



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:**  
**Cloverport Independent (District)**

Jan. 12-15, 2026

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
Strengths and Continuous Improvement: .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results</b> .....	<b>5</b>
eleot Narrative .....	8
<b>Improvement Priorities</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	11
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Improvement Priority 2 .....	13
Potential Leader Actions:.....	14
Your Next Steps .....	14
<b>District Capacity in Diagnostic Review</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....	18
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	18
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....	20
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning.....	24
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning.....	26
Student Performance Data.....	30
Schedule .....	34



# Introduction

The Cognia Diagnostic Review is conducted by a team of highly qualified evaluators who examine the institution’s adherence and commitment to the research aligned to Cognia Performance Standards. The Diagnostic Review process is designed to energize and equip the leadership and stakeholders of an institution to achieve higher performance levels and address areas that may be hindering efforts to reach those 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>	3
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	9
<b>Certified Staff</b>	4
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	8
<b>Students</b>	15
<b>Parents</b>	6
<b>Total</b>	48

## 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 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:**

Stakeholder interviews, survey data and informal observations reflect a welcoming, family-oriented and positive district climate characterized by pride and strong community connections. The Diagnostic Review Team observed facilities that were well maintained, safe, clean and orderly for both students and staff. Multiple district leaders and staff stated the district's strong sense of community, personal connection to students and the family-like atmosphere were the best aspects of Cloverport Independent. The school library functions as a community library, providing public access to books and resources and an on-campus fitness room is available to community members, also. The superintendent maintains a visible and active presence, greeting students and staff by name and assisting with bus duty at the beginning and end of each school day. District and school leaders consistently described the superintendent as valued, accessible and highly engaged.

Three years ago, the district established a community education liaison position to strengthen connections between the district, school and community. The role focuses on coordinating activities that address both school and community needs. One such initiative was a middle school career fair featuring local community members, primarily alumni, who shared their career pathways and educational experiences. This event broadened students' awareness of diverse career opportunities, including nontraditional local industries such as river and railroad occupations. Additionally, students participated in an entrepreneurship club developed in response to student interest, which provides opportunities to design, create and sell products.

A review of documents, artifacts, stakeholder interviews and survey data indicates the need for a more systematic and continuous improvement process to guide human resource allocation decisions based on district and school needs assessments. When asked about processes for adjusting staff roles and responsibilities, district leaders indicated that decisions are made informally and based on what makes sense logically. The superintendent currently fulfills multiple district-level roles, including district assessment coordinator, director of federal programs (e.g., Titles I, II, IV), professional development coordinator and instructional supervisor. Other district leaders also hold multiple complex roles; for example, the director of pupil personnel, the special education director and the athletic director responsibilities are assigned to one individual, while the district information technology (IT) director also serves as the facilities and maintenance manager. Additionally, several district leaders have responsibilities related to the Kentucky Virtual Academy (KYVA), creating challenges in meeting the demands of both schools.

The Diagnostic Review Team found limited evidence that the district engaged stakeholders in a systematic, continuous improvement process. Interview data and a review of the comprehensive district improvement plan (CDIP) indicated that few district staff participated in the development, review or discussion of the plan. Additionally, there was little evidence that the district is actively implementing or monitoring progress toward the CDIP goals. Minimal evidence was found to indicate that district or school leaders consistently use data to inform instructional decisions, monitor progress or evaluate the effectiveness of teaching and learning strategies. There was a lack of urgency regarding clear expectations, data analysis and a research-based instructional process. While the district has taken steps to build relationships, discuss practices and procedures and attend a deeper learning professional development, a process for a thorough analysis of assessment data that leads to data-



informed decision making has not been established or implemented. The Diagnostic Review Team acknowledges that district leadership is aware of the need to develop specific processes and procedures related to academic priorities. Interview data indicated that the district is considering adding a dedicated instructional leadership role to provide a more focused, intentional approach to instruction at both the district and school levels.



# 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.

<b>A. Equitable 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>
A1	<b>1.3</b>	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	73%	19%	8%	0%
A2	<b>2.5</b>	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	50%	46%	4%
A3	<b>2.8</b>	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	27%	62%	12%
A4	<b>1.7</b>	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.	46%	42%	12%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.1</b>				

## B. High Expectations Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.8	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	27%	62%	12%	0%
B2	1.9	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	27%	58%	15%	0%
B3	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	62%	35%	4%	0%
B4	1.8	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	23%	73%	4%	0%
B5	1.6	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	42%	58%	0%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			

## C. Supportive Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.5	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	8%	42%	38%	12%
C2	2.2	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	19%	42%	35%	4%
C3	2.3	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	8%	50%	42%	0%
C4	2.9	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	35%	42%	23%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.5</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	<b>1.9</b>	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	27%	54%	19%	0%
D2	<b>1.7</b>	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	35%	58%	8%	0%
D3	<b>2.3</b>	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	15%	46%	31%	8%
D4	<b>1.5</b>	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	58%	35%	8%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.9</b>			

<b>E. Progress Monitoring &amp; 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	<b>1.6</b>	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	42%	58%	0%	0%
E2	<b>2.0</b>	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	19%	65%	15%	0%
E3	<b>2.0</b>	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	27%	50%	19%	4%
E4	<b>1.4</b>	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	58%	42%	0%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			

## F. Well-Managed Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.9	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	8%	27%	31%	35%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	42%	38%	19%
F3	2.6	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	12%	35%	38%	15%
F4	2.4	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	8%	54%	31%	8%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.7</b>			

## G. Digital Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	69%	15%	15%	0%
G2	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	73%	15%	8%	4%
G3	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	73%	23%	4%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.4</b>			

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 26 formal classroom observations using the eleot observation tool and completed additional informal walkthroughs in non-core instructional areas and shared school spaces.

Observational data reflected consistent implementation of adult supervision across both structured and unstructured settings, reinforcing student safety and contributing to a positive school climate. School staff and administrators were observed monitoring student movement at key points of the school day, including transitions to and from the cafeteria and special-area classes and arrival and dismissal procedures for carpool and bus transportation. These practices supported orderly transitions and established predictable routines, thereby enhancing the school's overall culture and climate. Survey perception data further indicated that 73% of middle/high school students selected "safe" and 85% of elementary students selected "friendly" when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?" Observational data further demonstrated that it was evident/very evident in 65% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)."

Team members also observed teachers, support staff and administrators responding attentively to individual student needs during arrival, throughout daily activities and at dismissal. Interactions between students and adults were consistently positive, with students appearing comfortable engaging with staff. This evidence suggests a climate characterized by mutual respect and trust between students and adults. For instance, it was evident/very evident in 66% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teachers(s) and each other (F1)." Teachers treated students with respect, as indicated by observers finding it evident/very evident in 74% of classrooms that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." Students confirmed in interviews that they trust their teachers and can talk to them if needed. Also, the team found it evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1)."

While a positive and respectful climate was evident across classrooms, instructional practices did not consistently reflect the same level of intentionality to actively engage students in cognitively demanding learning. Classroom observations indicated that instruction was primarily teacher-directed, with lessons structured around whole-group delivery and task completion. As a result, it was evident/very evident in 15% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." Seventy-two percent of elementary students selected "listen to teachers talk" and 58% of middle/high school students selected "take notes" when asked, "Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?" While students were generally compliant and on task, instructional practices infrequently required learners to actively construct understanding, engage in sustained discourse or apply learning through cognitively demanding tasks. For example, it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)" and that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." It was evident/very evident in 39% of classrooms that learners were "actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." Opportunities for collaboration, problem-solving and student-led discussion were limited, particularly at the middle and high school levels where lecture and teacher-led reading were the predominant instructional approaches. As a result, it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)."

Instructional planning and classroom implementation did not consistently reflect the use of formative assessment evidence to vary content, process or learning expectations in response to student performance. In many classrooms, students completed the same instructional tasks regardless of readiness or demonstrated understanding, 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)." Intentional differentiation designed to address varied learning needs was rarely observed. When present, differentiation lacked sufficient depth to meaningfully adjust instruction. Nineteen percent of elementary students and 15% of middle/high school students selected "work on what I need" when asked, "Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?"



Also, it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Observations and a review of the “Data Analysis Protocol” and lesson plans revealed a lack of clarity regarding the lesson’s purpose and expectations for high-quality work. In most classrooms, students were unable to articulate the intended learning targets or describe the criteria for success. Structures to support ongoing feedback and student reflection were inconsistently evident, limiting students’ ability to monitor their own progress or make adjustments to improve performance. Consequently, it was evident/very evident in 15% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2).”

The use of assessment data to inform instructional decisions was limited. A review of the “Data Analysis Protocol” and “Professional Learning Community (PLC) Agenda” showed inconsistent implementation of formative or summative assessment practices to monitor learning over time or guide instructional adjustments. Tools to support progress monitoring, such as data notebooks, classroom tracking systems or visible indicators of student growth were not observed. As a result, instructional responses were often uniform rather than targeted, resulting in limited personalization of learning experiences. However, when asked, 95% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I used a variety of resources to meet learners’ needs and interest (19).”

A review of “Learning Walk”, “PLC meeting agenda”, “Instructional Rounds-Peer Observations” and “Monthly Data Analysis Protocol” documents indicated an incoherent, unbalanced assessment system to support continuous improvement. During interviews, teachers indicated that the data selected for analysis was often determined by individual teacher preference rather than guided by a predetermined, shared and monitored assessment process. Interviews further suggested that analysis of assessment and performance data occurred on an ad hoc basis and that even for standardized assessments, they were inconsistently applied and lacked a well-defined protocol for adjusting instruction in response to results. While existing data analysis protocols prompted teachers to document observations and questions about student performance, the identified next steps were frequently broad and left to individual interpretation, resulting in inconsistent instructional follow-through. In addition, limited evidence was available to demonstrate how analysis results were used to identify learning gaps, plan targeted instruction or monitor academic growth over time, as few student assessment samples or examples of analyzed student work were provided to the team.

Cloverport Independent School’s comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) referenced data sources such as ACT, Kentucky Online Testing (KYOTE) and Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) results; however, the evidence provided did not demonstrate a systematic process for analyzing these data or using the findings to inform instructional priorities, differentiated supports or measurable improvement goals. Observational data further demonstrated it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Available student performance data, including KSA results and the “Monthly Data Protocol,” indicated inconsistent academic growth or insufficiently sustained success across grade levels.

Taken together, the evidence suggests that instructional practices, assessment systems and planning processes are not fully aligned to support high levels of student engagement, clear learning expectations, responsive instruction and continuous academic growth. Addressing these areas will require focused professional learning, strengthened collaborative planning structures and consistent implementation of evidence-based instructional and assessment practices across classrooms.

# Improvement Priorities

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

## Improvement Priority 1

Establish and document a continuous improvement process that includes the analysis of data for curricular, instructional and organizational decision-making to effectively monitor district-wide progress toward meeting school- or district- established performance indicators.

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

### Findings:

Analysis of multiple data sources indicated that the district lacks a coherent, system-wide continuous improvement process focused on students' experiences and needs. Student performance data revealed significant declines in 3rd- and 5th-grade achievement, underscoring the need for stronger leadership practices to guide professional staff in the continuous improvement process. Specifically, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined from 54% in 2022-2023 to 35% in 2024-2025. Similarly, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 50% to 31% during the same timeframe. These downward trends suggest the absence of effective systems to monitor progress, respond to data and adjust instructional practices to improve student outcomes.

Stakeholder survey data further reinforced the need to strengthen the district's continuous improvement processes by using data more effectively to inform curricular, instructional and organizational decisions. Findings indicate that instruction is inconsistently monitored and seldom adjusted to meet established performance indicators or learners' academic needs and interests. Survey data showed that 77% of elementary students agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults try new things to make our school better (6)" and 63% of middle and high school students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults try new things to improve our school (6)." Additionally, 73% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they "participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)." While these data suggest a willingness to improve, they show the lack of a systematic or strategic approach to continuous improvement aligned to student learning outcomes.

Interview data revealed that stakeholders were largely unable to articulate a clear, system-wide improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs. Limited evidence suggests the existence of a formal continuous improvement process guiding decision-making. When asked how decisions related to curriculum, instruction, assessment, fiscal resources, technology or school improvement are made, stakeholders consistently reported that decisions occur through informal discussions rather than through a defined, data-informed system. Interviews also indicated that staff members need additional professional learning focused on analyzing data to inform organizational, instructional and fiscal decisions.

Board members, district leaders and school leaders reported limited involvement in developing the CDIP, although they expressed general awareness of the plan. While most stakeholders reported not participating in writing the CDIP, many said they discussed it informally. District and school leaders further noted that there are few opportunities for leaders and teachers to engage in job-embedded professional learning intentionally focused on analyzing curricular, instructional and organizational data to improve established performance indicators. Although regular PLC, staff and administrative meetings occur, interview data indicated that meeting content typically focused on troubleshooting student discipline, attendance or non-academic concerns rather than on



instructional improvement. While PLC meetings are scheduled at the school level, most stakeholders described the process as indeterminate, with limited direction or purpose provided by district leadership. District leaders acknowledged that they were not actively involved in the PLC process and generally provided support only when requested.

Classroom observational data aligned with these findings and indicated limited evidence of instructional practices that support student ownership of learning and progress monitoring. Observations revealed that students rarely monitored their own progress and were seldom able to explain how their work would be assessed. The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment data showed that learners who “understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)” were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms. Additionally, classroom observations frequently showed teachers delivering instruction from the front of the classroom using a whiteboard while students copied problems into their notebooks. These observations aligned with eleot data, where it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” In the Equitable Learning Environment, differentiated learning opportunities to meet student needs were evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms where “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)”, suggesting limited instructional responsiveness to diverse learner needs.

The team found limited evidence of a systematic approach to continuous improvement. The CDIP lacked clear progress-monitoring processes and measures for attaining identified goals. There was minimal evidence that the district consistently relied on the plan to drive instructional improvement, build organizational capacity or increase student learning. Similarly, the “Professional Development Plan” demonstrated the lack of a system-aligned approach designed to support continuous improvement. A review of the PLC mission, vision, and value statements, as well as meeting agendas, indicated the school lacked a clear system for using data to guide instruction, a balanced assessment system and defined next steps tied to goals and data. The “Superintendent’s Professional Growth Plan” also showed limited evidence of goal monitoring or alignment to a continuous improvement framework. Furthermore, district-submitted curriculum documentation, including the “CIS Curriculum spreadsheet”, provided little evidence of a systematic approach for adopting high-quality instructional resources (HQIR) or systems to monitor curriculum implementation using data. Collectively, the evidence from student performance data, surveys, interviews, classroom observations and document reviews demonstrated a lack of a coherent, district-wide continuous improvement system, limiting the district’s ability to consistently improve instructional practices, effectively use data to inform decision-making and ultimately improve student learning outcomes.

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

- Provide professional learning on evidence-based practices that leverage the use of data as a tool to inform continuous improvement and guide instructional planning.
- Identify district critical data points to collect, analyze and use for decision-making (e.g., curricular, instructional, organizational).
- Establish regularly scheduled data team meetings (e.g., curricular, instructional, organizational) to monitor and analyze learning progress towards and attainment of intended learning objectives.
- Analyze and evaluate current programs and instructional practices to determine fidelity of implementation and effectiveness (e.g., “needs assessment”, “CDIP”, “30-60-90 Day Plan of Curriculum and Assessment” data).
- Establish a formal reciprocal communication structure among all stakeholder groups (e.g., district/school administration, teachers, parents, community).



## Improvement Priority 2

Develop, implement and continuously monitor a comprehensive data system to systematically inform ongoing planning, decision making and adjustments for curriculum, instruction (teaching and learning) and assessment.

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

### Findings:

Analysis of student performance data, as previously discussed and detailed in the appendix of this report, indicated clear declines in reading achievement at the elementary level and suggested that instructional processes were inconsistently developed, implemented or monitored to support student learning. These trends indicated limited effectiveness in instructional practices and insufficient monitoring of student learning to improve achievement.

Stakeholder survey data further indicated minimal evidence that instructional practices were routinely adjusted to meet student needs. Sixty-nine percent of elementary students and 47% of middle and high school students agreed/absolutely agreed that "I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Additionally, 74% of elementary students and 78% of middle and high school students agreed/absolutely agreed that they received "support when I needed it (18)", and 77% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that their child "received support based on their needs (21)." In contrast, 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they "deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)", suggesting a disconnect between educator perceptions and student and parent experiences. The Diagnostic Review Team found limited evidence that the district had established a consistent process for monitoring and adjusting curriculum, instruction and assessment.

Classroom observational data indicated that the district had not developed or implemented systems to ensure curriculum and assessment practices resulted in high levels of student learning. Observations showed it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." Instruction was primarily delivered through teacher-led questioning, assignment packets and limited opportunities for feedback. Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)." The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall score of 1.7 on a 4-point scale, reflecting that while teachers attempted to use HQIRs, instruction often lacked the rigor and depth needed to actively engage students in learning.

Stakeholder interview data revealed limited evidence of a coherent, system-wide process for using data to monitor, adjust and improve instruction. Although stakeholders frequently stated that data were discussed in meetings, interviews did not reveal a balanced assessment system or defined structures, such as walkthrough tools or classroom observational data, to support instructional decision-making. Stakeholders reported general awareness of the CDIP; however, they consistently reported that they were not involved in monitoring progress toward its goals. Interviews suggested the CDIP was discussed informally, with limited use of the plan to guide instructional or organizational decisions.

When discussing how student progress was monitored, stakeholders most often referenced the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data. The team found little mention of formative assessments, classroom-based summative assessments or ongoing progress-monitoring tools used to inform daily instruction. Stakeholders were generally unable to explain how multiple data sources were analyzed to identify student needs or support differentiated instruction. District and school leaders also reported few opportunities for job-embedded professional learning focused on analyzing instructional, curricular or organizational data. While PLC, staff and administrative meetings occurred regularly, stakeholders indicated these meetings primarily addressed non-academic concerns rather than instructional improvement or student learning.



Reviewed district documents and artifacts provided limited evidence of a clear, system-wide approach to using data to improve instruction and guide professional learning. Although plans and structures existed, documentation did not consistently demonstrate how these tools were used to support ongoing, data-driven improvement. PLC agendas showed minimal evidence that staff regularly analyze student performance data or document instructional adjustments based on student learning needs. PLC agendas lacked clear records of data discussions, action steps or follow-up processes to evaluate the impact of instructional changes. Additionally, the “CIS Curriculum Spreadsheet” showed minimal evidence of a structured process for selecting or monitoring HQIRs. Documentation lacked clarity about the use of defined criteria, stakeholder input and student performance data to guide curriculum decisions and demonstrate the use of systems to monitor implementation or evaluate effectiveness. While the “Professional Development Plan” referenced MAP and KSA data to inform potential learning topics, the plan lacked a clear description of how classroom observation or walkthrough data were used to identify instructional needs. Collectively, the reviewed documents and artifacts demonstrated limited alignment with PLC practices, curriculum processes, professional development planning and instructional monitoring, thereby constraining the district's ability to operate within a unified, continuous improvement system focused on improving student learning outcomes.

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

- Evaluate systems and support to ensure instructional practices and assessments are at the appropriate depth of knowledge level needed to meet the rigor of the Kentucky Academic Standards.
- Ensure the development and implementation of high-quality professional learning opportunities grounded in evidence-based practices that build leadership and staff capacity to analyze and apply a balanced assessment system (e.g., universal, diagnostic, progress monitoring).
- Establish a PLC framework to guide and ensure consistent implementation across the district.
- Use a documented data analysis protocol consistently to identify and prioritize curricular, instructional and organizational needs within the framework of a continuous improvement model.

## Your Next Steps

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

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

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



# District Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that Cloverport Independent has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school, Cloverport Independent School.

The district leadership has been intentional in establishing a strong culture and climate between the institution and community, built on trusting relationships. The district's enrollment has grown significantly with the addition of the KYVA), which has expanded to include students from across the state and currently has an enrollment of over 2,100 students. Also, the district has hired a new principal to lead the K-12 in-person school. The new principal has begun the process of evaluating and adjusting programs and practices to ensure all students have an opportunity for a quality education. Stakeholder interviews indicate district leadership has created a family environment that is welcoming while encouraging students and parents to see the building as the center of their community.

Based on an extensive review of artifacts, evidence and stakeholder interviews, the district lacks a comprehensive system for using data to make instructional decisions and adjustments to help students achieve



grade-level standards. While the district has established opportunities (e.g., PLCs, professional development (PD) days, faculty meetings) for instructional data review, evidence indicates that a formal process for reviewing instructional data with expectations for implementation and monitoring has not been implemented. The district should consider partnering with other agencies (i.e., Green River Regional Educational Cooperative) to offer additional training for all school personnel on the use of data for instructional decision-making and to support the development of a system to ensure the implementation of these practices. It is evident from multiple stakeholder interviews that the district has not created a sense of urgency to make the necessary instructional adjustments. It would benefit the district to implement a balanced, comprehensive assessment system to consistently make data-informed, timely decisions that intentionally focus on improving student achievement. District-level leadership should collaborate with school leadership and teachers to establish these expectations and develop a process to ensure implementation, along with mechanisms to assess the overall effectiveness of student learning.

While informal improvement efforts are underway, during the interview process, stakeholder groups (e.g., district leaders, governing body, principal, building leaders, teachers) were unable to identify or describe a formalized continuous improvement process used to guide improvement efforts at any level. The evidence submitted by district leadership and reviewed by the Diagnostic Review Team does not demonstrate that a continuous improvement plan is currently in place. The continuous improvement process should reflect analyzed trends and current data about the institution's curricular, instructional and organizational effectiveness (e.g., "Needs Assessment", "CDIP", "30-60-90 Day Plan of Curriculum and Assessment data"). The district leadership is encouraged to engage with stakeholder groups in designing, implementing and monitoring a documented process for continuous improvement that includes metrics of success.



# 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>Quentina Timoll</b>	Quentina Timoll has more than 25 years of education experience. Currently, she is the superintendent of University View Academy, a public online charter school with more than 3,700 students. She has served as the Louisiana Department of Education's chief of staff, an assistant superintendent and innovation network leader for East Baton Rouge Parish School System and the assistant superintendent for St. John the Baptist Parish School System. She also serves as an adjunct professor for Reach University.
<b>William Philbeck</b>	William Philbeck has served in numerous capacities over his 32 years in education. He spent his early career as a classroom teacher, instructional coordinator and department lead. William has also served as an elementary principal, an adjunct professor and as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). Currently, William works part-time for KDE and for the University of the Cumberlands.
<b>Crystal Darensbourg</b>	Crystal Darensbourg has 19 years of experience in education. Currently, she serves as an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS) for KDE, Office of Continuous Improvement and Support. Her experience includes being a classroom teacher, a behavior coach and a district multi-tiered systems of supports (MTSS) academic pedagogy and engagement resource teacher. Crystal also serves as an adjunct professor for Spalding University's Aspiring Leaders program.
<b>Leslie Workman</b>	Leslie Workman has 20 years of experience in education. Her past experience includes 14 years as a high school English teacher, five years as an elementary principal and one year as the director of curriculum, instruction and assessment. Leslie also serves as the co-director for the Morehead Writing Project.

# 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 institutional culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members seldom implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders occasionally model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders regularly model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders consistently model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	3
2. Learners' well-being is at the heart of the institution's guiding principles such as mission, purpose, and beliefs.	Staff members seldom demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions may not be based on its stated values.	Staff members occasionally demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members routinely demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented, and are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members continually demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented and regularly reviewed for consistency with its stated values.	2



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

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	1
8. The governing authority demonstrates a commitment to learners by collaborating with leaders to uphold the institution's priorities and to drive continuous improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate minimal commitment to learners and rarely support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders seldom collaborate on the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate some commitment to learners and sometimes support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to focus the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions demonstrate a commitment to learners and support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to collaboratively further the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions are regularly reviewed to ensure an uncompromised commitment to learners and the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to consistently and intentionally collaborate to further the institution's improvement.	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
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
10. Leaders demonstrate expertise in recruiting, supervising, and evaluating professional staff members to optimize learning.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members without consideration of contribution to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders rarely use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders seldom supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders sometimes use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders routinely use data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders regularly implement practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	Leaders intentionally and consistently identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders consistently use analyzed data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders implement and monitor documented practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
15. Learners' needs drive the equitable allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources.	Professional staff members rarely analyze learners' needs and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources. Resources are rarely allocated in alignment with documented learners' needs or to ensure equity for learning.	Professional staff members sometimes analyze learners' needs, current, and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are sometimes based on current or updated data.	Professional staff members routinely analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are routinely based on current data and at predetermined points in time.	Professional staff members engage in a systematic process to analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are consistently based on current data at any point in time.	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.	2



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

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
				learner performance with stakeholders.	

# Student Performance Data

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

## 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	54	46	*	47	35	47
4th-Grade Reading	59	48	27	50	*	50
5th-Grade Reading	50	48	25	46	31	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	*	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	*	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	50	41	30	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	59	42	*	39	25	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	68	47	60	47	*	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	41	39	*	39	*	38
6th-Grade Reading	59	48	30	49	*	52
7th-Grade Reading	56	45	50	47	71	48
8th-Grade Reading	53	44	50	41	53	42

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Math	41	38	44	42	38	41
7th-Grade Math	*	37	56	39	54	43
8th-Grade Math	41	36	*	37	40	40
7th-Grade Science	25	23	*	22	58	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	44	35	40	35	40	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	50	49	50	47	67	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	41	45	55	49	73	49
10th-Grade Reading	*	46	38	46	61	47
10th-Grade Math	*	34	52	36	39	41
11th-Grade Science	*	11	*	6	*	22
11th-Grade Social Studies	44	38	23	38	45	38
11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	36	45	*	45	50	41
11th-Grade On Demand Writing	40	42	38	43	50	45

### Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	35	26	39	29	37	30
Percent Score of 60-80	36	35	34	35	38	35
Percent Score of 100	20	24	21	23	19	22
Percent Score of 140	9	14	7	13	5	13

### Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	*	68	*	66	*	60
Percent Score of 60-80	*	24	*	23	*	26
Percent Score of 100	*	7	*	8	*	10
Percent Score of 140	*	2	*	3	*	3

**High 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	*	64	*	62	*	59
Percent Score of 60-80	*	26	*	26	*	27
Percent Score of 100	*	8	*	9	*	11
Percent Score of 140	*	2	*	3	*	3

# Schedule

## Monday, January 12, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
Noon – 7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8 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		
4:30 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, January 14, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8 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		
4:30 p.m.- 10 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, January 15, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m.- Noon.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

