



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:  
Cane Run Elementary**

Feb. 17-20, 2026

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....</b>	<b>5</b>
eleot Narrative.....	8
<b>Improvement Priorities .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	10
Potential Leader Actions:.....	11
Improvement Priority 2.....	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	13
Your Next Steps.....	13
<b>Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Team Roster.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings.....	17
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning .....	17
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning.....	19
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning .....	21
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....	23
Student Performance Data.....	26
Schedule.....	39



# Introduction

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

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

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

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

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	2
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	8
<b>Certified Staff</b>	15
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	3
<b>Students</b>	54
<b>Parents</b>	4
<b>Total</b>	89

## 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 from documents, artifacts, interviews and survey data highlights notable strengths in the school's culture and climate. Stakeholders, including students, families and educators, consistently expressed positive perceptions, supported by the effective use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). Collectively, the evidence points to a collegial, supportive environment rooted in respect, recognition and encouragement.

Across all three groups, families, students and educators, the data reflect strong perceptions of safety, care, respect and support within the school community. Families and students reported receiving the resources needed for learning and feeling safe and experiencing genuine care and respect from staff, with high marks for relationship building. Family survey data supported this, as 89% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." Likewise, 92% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults care about children's well-being (7)." Respectful treatment was also a notable strength, as 86% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that the adults "treat us with respect (2)." Educators similarly highlighted safety and a welcoming environment as key strengths, noting that the school prioritizes students' well-being. Educator survey results also support the sentiment expressed in interviews of a positive culture, as 97% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)" and 95% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)."

Interviews and a review of documents indicated that the school-wide expectations of: "Prepared Learner, Appropriate Actions, Works Hard and Shows Kindness (PAWS)," were implemented schoolwide and are non-negotiable. Collectively, the evidence indicates a strong, positive culture and climate, supported by consistent PAWS practices, respectful relationships and stakeholder perceptions of inclusivity which provide a solid foundation. During informal observations, team members noted that when students exhibited the PAWS traits, staff members would color in the paws on the posters displayed in the halls. Additionally, team members observed that students were reminded daily of the school-wide expectations during morning announcements and again during classroom and hallway transitions. Consistent themes related to school climate and culture emerged during interviews, including strong collaborative relationships and administrative support. The Educator Upbeat Spring 2025 Survey data reinforced these results, as 93% of educators positively responded to the statement, "Administrators at my school actively seek input from teachers when making important decisions (38)." Interviews revealed improved staff attendance and a positive shift in the school's climate over the past three years, particularly in behavioral systems and expectations. Educators also consistently referenced an inclusive environment, improved communication and collaborative practices as factors contributing to staff stability and retention.

Documents and artifacts provided to the team revealed some enabling conditions and structures for effective professional learning community (PLC) meetings, including meeting agendas and time allocated for PLCs. Stakeholders also referenced PLCs during interviews; however, observational data revealed that the effective implementation of Tier 1 instruction remains an area for growth. For example, it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs



(A1).” While teachers and administrators spoke to the amount of time spent in PLCs and the school has a “PLC Fidelity Checklist,” the current structure is not producing an adequate level of instructional impact, collaboration or desired student outcomes, further underscoring the need to strengthen classroom-based differentiation within PLC-driven instructional planning.

Student achievement data further emphasized the need to improve differentiated instructional effectiveness and targeted instruction. While PLC meeting time is embedded in the schedule, classroom instruction would benefit from a more structured PLC protocol that emphasizes data analysis and classroom-level application of planned instructional strategies. According to the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) benchmark data from winter 2025, student medial achievement scores are consistently below grade-level expectations across school settings. While MAP medial growth scores show some positive shifts, existing performance gaps underscore the need for interventions tailored to students’ needs using data-driven decision-making to ensure all learners receive appropriate support for gap closure.

Evidence and artifacts indicate that the school has developed a 2025-2026 comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) that outlines long-term and annual goals aimed at achieving desired student outcomes; however, the activities prioritized within the plan are extensive. Additionally, the team found a lack of monitoring tools for tracking the implementation of these CSIP activities. To effectively focus on school improvement, the school would benefit from establishing incremental milestones using a 30-60-90-day plan, along with a dedicated commitment to monitoring the activities outlined in the plan.

# 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 26 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.3	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	77%	15%	8%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	35%	65%	0%
A3	3.0	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	15%	73%	12%
A4	2.0	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.	35%	35%	31%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		<b>2.2</b>				

<b>B. High Expectations Learning Environment</b>						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.9	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	23%	65%	12%	0%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	15%	69%	15%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	54%	46%	0%	0%
B4	1.8	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	27%	62%	12%	0%
B5	1.9	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	31%	50%	19%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			<b>1.8</b>			

<b>C. Supportive Learning Environment</b>						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.6	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	0%	42%	54%	4%
C2	2.5	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	8%	35%	58%	0%
C3	2.4	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	12%	38%	50%	0%
C4	2.7	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	27%	73%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			<b>2.6</b>			



<b>D. Active Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
D1	1.8	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	31%	62%	8%	0%
D2	1.8	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	42%	35%	19%	4%
D3	2.1	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	12%	65%	23%	0%
D4	1.8	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	35%	46%	19%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			<b>1.9</b>			

<b>E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
E1	1.3	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	73%	19%	8%	0%
E2	2.0	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	27%	42%	31%	0%
E3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	15%	65%	19%	0%
E4	1.2	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	81%	19%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			<b>1.7</b>			



F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.8	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	4%	31%	46%	19%
F2	2.9	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	27%	58%	15%
F3	1.9	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	38%	31%	31%	0%
F4	2.4	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	0%	62%	38%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			<b>2.5</b>			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	92%	8%	0%	0%
G2	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	96%	4%	0%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	96%	4%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			<b>1.1</b>			

## eleot Narrative

The team conducted 26 observations in core content classrooms, revealing both strengths and opportunities for growth. The team observed a strength in how adults treated students. For example, in 85% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).”

The Supportive and Well-Managed Learning Environments earned the highest overall ratings, scoring 2.6 and 2.5, respectively, on a 4-point scale. Student-teacher interactions were generally respectful, and teachers were frequently observed supporting students. It was evident/very evident in 73% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teachers (C4).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 65% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” Survey data reflected a slightly higher perception of respect throughout the school environment, as 77% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” Additionally, students’ perceptions of

their access to resources in order to have what they need to learn was slightly higher than observational data, as 87% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make sure we have what we need to learn (8),” whereas it was evident/very evident in 65% of classrooms that “learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2).”

The team identified a need for the school to strengthen instructional expectations through PLCs and ensure a consistent level of cognitive engagement across classrooms. Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” In addition, it was also evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teachers (B1),” and “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 15% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” These results indicate that learning experiences do not consistently reflect strong expectations or sustained cognitive engagement. Improving student outcomes requires clear instructional expectations that are modeled, coached and monitored.

Mechanisms for students to monitor their own learning were limited, as it was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3),” and it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Student survey results revealed a perception of reliance on the teacher to tell students how they are performing, as 64% of students chose “check my goals”, 60% of students selected “check homework” and 57% of students chose “give a grade” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe how your teachers know you are learning (24)?” Observational data also revealed that it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Interviews revealed that some teachers are unsure of what constitutes high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) and often find them overwhelming to navigate.

The team identified a need to strengthen instructional practices to ensure learning experiences are responsive to students’ individual needs, interests and readiness levels. Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2).” Student survey results revealed that 78% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “I had lessons that will help me do well in the future (11),” thus highlighting a disconnect between what was observed in classrooms and students’ perception of what will help prepare them for the future. In addition, it was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” Family surveys also highlighted a disconnect between perception and classroom observation, as 86% agreed/absolutely agreed that “my child engaged in lessons that improved their desire to learn new things (14).” Strengthening intentional differentiation and relevance in daily instruction will be essential to increasing student engagement and improving learning outcomes across classrooms.

Finally, the team observed minimal collaboration among students regardless of whether they were using technology. For example, it was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4),” and it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” Overall, the data highlights a clear opportunity to enhance collaborative learning practices and the intentional use of digital tools to support them.



# 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

Revise, consistently implement and intentionally monitor an instructional framework prioritizing coherent Tier 1 instruction to enhance student cognitive engagement, provide data-driven differentiation and promote equitable learning opportunities.

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

### Findings:

Student performance on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) showed mixed trends across grade levels and subjects, though all data fell significantly below state averages. For example, 5th-grade reading showed the most significant improvement, rising from 11% Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025. However, this improvement still lags behind the state average of 50% Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025. Also, 4th-grade reading declined from 14% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 8% Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025, with even larger drops among female and economically disadvantaged students. Stakeholder interviews revealed that students often lack the foundational skills to be successful with grade-level content and expressed a need for additional support in scaffolding and/or providing instructional strategies to continue improving student outcomes.

The principal's presentation highlighted the school's commitment to improvement through focused instructional activities. Since 2024, the school has implemented systems to promote instructional consistency and progress on previously identified improvement priorities. The principal also discussed several initiatives, including PLC structures aligned with four key PLC questions, data cycles and academic intervention protocols. Moreover, the presentation emphasized efforts to reduce classroom practice variability by establishing an instructional framework, which should enhance instructional consistency across grade levels and set clear expectations for teaching, learning and positive behavioral responses. The Diagnostic Review Team's observations revealed the lack of a fully functioning framework. Additionally, the principal mentioned developing a walkthrough tool; however, the school did not share a plan for its implementation or progress monitoring. In contrast, stakeholder interviews indicated that walkthroughs were conducted inconsistently, and little to no feedback was provided to support instructional design and delivery.

Survey results revealed that 69% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)”, and 80% agreed/absolutely agreed that “we uphold high expectations for learning (12).” Family responses mirror these perceptions, as 88% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults have high expectations for learning (10).” However, observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” In addition, it was also evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teachers (B1)”, and that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 15% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” This suggests a significant disconnect between classroom instructional practices and the perceptions held by stakeholders. What is believed to be occurring instructionally does not align with students' actual classroom experiences. This misalignment indicates gaps in monitoring, feedback, communication and shared understanding of Tier 1 expectations.



Although staff are dedicated and collaborative, several educators highlighted the need for stronger instructional support. Interviews revealed challenges with implementing HQIRs, managing small groups and differentiating instruction to meet diverse student needs. While walkthroughs and coaching are helpful when delivered, some staff reported inconsistent delivery. Overall, this evidence highlights persistent gaps between instructional intentions and classroom implementation, underscoring the importance of clearly defined expectations, systematic feedback structures and targeted professional learning.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Collaboratively create and develop instructional non-negotiables to strengthen Tier 1 instruction.
- Provide targeted professional learning to ensure all professional staff understand the intent, structure and instructional design of the recognized curriculum.
- Establish and implement a regular walkthrough and feedback cycle to monitor the implementation of non-negotiables in classroom settings.
- Provide targeted support and coaching to all teachers based on the analysis of the walkthrough data.

## Improvement Priority 2

Align PLC practices with the school's established PLC model to ensure teams consistently analyze student work, design and plan differentiated Tier 1 instruction and engage in collaborative practices that strengthen instructional expertise and directly improve student performance.

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

### Findings:

An analysis of KSA student performance data indicates multiple areas of concern across 3rd through 5th grades, with proficiency rates in reading and mathematics consistently remaining below state levels from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. These outcomes align with classroom observational data and stakeholder feedback, including interview findings, indicating limited differentiation, inconsistent student understanding of learning expectations and uneven instructional responsiveness to student needs. Interview data and a review of artifacts indicated that, although multiple data sources are collected and reviewed during meetings, inconsistent instructional adjustments based on those data were observed.

Staff interview data reveal significant inconsistencies in the structure, focus and execution of PLCs. While teachers reported engaging in collaborative planning, curriculum support and data analysis, conversations often centered on lesson preparation and end of unit assessments rather than on the ongoing formative data needed to drive instructional decisions. Classroom and PLC observations also indicated limited familiarity with HQIRs, suggesting variability in teachers' understanding of instructional expectations.

Additionally, PLCs were frequently described as prioritizing shared intervention programs over analysis of Tier 1 curriculum and instructional practices. Although collaboration is occurring, a consistently implemented, fully data-driven PLC process is not evident. Observations further confirmed that the current PLC workflow lacks clarity and coherence. Several teachers appeared unsure about procedures, next steps and expected outcomes, indicating uneven understanding of the school's intended PLC model.

Further PLC observations highlighted uncertainty regarding collaborative learning structures designed to deepen teachers' collective understanding of HQIRs. In some sessions, the "Affirming Racial Equity (ARE) Tool" was utilized, while in others, components of the Intellectual Preparation process were applied, resulting in inconsistent practices across teams.

Classroom observational data provide additional context, as it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)", and evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." Interviews revealed that students were unable to articulate what they were learning or how they knew when they were successful in class.

Educator survey results further indicate the need to align student performance with instructional practices. As previously stated, the school's KSA data for 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 was below the state average in all grades and subject areas. However, a disconnect was observed in educator survey data and student performance outcomes. For example, 97% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", while 85% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they "use a variety of information to determine learners' progress (20)." These findings indicate an opportunity to more closely connect instructional practices with the realities of student performance data.

Stakeholder interviews and agendas provided by the school revealed that the "Cane Run Elementary PLC Protocol" aligns with the four guiding PLC questions. The team reviewed the documents titled "PLC Protocol", "PLC Fidelity Checklist" and "PLC Agenda" provided by the school, but the team was unable to confirm that these documents have translated into a cohesive or effective PLC structure across teams.



The school needs to establish and implement a clearly defined PLC vision that ensures consistent collaboration, focused data analysis and alignment of instructional practices across all teams. The school's current PLC setup shows signs of insufficient alignment with practices that improve teaching and learning. Interviews and a review of PLC agendas indicate the meetings lack a clear purpose, consistent roles or strong processes, resulting in conversations that are surface-level and disconnected from instruction. In many cases, data analysis is inconsistent; collaboration varies across grade levels and teams struggle to use PLC time efficiently.

To address these gaps, focusing professional development on differentiated instruction, small-group implementation and strengthening Tier 1 practices through effective PLCs will support the goal of building capacity through high-quality Tier 1 instruction, as indicated in the principal's presentation. By aligning PLC implementation, professional learning and instructional improvements to clearly defined improvement objectives, the school can enhance PLC functionality, strengthen Tier 1 effectiveness and increase student achievement across all grades and subgroups.

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

- Collectively establish and articulate a schoolwide vision for PLCs that details how data analysis will impact instruction.
- Clarify and communicate how to implement the vision of PLCs by modeling, supporting and monitoring collaborative data-driven practices that strengthen Tier 1 instruction and improve student learning outcomes.
- Facilitate and create a dedicated time to continue aligning intellectual preparation (i.e., unit internalization, lesson internalization, lesson rehearsal, student work analysis) with the school's PLC model to improve Tier 1 instruction.
- Collaboratively create a cyclical system to progress monitor and refine PLC practices as needed.

## Your Next Steps

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

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

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

# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

Following its review of extensive evidence, the Diagnostic Review Team submitted the following assessment regarding the principal's capacity to lead turnaround in a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement (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 at Cane Run Elementary, who took her position in January 2024 as the third principal in five years, shows urgency in addressing the school's CSI status through her presentation and stakeholder interviews. She adopts a systems approach to implement new strategies to improve the learning environment but needs to strengthen monitoring and evaluation of their effectiveness.

The Diagnostic Review Team analyzed various pieces of evidence, conducted numerous classroom observations and interviewed a diverse range of stakeholders. They noted that hallway transitions and activities in common areas were orderly. Additionally, both observations and stakeholder interviews revealed an atmosphere characterized by care, concern and support for the diverse student population. Students described Cane Run Elementary using the words safe, friendly, exciting and polite as their top four adjectives.

School leadership should develop and clearly communicate an instructional vision that aligns with both school improvement and the continuous improvement process. This vision should enhance the staff's ability to design and deliver a curriculum and instruction that are consistently aligned, relevant and effective in meeting the diverse needs of all learners. Successful curriculum implementation and instruction require the participation of all stakeholders in professional learning opportunities that help inform instructional practices. These opportunities should be supported by establishing systemic instructional non-negotiables, which include timely feedback and follow-up.

The previous Diagnostic Review report, dated January 2024, identified PLC systems as an area of need. The school has partially addressed this; subsequently, the current structure needs refinement and should include the consistent use of a systematic data analysis protocol (e.g., Plan Do Study Act [PDSA]) to assist with making meaningful instructional adjustments that lead to advancing student learning outcomes. This is necessary to



ensure teachers collaboratively plan for effective Tier 1 instruction, disaggregate data, plan next steps and adjust instruction. Multiple sources of data (e.g., common formative assessments, attendance, KSA, behavioral) are collected, but little evidence shows the development and implementation of action plans to improve student performance. Classroom observations revealed a lack of student engagement and high-quality instruction. The data indicated learners who “strived to meet or were able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” were evident/very evident in 9% of classrooms. Additionally, learners who “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that required the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)” were evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms. Observations revealed teachers deliver mandated curricula to students; however, there was limited evidence to support the common practice of intellectual preparation, including the deconstruction of Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS), has been implemented since the previous Diagnostic Review in January 2024. Stakeholder interviews and artifacts indicated there is an intentional refocus of lesson internationalization work occurring since the school was designated as CSI status again in the fall of 2025.

Finally, the School Leadership domain of the Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey measures educators' perceptions of school administrators' effectiveness, support and communication. Responses to the question, “How confident are you that your school leaders have the best interests of the school in mind?” in the 2025-2026 survey indicated 88% favorability. Additionally, this domain aims to improve school environments and support teacher retention, and there was a 23% increase in favorability within it. School leadership should leverage these findings to build capacity with other members of the administration team.

# Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Terry Fludd</b>	Terry Fludd has over 20 years of experience in education. She has worked as a secondary mathematics teacher, assistant principal, principal, curriculum support specialist, Enterprise Learning Coach, regional support coach for the South Carolina State Department of Education and a district-level administrator. Dr. Fludd has served as an adjunct professor in South Carolina and North Carolina. Currently, she is the director of school improvement and innovation and district-wide professional development and secondary math content coordinator for Orangeburg County Schools and leads is the chief executive officer (CEO) and founder of Notable Consulting and Instructional Services, LLC.
<b>Donna Bumps</b>	Donna Bumps is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), where she supports turnaround schools across the state in developing and implementing sustainable systems of continuous improvement. She has 26 years of experience as an educator, having served as a middle and high school teacher, assistant principal and high school principal. Donna is trained in Jim Shipley Systems and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL). She has also contributed to multiple Diagnostic Review teams over several years, serving as both a team member and an associate lead evaluator.
<b>Kelli Prater</b>	Kelli Prater is an ERL for KDE in the Office of Continuous Improvement and Support. In her role, she collaborates with educational leaders and staff to assess needs and implement improvement models that align with their goals, focusing on key priorities and effective curriculum and assessment systems. With 23 years of experience in K-12 education, Kelli has held various roles, including instructor of exceptional children and district-level administrator. Her work has included a concentrated focus on instructional supervision, coordination of state and federal programs, pupil personnel management and district assessment coordination. Additionally, Kelli has served as a Continuous Improvement Coach for multiple school districts throughout Kentucky. She is dedicated to improving student outcomes and has presented on a range of education and school-improvement topics at local, state and national conferences.
<b>Paige Mattingly</b>	Paige Mattingly is an instructional coach in Marion County, Kentucky. She has experience supporting teaching and learning at the elementary level. Paige has served as a classroom teacher and in instructional leadership roles, working alongside educators to strengthen instructional practices, support curriculum implementation and promote continuous improvement.

# Appendix

## Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

### Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	1
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	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.	2
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	1

## Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
17. Learners have the support and opportunities to realize their learning potential.	Professional staff members give little or no consideration to individual learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Academic and non-academic opportunities are limited and standardized according to grade levels or a predetermined sequencing of courses. Learners frequently encounter a variety of barriers when accessing academic and non-academic offerings that would be well-suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are rarely challenged to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members consider varying learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access to some variety in academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners may encounter barriers when accessing some academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are sometimes challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members know their learners well-enough to develop and provide a variety of academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access and choice in most academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners rarely encounter barriers when accessing academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members develop relationships with and understand the needs and well-being of individual learners. Academic and non-academic experiences are tailored to the needs and well-being of individual learners. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards maximal levels of achievement and self-efficacy without barriers or hindrances by schedules or access to academic and non-academic offerings.	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.	1

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

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	1
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	*	46	11	47	*	47
4th-Grade Reading	14	48	*	50	8	50
5th-Grade Reading	*	48	11	46	26	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	8	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	*	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	*	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	*	42	9	39	*	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	*	47	30	47	18	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	*	38

### Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- Data revealed 11% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading compared to the state average of 47% on KSA 2023-2024.
- Data revealed 8% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math compared to the state average of 43% on KSA 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.

- Data revealed that 8% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading compared to the state average of 50% on KSA 2024-2025.
- Data revealed that 9% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies compared to the state average of 39% on KSA 2023-2024.
- The percentages of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 30% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.

### Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	40	26	41	29	44	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	50	35	41	35	31	35
Percent Score of 100	10	24	7	23	17	22
Percent Score of 140	0	14	11	13	8	13

#### Plus

- The percentage of ELs with a score of 100 on the ACCESS assessment increased from 7% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of ELs with a score of 140 on the ACCESS assessment increased from 0% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.

#### Delta

- The percentage of ELs with a score of zero on the ACCESS assessment increased from 40% in 2022-2023 to 41% in 2023-2024 and continued to increase to 44% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of ELs with a score of 60-80 on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 50% in 2022-2023 to 41% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of ELs with a score of 60-80 on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 41% in 2023-2024 to 31% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of ELs with a score of 100 on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 10% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of ELs with a score of 140 on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	*	11	*
Female	*	10	*
Male	*	13	*
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	*	*	*

#### Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was two percentage points higher than that of all students in the 2023-2024 school year.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was two percentage points higher than that of all students in the 2023-2024 school year.

#### Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 10% compared to the 11% Proficient/Distinguished for all students for the 2023-2024 school year.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 9% compared to 11% Proficient/Distinguished for all students for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	8	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	10	*
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	*	5	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the 2024-2025 KSA was 10% compared to 8% of all students.

#### Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA was 5% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA was 8% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	14	*	8
Female	17	*	7
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	17
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	12	*	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the 2022-2023 KSA was 17% compared to 14% of all students.

#### Delta

- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 4th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.

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

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

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

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	*	11	26
Female	*	16	31
Male	*	*	21
White	*	*	27
African American	*	*	25
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	12	26
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 5th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 31% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.

#### Delta

- Percentages were not low enough to qualify as a delta.

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

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

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	*	9	*
Female	*	16	*
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	*	10	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 16% compared to 9% of the all students group on the KSA for 2023-2024.

Delta

- Percentages were not low enough to qualify as a delta.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) % 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	*	30	18
Female	*	44	19
Male	*	16	17
White	*	*	*
African American	*	23	18
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	*	31	18
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.

**Delta**

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 5th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 30% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 44% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 23% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 31% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.

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

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

# Schedule

## Tuesday, Feb. 17, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3:15 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, Feb. 18, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, Feb. 19, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:45 a.m. – 3 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Friday, Feb. 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members