# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

cognia™

# Table of Contents

# Introduction

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

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

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

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

| Stakeholder Groups | Number |
|---|---|
| District-Level Administrators | 0 |
| Building-Level Administrators | 1 |
| Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator) | 3 |
| Certified Staff | 21 |
| Noncertified Staff | 11 |
| Students | 28 |
| Parents | 9 |
| Total | 73 |

## Performance Standards Evaluation

Diagnostic Reviews are based primarily on the evaluation of evidence that reflects an institution's ability to meet the expectations as defined by the essential Diagnostic Review Standards, which are a subset of the Cognia Performance Standards. These standards define the elements of quality that research indicates are present in an institution that is continuously improving. The standards provide the guideposts to become 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:**
Cloverport Independent School was identified as a comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) school during the 2024-2025 school year based on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) results. Although the CSI identification was based on the elementary grade band's academic performance, the school is configured as kindergarten through grade twelve (K-12) with one principal. The school recognizes that culture, relationships, leadership and systems of support influence student experiences and outcomes across grade levels. As the review progressed, culture and climate emerged as a foundational element of the school's previous work, providing important context for the insights that follow.

School leadership has intentionally prioritized culture and climate, which emerged as the most consistent and significant strength during the review. During the principal's presentation, the school was described as the, "heart of the community", serving approximately 270 students and maintaining strong generational ties dating back to 1872. These connections remain evident today, as many staff members have personal ties to the school as alumni or through family members currently enrolled. Stakeholders consistently expressed a strong sense of pride in the school and a shared belief that it is a place where students are known, supported and valued. This sense of identity and belonging is evident throughout the building, as a prominently displayed student-painted mural depicts meaningful community landmarks and reflects the school's longstanding role as a focal point of community connection.

Across interviews and observations, staff and administrators were described as caring, approachable and deeply invested in students' well-being. Parents spoke positively about the small-school environment, noting that adults know their children by name and respond quickly when needs arise. Families shared that their children feel safe, supported and successful within the inclusive environment the school has cultivated. Survey data provide additional context to these perceptions. When asked, "Which four words best describe our school (22)?", 89% of families selected "welcoming." Ninety-one percent of educators selected "welcoming" when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?" Similarly, 72% of middle and high school students selected "welcoming", and 85% of elementary students selected "friendly" when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?" These responses reflect stakeholders' perceptions of the school's environment and relationships among stakeholders.

Communication was also viewed positively by families and staff. Parents described regular communication from teachers and administrators through phone calls, emails, newsletters, flyers and informal conversations. Stakeholder interviews indicated that teachers and school leaders are responsive and accessible, returning calls promptly and meeting with families as needed to address student concerns. Parent-teacher conferences were described as meaningful opportunities to discuss student learning and progress. The principal's presentation and a review of "House System", "staff birthday recognition", "staff shoutouts recognition" and "ACES Acronym" documents indicated that multiple initiatives are implemented to address the school's culture and climate. A review of documents and artifacts confirmed the presence of communication tools, including the "2025-2026 Cloverport Student Handbook", "Smith's Scoop-CIS Newsletter" and the "CIS Student Code of Conduct 25-26." However, the school's website had not been updated to reflect current information related to the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP), indicating an opportunity to improve alignment across communication platforms.

During the review, the team found the school had a strong focus on student well-being. Administrators, faculty and staff consistently emphasized the importance of building relationships and attending to students' social and emotional needs as part of the school's daily work. Students shared that they feel comfortable talking with teachers and the principal when concerns arise and expressed confidence that adults will listen and respond appropriately. Survey data further reflect positive stakeholder perceptions related to students' well-being. Ninety-six percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we keep our learners' well-being as a priority in everything we do (11)." Additionally, 91% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults care about children's well-being (7)" and 91% of elementary students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults show that they care about us (7)." Conversely, 77% of middle and high school students agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults show that they care about us (7)."

The school serves a high-need population, with a significant percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced-price meals and many receiving additional supports through special education, Section 504 plans or English learner (EL) services. The principal acknowledged both the strength of family relationships and the challenges associated with economic barriers, limited access to external resources and the level of student need. These contextual factors highlight the importance of the school's emphasis on relationships, trust and care as foundational conditions that support student engagement.

To support and sustain a positive school culture, the school implemented and expanded several recognition and leadership initiatives. Student programs such as "Student of the Month", an expanded house system, "End-of-9 Weeks Awards" and a "Student Advisory Council" promote leadership, engagement and school pride. Staff recognition efforts further reinforce positive relationships and a shared commitment to the school community.

The principal indicated that the first year of leadership focused primarily on strengthening culture and climate, resulting in increased school pride, clearer behavioral expectations and stronger relationships across the school community. Stakeholders affirmed the positive impact of these efforts, and the KSA Quality of School Climate and Safety Survey (QSCS) showed an increase, resulting in a Green rating for the 2024-2025 school year. At the same time, the principal identified a need for greater clarity around the school's academic standing and the specific strategies being used to address academic gaps. The principal identified several priority areas for continued growth, including strengthening Tier 1 instruction and instructional consistency, enhancing staff support and capacity building, accelerating academic recovery, increasing student engagement and establishing systems that support long-term sustainability.

A review of the CSIP indicates that the school has established goals focused on improving student proficiency in reading, mathematics, science, social studies and writing. Additional goals include improving students' perceptions of school safety and increasing postsecondary readiness. While these goals reflect an awareness of key academic and nonacademic needs, a review of the CSIP and related artifacts revealed limited detail regarding the specific actions, timelines, monitoring processes and measures that would support sustained implementation and continuous improvement. Similarly, culture and climate documentation did not consistently identify next steps or clearly articulate how improvement efforts progress through a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle.

The principal's presentation and a review of artifacts further confirmed that the school has implemented multiple initiatives intended to support culture, climate and instructional practices, including a data analysis protocol, instructional rounds, learning walks, student assessment analysis and professional learning communities. Evidence from interviews and document reviews indicates that these structures are in place and occurring; however, the review also found that processes for monitoring, evaluating and refining these efforts are not yet consistently defined or applied. Limited analysis of walkthrough and instructional data restricts the school's ability to use these insights to guide instruction and enhance student achievement.

Data gathered from observations highlighted the need for leaders and educators to strengthen collaboration to use existing data-collection and analysis systems, ensuring findings are systematically applied to inform instruction and address the diverse learning needs of all students. When asked, "Which four phrases best

describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?", 54% of elementary students selected "complete worksheets" and 50% selected "do the same work as everyone else." Similarly, when asked, "Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?", 61% of middle and high school students selected "do the same work as everyone else." Moreover, learners who "engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)" were evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms according to eleot observation data.

A review of the "Curriculum Spreadsheet 2025-2026" indicated that curriculum resources are distributed across multiple sources, and there was limited evidence of vertical alignment or consistent implementation with fidelity across grade levels.

Collectively, these findings demonstrate that the school has established a strong foundation rooted in culture, relationships and student well-being. At the same time, evidence from document reviews, observations and interviews indicates that instructional systems and improvement processes are not implemented with the same level of coherence or consistency across the school. While multiple initiatives, tools and structures are in place to support teaching and learning, limited evidence of alignment, monitoring and data-informed refinement reduces their overall impact on instructional practice and student achievement. This combination of strengths and challenges provides important context for the instructional improvement priorities that follow.

# Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

Cognia's Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® (eleot®) is a learner-centric classroom observation tool that comprises 28 items organized in seven environments aligned with the Cognia Performance Standards. The tool provides useful, relevant, structured, and quantifiable data to the extent to which students are engaged in activities and demonstrate knowledge, attitudes, and dispositions that are conducive to effective learning. Classroom observations are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes.

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 26 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

| A. Equitable Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicators** | **Average** | **Description** | **Not Observed** | **Somewhat Evident** | **Evident** | **Very Evident** |
| A1 | 1.3 | Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs. | 73% | 19% | 8% | 0% |
| A2 | 2.5 | Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support. | 0% | 50% | 46% | 4% |
| A3 | 2.8 | Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner. | 0% | 27% | 62% | 12% |
| A4 | 1.7 | 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% |
| **Overall rating on a 4-point scale:** | | 2.1 | | | | |

| B. High Expectations Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicators** | **Average** | **Description** | **Not Observed** | **Somewhat Evident** | **Evident** | **Very Evident** |
| B1 | 1.8 | 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% |
| **Overall rating on a 4-point scale:** | | **1.7** | | | | |

| C. Supportive Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicators** | **Average** | **Description** | **Not Observed** | **Somewhat Evident** | **Evident** | **Very Evident** |
| C1 | 2.5 | 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% |
| **Overall rating on a 4-point scale:** | | **2.5** | | | | |

| D. Active Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicators** | **Average** | **Description** | **Not Observed** | **Somewhat Evident** | **Evident** | **Very Evident** |
| D1 | 1.9 | Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate. | 27% | 54% | 19% | 0% |
| D2 | 1.7 | Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences. | 35% | 58% | 8% | 0% |
| D3 | 2.3 | Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities. | 15% | 46% | 31% | 8% |
| D4 | 1.5 | Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments. | 58% | 35% | 8% | 0% |
| **Overall rating on a 4-point scale:** | **1.9** | | | | | |

| Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicators** | **Average** | **Description** | **Not Observed** | **Somewhat Evident** | **Evident** | **Very Evident** |
| E1 | 1.6 | Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored. | 42% | 58% | 0% | 0% |
| E2 | 2.0 | Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work. | 19% | 65% | 15% | 0% |
| E3 | 2.0 | Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content. | 27% | 50% | 19% | 4% |
| E4 | 1.4 | Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed. | 58% | 42% | 0% | 0% |
| **Overall rating on a 4-point scale:** | **1.7** | | | | | |

| F. Well-Managed Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicators | Average | Description | Not Observed | Somewhat Evident | Evident | Very Evident |
| F1 | 2.9 | 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% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | 2.7 | | | | | |

| G. Digital Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicators | Average | Description | Not Observed | Somewhat Evident | Evident | Very Evident |
| G1 | 1.5 | Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning. | 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% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | 1.4 | | | | | |

# 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 during key points of the school day, 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. 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, and when present, it 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 related to 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.

The CSIP referenced data, including ACT, Kentucky Online Testing (KYOTE) and 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," indicate 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 institution's capacity to achieve higher performance and to reflect the areas identified by the Diagnostic Review Team as having the greatest impact on improving student performance and organizational effectiveness.

## Improvement Priority 1

Create, establish and implement a coherent and systematic schoolwide framework for continuous improvement that guides staff in consistently analyzing student data, determining instructional goals, adjusting Tier 1 practices and monitoring progress toward improved student outcomes.

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

**Findings:**

Although Cloverport Independent School was identified for CSI based on elementary-level KSA student performance data, the Diagnostic Review Team examined the school as a unified K-12 system, recognizing that leadership practices, instructional systems and improvement processes influence student outcomes across grade levels. Evidence gathered across multiple sources indicates that structures and practices intended to support instructional improvement and academic outcomes are emerging but are not yet coherently defined, consistently implemented or systematically monitored across the school.

Student performance data from the KSA indicate inconsistent and declining academic outcomes, particularly in elementary reading. For example, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 54% in 2022-2023 and 35% in 2024-2025. Fourth-grade students scored 59% Proficient/Distinguished in reading in 2022-2023 and 27% in 2023-2024. In reading, 4th-grade student performance data were suppressed for public reporting during the 2024-2025 school year. In addition, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 50% in 2022-2023 and 31% in 2024-2025. Longitudinal KSA cohort data further reflect a sharp decline in performance over the past three school years. For instance, 3rd graders scored 54% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023, 27% as 4th graders in 2023-2024 and 31% as 5th graders in 2024-2025. Classroom observations further show the need for high expectations within the classroom. Learners who "strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)" were evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms. In addition, the team found it evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." In contrast, survey data showed that 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)."

Evidence from document reviews and stakeholder interviews indicates that systems intended to support continuous improvement - such as professional learning community (PLC) meetings, instructional rounds, learning walks, data analysis protocols and professional learning are present but lack a coherent, integrated framework. A review of the "2025-2026 Professional Development Plan" confirms that time is allocated for PLCs; however, interviews and artifacts provide little evidence that PLCs are occurring consistently or that PLC time is intentionally focused on strengthening Tier 1 instructional practices aligned with student learning needs. "PLC agendas", "data analysis protocols" and "lesson plans" provided little evidence of common protocols, clearly defined instructional outcomes or documented follow-up actions tied to student achievement. Interviews further indicated that while PLC meetings occur monthly, they often lack an instructional focus.

Additional evidence from school-led learning walks, instructional rounds and classroom observations further reflects the absence of a cohesive improvement process. The "Learning Walk" document reflected limited evidence that classroom observations are conducted using a research-based tool (e.g., eleot) to consistently

inform instructional practice or professional learning. Similarly, the "Instructional Rounds - Peer Observation" document and related artifacts showed little evidence of a clearly defined problem of practice or a synthesized analysis of findings that identified Tier 1 instructional practices as a priority for improvement. The Diagnostic Review Team's classroom observational results reinforced these findings, indicating that although a positive and respectful climate was consistently evident, instructional practices were primarily teacher-directed and focused on whole-group delivery or task completion. It was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that "learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)" and in 19% of classrooms that "learners/ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)." Evidence of rigorous, cognitively demanding tasks, intentional differentiation, student collaboration and formative assessment practices was inconsistently observed. Students were frequently unable to articulate learning targets, success criteria, how their work was assessed or structures that support ongoing feedback. The team found a lack of evidence showing that student self-monitoring was consistently evident. Despite these findings, perception data showed that when asked, 100% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)." Additionally, 82% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10)." These findings suggest a disconnect between perceived and enacted practices.

Assessment and data practices further illustrate the absence of a coherent, continuous improvement cycle. The "Data Analysis Protocol", "PLC Agendas" and "Professional Development Plan" provided little evidence to show the school was fully implementing a balanced assessment system with clearly defined expectations to identify which data are collected, when data are collected or how results are used to inform instructional decisions. Interviews with teachers indicated that assessment data selected for analysis are often determined by individual preference rather than guided by a shared and monitored assessment process. While the "Data Analysis Protocol" prompts teachers to document their observations and questions, the identified next steps were frequently broad, inconsistently revisited and infrequently monitored for impact. When asked, 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)." However, 69% of elementary students and 47% of middle/high school students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." "Student Assessment Samples" reflected analysis of a single assessment without documented instructional responses, targeted supports or progress monitoring over time.

Collectively, the evidence indicates that the school lacks a coherent and systematic schoolwide framework for continuous improvement that consistently guides staff in analyzing student data, determining instructional goals, adjusting Tier 1 practices and monitoring progress toward improved student outcomes. While multiple initiatives and structures are present, limited alignment, monitoring and data-informed refinement reduce their overall impact on instructional practice and student achievement.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Research and examine evidence-based PLC practices implemented in schools of similar size and context and use the findings to restructure regular, data-driven PLC meetings with clear procedural norms focused on student achievement and instructional practices aligned with the school's turnaround plan.

- Establish and implement clearly aligned timelines (e.g., assessment, professional learning, instructional pacing calendars) to support the consistent implementation, review and refinement of the identified Tier 1 instructional practices.

- Identify a small, clearly defined set of priority Tier 1 instructional practices aligned to student learning needs to create and establish a shared instructional focus with consistent expectations across all grade levels.

# Improvement Priority 2

Establish clear direction and shared expectations for curriculum, instruction and assessment aligned to the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) by implementing a coherent system that supports the consistent use, review and refinement of a defined set of Tier 1 instructional strategies and evidence-based engagement practices, supported through aligned assessments, monitoring processes and feedback to promote coherence and consistency across all grade levels.

**Standard 12:** Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.

**Findings:**

Evidence from multiple sources indicates variability in the implementation of curriculum, instruction and assessment aligned to the KAS across grade levels. While teachers demonstrate commitment to supporting students, the evidence reflects a lack of consistently shared expectations for standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction, resulting in uneven instructional experiences and outcomes. Student performance data from the KSA and the ACT provide context for the identified improvement priority. The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in social studies in 2022-2023 was 59% and declined to 25% in 2024-2025. While the percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading in 2022-2023 was 50%, it declined to 31% in 2024-2025. According to 2024-2025 data, the percentage of students meeting the ACT benchmark in English decreased from 58% in 2022-2023 to 45% in 2024-2025. According to 2024-2025 KSA data, the percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the ACT was 5 percentage points below the state average. Furthermore, according to 2024-2025 KSA data, the percentage of students who were post-secondary ready declined from 92% in 2022-2023 to 62.5% in 2024-2025. Collectively, these trends suggest variability in the implementation of standards-aligned curriculum and instructional rigor across grade levels. These performance trends align with classroom observational data, which indicate that expectations for rigorous, standards-aligned instruction are inconsistently evident. 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)." Interviews with teachers further support this pattern, as educators described differing interpretations of instructional rigor and pacing, indicating that alignment to grade-level standards is inconsistently operationalized in daily instruction.

Survey and interview data provide additional insight into how learners experience instructional variability across classrooms. For example, 95% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I provided opportunities for learners that aligned to their needs (18)." However, 68% of elementary students and 66% of middle/high school students agreed/absolutely agreed, "In the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me think in new ways (15)." Classroom observational data align with these differing perceptions, as instruction was frequently characterized as whole-group, teacher-directed delivery with fewer opportunities for student discourse, lack of collaboration and the absence of differentiated learning aligned with student readiness. The team found it evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)." Likewise, it was evident/very evident in 15% of classes that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." Student interviews further indicated that expectations for engagement and instructional routines vary across classrooms, contributing to learning experiences that are not consistently predictable or structured.

Document and artifact reviews help explain the instructional variability reflected in both performance and perception data. A review of the "Curriculum Spreadsheet 2025-2026" reflects a wide range of curricular resources across content areas, with limited evidence of a formalized process for vertical alignment or coordinated curriculum adoption. Interviews confirmed that curriculum decisions and selection of instructional materials are often teacher-driven, and observational data indicate frequent supplementation with teacher-designed or externally sourced materials, resulting in varied instructional approaches across classrooms.

Across evidence sources, patterns of instructional inconsistency are evident at the Tier 1 level. Teachers described individualized approaches to instructional planning with limited shared clarity regarding expectations for standards-aligned instruction. Document and artifact reviews, including the "Curriculum Spreadsheet 2025–2026", reflect a wide assortment of curricular resources across content areas, with interviews indicating that curriculum decisions are often made individually rather than through a formal adoption process and that vertical alignment is inconsistently considered. Leadership interviews further revealed that curriculum adoptions occurred before the current leadership tenure. Classroom observational data align with these findings, as instruction frequently used teacher-designed or externally sourced supplementary materials, leading to varied instructional approaches. In addition, the "Master Schedule" reflects differing instructional structures across grade levels, which further contributes to variability in instructional planning and delivery. When considered alongside student performance trends, eleot observational data and parent perceptions of instructional rigor and communication, this body of evidence indicates that curriculum implementation and instructional practices are not consistently aligned across grade levels, contributing to uneven learning experiences and inconsistent academic outcomes.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Define and clearly communicate shared expectations for standards-aligned Tier I instruction (e.g., instructional rigor, curriculum focus, student engagement) to establish a common understanding across grade levels.

- Use collaborative planning time to examine curriculum resources, pacing, instructional expectations and scheduling structures across grade levels and grade bands to strengthen vertical alignment and coherence of standards-aligned curriculum.

- Implement common instructional planning expectations that guide teachers in aligning lessons, tasks and assessments with grade-level standards, reducing reliance on individual interpretation and increasing instructional consistency.

- Use walkthroughs, classroom observations and review of instructional materials and student work to examine instructional alignment and consistency and provide feedback that reinforces shared expectations for curriculum and instruction across classrooms.

# Your Next Steps

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

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

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.

- Develop plans to address the Improvement Priorities identified by the Diagnostic Review Team.

- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.

- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.

# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the principal's capacity for leadership of school turnaround, as defined in 703 KAR 5:280, Section 1. The recommendation of the principal's ability to lead the intervention in the school is based on an assessment of Standard 10: School Improvement from the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) approved by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and adopted by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB).

703 KAR 5:280, Section 3, identifies the discretion of the audit team to incorporate the analysis and recommendation regarding the principal's capacity into this report. The superintendent will make any necessary determination regarding the principal or other certified staff pursuant to KRS 160.346(8).

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

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

> ☒It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) school.

> ☐It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) school.

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

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

The principal at Cloverport Independent School has intentionally focused on culture and climate since becoming principal last year. The principal is aware of the strong history of the school's connection to the community and has created an open and caring environment.

There is little evidence of the school implementing a system for continuous improvement. The school, under the leadership of the principal, should develop a rigorous and documented continuous improvement process focused on learners' needs and experiences. This process should be built upon analyzing current and trend data regarding the academic and non-academic needs of student learners. The continuous improvement process should help to achieve the vision and fulfill the mission of the school, as well as inform the development of the needs assessment and drive the implementation of the turnaround plan. Evidence also suggests that PLC meetings are only held monthly and rarely use data to inform instruction. The principal and teacher leaders should research PLC best practices to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate an effective PLC process that is data-driven and based on increasing student learning. This process should occur regularly and become an integral part of the continuous improvement process.

Observational data show a lack of instructional rigor in the classrooms wherein it was evident/very evident that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)" in 12% of classrooms. Similarly, "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)" was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms. The principal needs to create a system to ensure that KASs are taught at the appropriate level for which the students are being assessed on the KSA. The principal and

teacher leaders have set up a foundation to increase student learning but should now be ready to take teacher effectiveness and student achievement to the next level. The principal should expect teachers to provide students with high-yield instructional strategies and engaging lessons. School and district leadership should hold teachers accountable for setting high expectations for all students to make significant achievement gains, regardless of their barriers.

The principal should, with the support of district leadership, leverage the relationships that she built with her staff to implement a change-management process that produces demonstrable progress toward the goals identified in the turnaround plan.

# Team Roster

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

| Team member name | Brief biography |
|---|---|
| Lynda Ingram | Lynda Ingram has served in education for over 31 years. During her tenure, she was a teacher, department chair, National Association of Elementary Principals (NAESP) national mentor, classroom organization and management program (COMP) trainer, crisis management trainer, assistant principal and principal. She currently serves as a leadership and instructional coach with Bailey Education Group. She has previously served as principal coach with the Alabama State Department of Education, where she mentored principals in the turnaround process for CSI schools. In addition, Lynda serves as an adjunct instructor at Shelton State Community College. |
| Jim Hamm | Jim Hamm has 40 years of experience as a professional educator. He is currently serving the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as an Education Recovery Leader (ERL). He has served as both an elementary and a high school principal. He also served in various central office positions. The last several years of his career were spent working with the KDE. He has served as a professional growth and effectiveness lead, ERL, state assistance monitor and state manager during this time. Jim believes that every student in Kentucky should have access to a quality education, regardless of where they live in the commonwealth. |
| Tyler Gibson | Tyler Gibson currently serves as an ERL with KDE. He has over 12 years of experience as an educator and administrator. In his role with KDE, Tyler partners with schools and districts to develop and refine the instructional, behavioral and leadership systems necessary for continuous improvement, particularly in CSI schools. Before joining KDE, Tyler was a special education teacher, instructional coach and assistant principal in Louisville, Kentucky. |
| Sondra Gibbs | Sondra Gibbs has 31 years of experience in education. Currently, she serves as the director of academic operations for a rural, Title I school district in Kentucky. Her past experiences include being a teacher, early home-based developmental interventionist, assistant principal and principal. Mrs. Gibbs also works with professional learning, federal programs and grant writing. |

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

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

# Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

| Standard number and statement | Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement. | Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness. | Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard. | Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners. | Team rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs. | Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | 1 |
| 9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders. | Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities. | Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities. | Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities. | Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities. | 2 |

| Standard number and statement | Level 1: **Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity** leading toward improvement. | Level 2: **Developing or improving practices** that provide evidence that effort **approaches desired level of effectiveness.** | Level 3: **Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness** that is reflected in the standard. | Level 4: **Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results** that **positively impact learners.** | Team rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments. | Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change. | Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change. | Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change. | Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change. | 2 |
| 12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy, inclusion, and effectiveness. | Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners. | 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, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners. | 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, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners. | 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, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners. | 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 equitable 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 give consideration to 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 |
| 26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and | Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the | Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the | Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the | Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning. | 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. | 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. | 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. | 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. | |
| 27. Learners' diverse academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions. | The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices. | The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success. | The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success. | The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success. | 1 |
| 28. With support, learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers. | Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals. | Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals. | Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals. | Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals. | 1 |

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

# Student Performance Data

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

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results**

| Content Area & Grade | %P/D School (2022-2023) | %P/D State (2022-2023) | %P/D School (2023-2024) | %P/D State (2023-2024) | %P/D School (2024-2025) | %P/D State (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3rd-Grade Reading | 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 |
| 6th-Grade Math | 41 | 38 | 44 | 42 | 38 | 41 |

| 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA increased by 22 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 7th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading increased by 15 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading remained stagnant over the three-year span on the KSA at 53% but was above state average during the same period.

- The percentage of 7th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the 2024-2025 KSA in science was 23 percentage points above the state average.

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2022-2023 in social studies was 59% and declined in 2024-2025 to 25%.

- The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2022-2023 in reading was 50% and declined in 2024-2025 to 31%.

## Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

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

## 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 |

## Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmarks on the ACT

| Content Area | School (2022-2023) | State (2022-2023) | School (2023-2024) | State (2023-2024) | School (2024-2025) | State (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| English | 58 | 47 | 33 | 44 | 45 | 44 |
| Reading | 38 | 44 | 26 | 42 | 40 | 41 |
| Math | 21 | 33 | 15 | 30 | 25 | 30 |

Plus

- According to the school's 2024-2025 results, the percentage of students meeting benchmark in reading on the ACT increased slightly over the three-year reporting period.

- According to the school's 2024-2025 results, the percentage of students meeting benchmark in English was one percentage point higher than the state average.

Delta

- According to the school's 2024-2025 results, the percentage of students meeting benchmark in English on the ACT had a significant decrease of 13 percentage points over the three-year reporting period.

- According to the school's 2024-2025 results, the percentage of students meeting benchmark in math on the ACT was 5 percentage points below the state average in 2024-2025.

**Graduation Rate**

| Year | School Four-Year | State Four-Year | School Five-Year | State Five-Year |
|------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 2022-2023 | 100 | 91.4 | 96 | 92.5 |
| 2023-2024 | 100 | 92.3 | 100 | 93.4 |
| 2024-2025 | 100 | 93.5 | 100 | 94.2 |

Plus

- The four-year graduation rate was 100% over the three-year reporting period.

- The five-year graduation rate was 100% in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

- The 2024-2025 four-year graduation and five-year graduation rates were above the state average over the three-year reporting period.

Delta

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

**Post-Secondary Readiness**

| Year | School | State | School w/ High Demand | State w/ High Demand |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2022-2023 | 92 | 79.1 | 96 | 83.5 |
| 2023-2024 | 84 | 81 | 88 | 86 |
| 2024-2025 | 62.5 | 83 | 68.8 | 88.8 |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of students who were post-secondary ready declined by 29.5 percentage points over the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of students who were post-secondary ready in the high demand category declined by 27.2 percentage points over the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of students who were post-secondary ready declined in every category over the three-year reporting period.

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

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 54 | * | 35 |
| Female | * | * | 30 |
| Male | * | * | 38 |
| White | 50 | * | 33 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 58 | * | 39 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 3 who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined by 19 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined by 19 percentage points over the three-year reporting period.

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

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

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

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 59 | 27 | * |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | 57 | 21 | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | 33 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade students in the all students and White student groups who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

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

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

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

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

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

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 50 | 25 | 31 |
| Female | 50 | 17 | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | 52 | 26 | 27 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 20 | 38 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 5 who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2024-2025 in reading declined by 19 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 5th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2024-2025 in reading declined by 25 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

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

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 50 | 30 | * |
| Female | 30 | 25 | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | 48 | 32 | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 50 | 20 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade five who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 20 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

- The percentage of 5th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 15 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged student groups who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased 30 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

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

| Group | Social Studies (2022-2023) | Social Studies (2023-2024) | Social Studies (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 59 | * | 25 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | 67 | * | * |
| White | 57 | * | 27 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 50 | * | 31 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade five who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2024-2025 in social studies declined by 34 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 5th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2024-2025 in social studies declined by 30 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

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

| Group | Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023) | Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024) | Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 68 | 60 | * |
| Female | 50 | 75 | * |
| Male | 83 | * | * |
| White | 67 | 58 | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 63 | 50 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased 25 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by 13 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

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

| Group | On-Demand Writing (2022-2023) | On-Demand Writing (2023-2024) | On-Demand Writing (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 41 | * | * |
| Female | 40 | * | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | 43 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 6th-Grade Reading**

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 59 | 30 | * |
| Female | * | 20 | * |
| Male | * | 42 | * |
| White | 59 | 32 | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | 25 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 6th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 29 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

- The percentage of 6th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 27 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 6th-Grade Math**

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 41 | 44 | 38 |
| Female | * | 33 | * |
| Male | * | 58 | * |
| White | 41 | 44 | 36 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | 38 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 6 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math on the 2024-2025 KSA declined by 3 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 6th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math on the 2024-2025 KSA declined by 5 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th-Grade Reading**

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 56 | 50 | 71 |
| Female | * | * | 73 |
| Male | * | * | 69 |
| White | 60 | 50 | 73 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 71 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of all students in grade 7 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 15 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 7th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 13 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

Delta

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

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th-Grade Math**

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | * | 56 | 54 |
| Female | * | * | 36 |
| Male | * | * | 69 |
| White | * | 56 | 55 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 50 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 33 percentage points lower than male students in 2024-2025.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th-Grade Science**

| Group | Science (2022-2023) | Science (2023-2024) | Science (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 25 | * | 58 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | 54 |
| White | 27 | * | 59 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 64 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of all students in grade 7 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in science on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 33 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 7th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in science on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 32 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

Delta

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

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Reading**

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 53 | 50 | 53 |
| Female | 73 | * | * |
| Male | 37 | 45 | * |
| White | 53 | 53 | 53 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 42 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 8 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the 2024-2025 KSA was stagnant during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 8th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the 2024-2025 KSA was stagnant during the three-year reporting period.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Math**

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 41 | * | 40 |
| Female | 47 | * | * |
| Male | 37 | * | * |
| White | 41 | * | 40 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 35 | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 8 who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2024-2025 in math declined by 1 percentage point during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 8th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2024-2025 in math declined by 1 percentage point during the three-year reporting period.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Social Studies**

| Group | Social Studies (2022-2023) | Social Studies (2023-2024) | Social Studies (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 44 | 40 | 40 |
| Female | 60 | * | * |
| Male | 32 | 36 | * |
| White | 44 | 42 | 40 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 25 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 8 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the 2024-2025 KSA decreased by 4 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics**

| Group | Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023) | Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024) | Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 50 | 50 | 67 |
| Female | 60 | * | * |
| Male | * | 45 | * |
| White | 50 | 53 | 67 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 48 | 42 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of all students in grade 8 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 17 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the 2024-2025 KSA decreased by 6 percentage points between 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade On-Demand Writing**

| Group | On-Demand Writing (2022-2023) | On-Demand Writing (2023-2024) | On-Demand Writing (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 41 | 55 | 73 |
| Female | 53 | * | * |
| Male | 32 | * | * |
| White | 41 | 53 | 73 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 58 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of all students in grade 8 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 32 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 6 percentage points between 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.

Delta

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

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 10th-Grade Reading**

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | * | 38 | 61 |
| Female | * | * | 77 |
| Male | * | 23 | 47 |
| White | * | 38 | 61 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 50 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of all students in grade 10 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 23 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 10th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 24 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 10th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 23 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 11 percentage points below the all students group in 2024-2025.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 10th-Grade Math**

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | * | 52 | 39 |
| Female | * | * | 46 |
| Male | * | 46 | 33 |
| White | * | 52 | 39 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | 27 | 28 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 10th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 13 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade Science**

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

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade Social Studies**

| Group | Social Studies (2022-2023) | Social Studies (2023-2024) | Social Studies (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 44 | 23 | 45 |
| Female | 47 | * | * |
| Male | 40 | 25 | 33 |
| White | 44 | 22 | 45 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 20 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the 2024-2025 KSA decreased by 7 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics**

| Group | Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023) | Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024) | Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 36 | * | 50 |
| Female | 53 | * | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | 36 | * | 50 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | * | 30 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of all students in grade 11 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 14 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on 2024-2025 the KSA increased by 3 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

Delta

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

**Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade On-Demand Writing**

| Group | On-Demand Writing (2022-2023) | On-Demand Writing (2023-2024) | On-Demand Writing (2024-2025) |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 40 | 38 | 50 |
| Female | 67 | 50 | * |
| Male | * | 25 | * |
| White | 40 | 39 | 50 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 33 | 30 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of all students in grade 11 who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on 2024-2025 the KSA increased by 10 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

- The percentage of 11th-grade White students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the 2024-2025 KSA increased by 10 percentage points during the three-year reporting period.

Delta

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

# Schedule

## Monday, January 12, 2026

| Time | Event | Where | Who |
|------|-------|-------|-----|
| 2 p.m.-3 p.m. | Team travels to institution | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 3:15 p.m.-3:45 p.m. | Principal Presentation | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 4 p.m.-9 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 / Informal Observations | School Office | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 8 a.m.-3:45 p.m. | Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 3:45 p.m.-4:30 p.m. | Team returns to hotel | Hotel | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 4:45 p.m.-8 p.m. | Team Work Session #2 | Hotel Conference Room | Diagnostic Review Team Members |

## Wednesday, January 14, 2026

| Time | Event | Where | Who |
|------|-------|-------|-----|
| 7:45 a.m. | Team arrives at institution / Informal Observations | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 8 a.m.-4 p.m. | Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 4 p.m.-5 p.m. | Team returns to hotel | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 5 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.-3 p.m. | Final Team Work Session | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |