%	0%
G3	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	76%	18%	6%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.4**				

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 17 classroom observations at Byck Elementary using the eleot to analyze learner experiences. Observational data revealed generally respectful interactions and orderly classroom environments, while also identifying variability in rigor, differentiation, learner ownership and the use of formative practices to guide instruction. These patterns indicate that although supportive conditions for learning were mostly present, instructional practices were not consistently implemented across classrooms.

Evidence of classroom climate and equitable access indicated that students frequently experienced fair treatment and supportive relationships. It was evident/very evident in 76% of classrooms that "learners have equal access

to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2)" and evident/very evident in 71% of classrooms that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 71% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)." These findings are reinforced by survey data, as 85% of students agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults treat us with respect (2)", and 91% agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults show that they care about us (7)." While these findings reflect positive learning environments, supportive conditions alone do not consistently translate into high levels of cognitive engagement or learner ownership.

Across classrooms, expectations for learning and depth of instruction varied. Observational results showed that it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." It was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)" and evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)." While 98% of families agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults have high expectations for learning (10)", observational data reflected limited evidence of sustained cognitive demand and higher-order thinking across classrooms. This contrast indicates that expectations may be communicated, but they were not consistently translated into rigorous instructional practice.

Instructional responsiveness to learner needs was also inconsistent, influencing the depth of student engagement. It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)" and evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "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 (A4)." Stakeholder perception data showed that 75% of students agreed/absolutely agreed, "In the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)", and 88% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)." However, observational evidence indicated a lack of differentiated, intentional responsiveness to diverse learner needs in instructional practice.

Learner engagement was observed in some classrooms; however, deeper engagement through collaboration, application and discourse was less consistent. It was evident/very evident in 59% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." In contrast, it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)", and evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that "learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)." These findings indicate that engagement did not consistently extend to meaningful collaboration, real-world application or student-driven learning.

Formative assessment and feedback practices were among the least consistently observed instructional elements. It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)." Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms that "learners receive/respond to feedback to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)" and evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)." It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." Survey data indicated that 81% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had many ways to show my teachers what I learned (19)", and 96% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "In the past 30 days, I used a variety of information to determine learners' progress (20)." While monitoring systems and feedback processes were perceived to be in place, the team found a lack of student ownership of progress and clarity of assessment criteria in most classrooms.

The use of digital resources to support learning was limited. It was evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that "learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)." This finding

indicates that digital tools were not consistently used to promote inquiry, collaboration or deeper learning experiences or leveraged to meaningfully enhance instructional engagement.

Collectively, observational data revealed variability in instructional implementation and learner-centered practices across classrooms. While respectful environments and supportive relationships were evident, rigor, differentiation, collaboration and formative practices were not consistently embedded. Effective instructional practices were observed in individual classrooms but were not implemented as shared expectations across the school. As a result, learners experienced uneven levels of cognitive demand, engagement and ownership of learning. These patterns indicate the need for stronger instructional coherence, clearer expectations for high-quality instruction and strengthened collaborative practices to ensure consistent implementation of rigorous, learner-centered instruction across 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

Strengthen the schoolwide culture and collective efficacy by establishing coherent, collaborative systems and reflective leadership practices that promote a growth mindset, support effective change management and ensure clear expectations and consistent behavior responses.

Standard 5: Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners.

Findings:

A review of multiple data sources shows caring relationships and a commitment to students and families; however, professional collegiality, collaboration and collective efficacy are not consistently experienced across the school. This limits the school's ability to implement coherent and sustained improvement efforts at the level required for accelerated progress within a comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) school.

Evidence indicates the school has established cultural structures, including the Cougar PRIDE framework, which provides a shared language for behavioral and academic expectations, along with comprehensive social and emotional learning (SEL) supports through Global Game Changers, counseling services and mental health partnerships. These structures reflect intentional efforts to support students' well-being and character development; however, implementation, consistency and professional practices vary across classrooms, indicating that systems are present but not coherently aligned.

The 2025-2026 Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey (Impact) results reflect variability in staff perceptions of leadership tone, communication and overall professional culture. Twenty-seven percent of staff members selected quite positive/extremely positive when responding to the question, "How positive is the tone that school leaders set for the culture of the school?" Thirty-two percent selected quite effectively/extremely effectively when responding to the question, "How effectively do school leaders communicate important information to teachers?" Additionally, 23% selected quite positive/extremely positive when responding to the question, "How positive are the attitudes of your colleagues?", and 9% selected quite positive/extremely positive when responding to the question, "Overall, how positive is the working environment at your school?" These findings indicate that while collegial relationships exist among staff, shared clarity, trust and collective ownership are inconsistently experienced across the school.

Teach Upbeat Teacher Engagement Survey results further illuminate the role of leadership in shaping professional culture. From October 2025 to February 2026, staff perceptions of instructional leadership improved. The percentage reporting that "the principal at my school communicates a clear vision for teaching and learning" increased from 45.0% to 83.3%, while the percentage reporting that "the principal at my school uses data to monitor students' progress" increased from 82.0% to 91.7%. Additionally, the percentage reporting that "the principal at my school is an effective instructional leader" increased from 50.0% to 66.6%, indicating growth in perceptions of instructional leadership.

However, trust and relational leadership indicators, while improving, remain areas for growth. Between October 2025 and February 2026, staff trust in the principal experienced a significant rise, increasing from 32.0% to 66.7%. Likewise, perceptions of the principal's support for teacher well-being rose from 37.0% to 66.6%, and the proportion of staff feeling backed by the principal grew from 50.0% to 66.6%. These shifts indicate substantial progress in how staff viewed leadership and support during this timeframe. These data indicate that while

leadership practices are improving, trust and collective confidence are still developing and do not consistently support collective efficacy and coherent schoolwide improvement.

Interview data provide additional context. Professional staff described inconsistent communication practices, variability in behavior responses and limited clarity regarding schoolwide norms and shared commitments. Several staff noted that collaboration among peers remains a strength; however, alignment around leadership expectations, feedback cycles and consistent systems have not been fully established. These patterns indicate that while relational foundations exist, leadership practices are not yet consistently fostering the level of trust and coherence necessary to sustain instructional change.

Observational results reinforce this variability. It was evident/very evident in 53% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1)", and evident/very evident in 47% of classrooms that "learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)." Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)", and in 59% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)." These findings indicate that while supportive and respectful environments are present, consistent collaborative learning structures and shared behavioral expectations are not fully realized across classrooms.

Evidence also reflects strong family and community engagement systems through the Family Resource and Youth Services Center (FRYSC), community partnerships and structured outreach efforts. These relational strengths provide a foundation for improving internal collaboration and collective efficacy; however, without coherent internal systems that promote clear communication, shared leadership and consistent expectations, the school's ability to leverage these strengths for sustained academic improvement remains limited.

When triangulated, survey results, Teach Upbeat data, interview evidence and observational findings indicate that while relational strengths and foundational cultural structures exist in most classrooms, a consistently implemented system that promotes strong collegial collaboration, reflective leadership and collective accountability is not yet fully established. In the context of CSI, this variability in professional culture and communication structures may hinder the school's ability to implement and sustain high-quality instructional practices intended to improve student outcomes.

Potential Leader Actions

- Implement structured listening opportunities and facilitate collaborative development of shared commitments to strengthen trust, clarify expectations and build collective efficacy.

- Expand and refine the leadership team's role to model reflective leadership, transparent communication and shared decision-making structures.

- Reestablish the shared commitment to the consistent implementation of a clear, schoolwide behavior response system aligned to Cougar PRIDE expectations, and communicate, support and monitor it through visible leadership actions and regular data review to ensure consistency and shared accountability.

- Increase leadership visibility and feedback cycles to reinforce clarity, consistency and shared accountability across the school.

- Collaborate with available human resources (e.g., district leadership, building leadership, coaches) to implement a structured change-management framework grounded in growth mindset and continuous improvement principles to ensure coherence across professional practices.

Improvement Priority 2

Establish a coherent, schoolwide system that ensures instruction consistently reflects high expectations and learner-centered practices that result in rigorous learning experiences and increased mastery of grade-level standards.

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

Findings:

Analysis of student performance, classroom observation, survey data and evidence indicates that while instructional structures are established, implementation of high-expectations and learner-centered instruction is inconsistent across classrooms, limiting student ownership and mastery of grade-level standards.

During the 2023-2024 school year, 20% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading compared to the state average of 50%, and 10% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading compared to the state average of 50% in 2024-2025. Additionally, 8% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in science compared to the state average of 37% in 2024-2025. Across the past three years, 4th-grade reading increased from 8% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024 and remained at 20% in 2024-2025. In contrast, 5th-grade reading declined from 20% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2023-2024 and increased slightly to 10% in 2024-2025, indicating inconsistent and unsustained improvement in grade-level mastery. This pattern suggests that variability in Tier 1 instruction is contributing to inconsistent student outcomes.

Classroom observational data reflect limited consistency in cognitively rigorous, learner-centered instruction. It was evident/very evident in 12% 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)." Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that "learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5)." These findings indicate that in most classrooms, learners are not consistently engaged in cognitively demanding tasks or supported in monitoring and directing their learning.

School leadership conducted focused walkthroughs on learning targets during the 2025-2026 school year to monitor instructional clarity practices. School walkthrough data indicate that learning targets were posted in 66.67% of the classrooms observed; however, the team observed that learning targets were referenced in 20% of classrooms. When learning targets are not intentionally integrated into instruction, learners are less able to understand expectations or monitor progress toward mastery. Stakeholder perception data reveal a discrepancy between articulated expectations and instructional experience. Ninety-eight percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults have high expectations for learning (10)." However, 61% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)." This gap suggests that expectations are communicated but not consistently translated into rigorous, learner-centered classroom practice.

Additional student perception data indicate variability in instructional responsiveness and cognitive demand. Seventy-five percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Eighty percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me think in new ways (15)." Eighty-four percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)." These findings indicate that some students experience inconsistent differentiated instruction and a lack of cognitively challenging learning opportunities, suggesting variability in instructional responsiveness and rigor across classrooms.

System-level documentation indicates that the CSIP identifies coaching, student behavior and instructional planning as core priorities and includes monitoring through 30-60-90 day planning cycles. Professional learning structures include internalization, data analysis, learning targets and coaching cycles designed to build

instructional capacity. Collaborative structures are also present, with weekly PLC meetings focused on student data, unit internalization and instructional planning. However, evidence from interviews, leadership documentation and PLC artifacts indicates that while collaborative planning structures are established, PLC implementation is not consistently focused on a deep analysis of student learning, instructional rigor and standards alignment, limiting the impact of collaborative planning on classroom instructional quality and student outcomes. Despite these structures, classroom observational and performance data indicate inconsistent implementation of HQIRs, cognitively rigorous tasks and learner ownership practices.

When triangulated, these findings indicate that instructional systems are established but lack consistent coherence and fidelity of implementation. Strengthening alignment among instructional expectations, collaborative planning, coaching and classroom practice is necessary to ensure that all learners consistently experience rigorous, learner-centered instruction that leads to sustained increases in grade-level mastery.

Potential Leader Actions

- Define and communicate clear expectations for high-quality Tier 1 instruction and monitor implementation through a calibrated observation and feedback system.

- Strengthen professional learning to build teacher capacity to design and facilitate cognitively rigorous, learner-centered instruction that promotes engagement, ownership and mastery of grade-level expectations.

- Implement HQIRs with fidelity through lesson internalization, observation and feedback cycles with aligned coaching support.

- Strengthen the implementation of the PLC protocols to focus on analysis of student work and data, task rigor and alignment to grade-level standards to support consistent instructional planning.

- Ensure coaching, professional learning and monitoring focus on the same instructional priorities and use evidence from classroom implementation to guide adjustments and improve instructional consistency.

Your Next Steps

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

☐ The team has chosen not to reflect on the principal's capacity to lead the school's turnaround efforts.

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

☐ It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

☐ It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school and should be reassigned to a comparable position in the district.

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

The principal seeks to make the school more effective for each student, staff member, family and the broader community by establishing and refining conditions that support continuous improvement. Evidence from the principal presentation and interviews reflects a focused effort to strengthen instructional systems and student supports at Byck Elementary. The principal communicates urgency and demonstrates perseverance in advancing improvement efforts. Stakeholder interviews indicated resistance to leadership changes and uncertainty regarding the approach to change. While improvement structures are in place, structured opportunities for stakeholders to process change and provide meaningful input continue to develop and require refinement to strengthen readiness and collective commitment. Strengthening transparency in communication and increasing early engagement in decision-making processes will support trust and collective ownership.

The principal uses methods of continuous improvement and demonstrates knowledge of improvement science and effective improvement tools, including root cause analysis and systems checks to monitor system implementation. The principal seeks professional coaching to refine leadership practice and strengthen improvement efforts. Byck Elementary's Three Big Rocks (i.e., Powerful Intentional Planning, Teacher Coaching, Positive Student Behavior), provide a structure for prioritizing school improvement efforts. Although the instructional vision and plans are shared with stakeholder groups, interviews indicate that opportunities for input often occur after the initial direction has been established. Expanding collaborative development and embedding shared decision-making grounded in data and research will strengthen coherence, alignment and collective ownership across initiatives.

The principal employs situationally appropriate strategies for improvement planning. Monitoring tools such as "Evidence of Learning Checks" and coaching cycle tracking systems support examination of instructional impact

and student performance. PLCs provide a structure for examining student work and determining instructional responses; however, refinement of PLC protocols remains necessary to ensure that analysis consistently results in clear instructional preparation and maximized instructional time. In collaboration with the academic instructional coach (AIC), the principal is redesigning PLC processes to strengthen clarity of expectations and alignment to the instructional vision. Collective ownership and consistent implementation continue to develop as these systems are internalized. Stakeholder feedback indicates that increased transparency in decision-making and earlier opportunities for input will strengthen trust and improve implementation fidelity. By expanding structured dialogue, clarifying roles and strengthening distributed leadership practices, the principal can build collective efficacy and accelerate progress.

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 eleot certification to ensure knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Diagnostic Review Team.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Nikkita Warfield	Nikkita Warfield has 25 years of experience in education. She serves as chief schools officer/special advisor for Purpose Built Schools Atlanta. Her professional experience includes teacher, instructional coach, assistant principal, principal, director and district-level executive leader. Nikkita has led and evaluated school improvement efforts across elementary, middle and high school settings and is recognized for her expertise in instructional leadership, turnaround and leadership development.
Denva Smith	Denva Smith brings over 27 years of experience in education, serving in various roles including teacher, reading interventionist, instructional coach and district administrator. As an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), she leads improvement initiatives in CSI schools, as well as state-managed districts and targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools. Denva is a certified trainer for Jim Shipley Systems & Associates and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL).
Carrie Prater	Carrie Prater has over 27 years of experience in education with a specific emphasis on working in high-poverty elementary schools. Currently, she serves as the principal of Meadow View Elementary School in Hardin County. Before that, she held roles as a teacher, school counselor, educational consultant and instructional coach in multiple districts in Kentucky.
Amy Harris	Amy Harris has 23 years of experience in education, serving in various roles including teacher, administrative interventionist, instructional supervisor, assistant superintendent and college adjunct professor. She currently serves as an ERL with KDE and leads initiatives in CSI schools.

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	3
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.	3
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.	1
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.	1

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	14	46	36	47	*	47
4th-Grade Reading	8	48	20	50	20	50
5th-Grade Reading	20	48	9	46	10	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	5	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	*	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	5	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	8	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	18	42	*	39	*	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	9	47	*	47	10	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	11	39	*	39	8	38

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

Delta
- Fourth-grade KSA Proficient/Distinguished performance in reading remained at 20% from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 50%.
- Fifth-grade KSA Proficient/Distinguished performance in reading was 10% in 2024-2025, which was below the state average of 50%.
- Fourth-grade KSA Proficient/Distinguished performance in science was 8% in 2024-2025, which was below the state average of 37%.
- Fifth-grade KSA Proficient/Distinguished performance in editing and mechanics increased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025 and remained below the state average of 47%.
- Fifth-grade KSA Proficient/Distinguished performance in on-demand writing declined from 11% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025 and remained below the state average of 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	38	26	30	29	*	30
Percent Score of 60-80	20	35	47	35	*	35
Percent Score of 100	14	24	13	23	*	22
Percent Score of 140	28	14	10	13	*	13

Plus
- The percentage of ELs who received 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was above the state average at 28% in 2022-2023

Delta
- The percentage of ELs who received 0 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was 38% in 2022-2023 and 30% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of ELs who received 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment declined to 10% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	14	36	*
Female	12	45	*
Male	*	29	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	38	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	16	35	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta
- While the percentage of 3rd-grade students in the all students group who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 36% in 2023-2024, performance remained below the state average of 47%.
- Third-grade females demonstrated increased reading performance on the KSA in 2023-2024 at 45% Proficient/Distinguished but remained below the state average of 47%.
- Third-grade reading Proficient/Distinguished percentages on the KSA increased for economically disadvantaged students from 16% in 2022-2023 to 35% in 2023-2024 but remained below the state average of 47%.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	30	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	29	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	32	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	30	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta
- Thirty percent of 3rd-grade students in the all students and economically disadvantaged groups scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024.
- Twenty-nine percent of 3rd-grade males scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	8	20	20
Female	*	*	29
Male	9	20	*
White	*	*	*
African American	9	*	24
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	8	22	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta
- The percentage of students in 4th grade who scored Proficient/Distinguished remained at 20% from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- Among 4th-grade subgroups in reading, the Proficient/Distinguished percentage declined for economically disadvantaged students from 22% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- Among 4th-grade subgroups in 2024-2025, females (29%) demonstrated higher Proficient/Distinguished performance in reading than African American students (24%) and economically disadvantaged students (20%), indicating performance gaps among student groups.

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

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

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	8
Female	*	*	17
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	10
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	8
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta
- In 2024-2025, 8% of fourth-grade students in the all students group scored Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA, which was below the state average of 37%.
- Among fourth-grade subgroups in 2024-2025, females (17%) demonstrated higher Proficient/Distinguished performance than African American students (10%) and economically disadvantaged students (8%), indicating performance gaps among student groups.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	20	9	10
Female	26	*	9
Male	*	15	*
White	*	*	*
African American	19	*	8
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	18	10	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta
- Fifth-grade reading performance declined for females from 26% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- Fifth-grade reading performance declined for African American students from 19% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	5	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	10	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	5	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	5	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the all students group who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math in 2023-2024 was 5%.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged and African American students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math in 2023-2024 was 5%.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	18	*	*
Female	21	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the all students group who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 18% in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 21% in 2022-2023.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	10
Female	*	*	13
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	13
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	14

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

Delta
- In 2024-2025, 10% of 5th-grade students in the all students group scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in editing and mechanics, which was below the state average of 47%.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	11	*	8
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	8	*	8
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	10	*	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Delta
- Fifth-grade on-demand writing performance in the all students group declined from 11% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- Fifth-grade on-demand writing performance for African American students remained the same in 2024-2025 as in 2022-2023 at 8% Proficient/Distinguished.
- Fifth-grade on-demand writing performance for economically disadvantaged students declined from 10% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2024-2025.

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3:10 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Initial Team Meeting/ Introductions/ Review of Schedule	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, Feb. 24, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, Feb. 25, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:30 a.m. – 5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. 9:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 26, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members