



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:  
Cochran Elementary**

Feb. 17-20, 2026

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results</b> .....	<b>5</b>
eleot Narrative .....	8
<b>Improvement Priorities</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	11
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Improvement Priority 2 .....	13
Your Next Steps .....	14
<b>Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....	18
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	18
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....	20
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning.....	22
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....	24
Student Performance Data.....	27
Schedule .....	40

# Introduction

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

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

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

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

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	1
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	3
<b>Certified Staff</b>	13
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	6
<b>Students</b>	58
<b>Parents</b>	8
<b>Total</b>	92

## Performance Standards Evaluation

Diagnostic Reviews are based primarily on the evaluation of evidence that reflects an institution’s ability to meet the expectations as defined by the essential Diagnostic Review Standards, which are a subset of the Cognia Performance Standards. These standards define the elements of quality that research indicates are present in an institution that is continuously improving. The standards provide the guideposts to becoming a better institution. The Diagnostic Review Team applies a four-level rubric to determine the degree to which the institution demonstrates effective practices that reflect the expectations of each standard. The rubric scale is designed to

indicate the current performance of the institution. The Diagnostic Review Team's findings and the rubric for each standard are in this report's appendix.

## Insights from the Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the processes, programs, and practices within the institution to arrive at the findings of the team. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

### **Strengths and Continuous Improvement:**

Cochran Elementary has intentionally focused on improving its climate and culture to create an environment conducive to teaching and learning. Ninety-three percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults make us feel welcomed (1)." During stakeholder interviews, parents expressed gratitude for having their children enrolled at the school and shared that the faculty and staff consistently go above and beyond to support them and their students. According to stakeholder survey data, when educators were asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?", 79% chose "welcoming", 67% selected "respectful", 65% chose "warm" and 56% picked "safe". Eighty-four percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults try new things to make our school better (6)." This year marks the first implementation of the Ron Clark Academy (RCA) House System. Both educators and students expressed positive feedback during interviews, sharing how much they value and enjoy the new system designed to build community and leadership.

As a result of these efforts, the school significantly reduced discipline referrals from 961 in 2024-2025 to 373 in 2025-2026 year to date, as shared in the principal's presentation, allowing more students to remain in class and engage in instruction. Observational data showed that learners who "speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)" were evident/very evident in 78% of classrooms. Additionally, classroom observations showed it was evident/very evident in 89% of classrooms that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." The principal has implemented schoolwide morning meetings and the Franklin Covey Education's Leader in Me program to strengthen the school's social-emotional foundation. A review of documents and artifacts confirms that Leader in Me is well aligned with the school's mission and vision, a process developed collaboratively with the staff. These strategies provide students with practical tools and options to navigate challenges effectively during instructional and non-instructional time.

The Diagnostic Review Team also identified attendance as a key strength. During stakeholder interviews, participants shared that the school has established an attendance team that meets weekly to monitor and address attendance concerns. According to the principal's presentation, the school's chronic absenteeism reduced from 154 absences in 2024-2025 to 128 absences in 2025-2026, year to date.

The school further supports attendance and engagement through its Family Resource Center, which hosts monthly parent events to strengthen family involvement. Most recently, the school hosted a "Snack and Paint" event in Feb. 2026. Additionally, each house within the RCA House System, associated with the Ron Clark Academy, is expected to host two events annually to promote community and student connection. To encourage consistent attendance, the school has established a Boys and Girls Club that meets weekly, as well as a winter basketball team to provide extracurricular opportunities that motivate students to attend regularly. Finally, an active Parent Teacher Association (PTA) has helped secure resources and partnered with the school to promote and sustain strong student attendance.

Stakeholder interviews and a review of artifacts indicate that professional learning community (PLC) meetings are in place to support the internalization process, utilizing high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) such as Expeditionary Learning and Illustrative Mathematics (IM). The PLCs are led by collaborative teachers (i.e.,



teacher coaches) to build teachers' understanding through a process for aligning the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) with the school's curriculum. While most classroom observations revealed the use of HQIRs, the team found many classrooms lacking high expectations and cognitive demand for students. The school conducted classroom observations using Cognia's Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® (eleot®) during the fall of the 2025-2026 school year and found several areas of concern. Results from school "Walkthrough Data on Equitable Pedagogy with analysis" artifact conducted on October 9, 2025 revealed that it was evident/very evident in 64% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)", and in 50% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)". Additionally, the 2025-2026 Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey (Impact) revealed 60% of teachers responded extremely effective/quite effective to the statement, "How effective do you feel at your job right now?" Moreover, 3rd-, 4th- and 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading and math decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA). Furthermore, stakeholder interviews revealed that the provided coaching and feedback addressed teacher-selected professional growth goals from domains two and three within the district's certified evaluation plan. Results from the Impact survey indicate that 61% of teachers responded almost always/frequently to the question, "How often do you receive feedback on your teaching?", and 65% responded almost always/frequently to the question, "How useful do you find the feedback you receive on your teaching?" The survey results suggest that teachers have a strong desire for additional coaching and feedback to guide improvements in instructional practices and delivery.

The school provided evidence of an analysis of the school's KSA results, Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) results and the district's Evidence of Learning Checks (ELC) results, conducted by the instructional leadership team (ILT). The ILT uses findings from the analysis of school-level performance data to guide the development of the school's comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) goals and Wildly Important Goals (W.I.G.). However, many stakeholder interviews reported a lack of knowledge about the goals, strategies and activities in the CSIP. Likewise, interviews indicated a lack of stakeholder involvement in the school's continuous-improvement decision-making process. According to the district's Upbeat survey, 72% of teachers responded agreed/strongly agreed to the statement, "Administrators at my school actively seek input from teachers when making important decisions." Similarly, Impact survey results show that 47% of teachers reported having a tremendous amount/quite a bit of input when asked, "When the school makes important decisions, how much input do teachers have?"

A review of artifacts showed that the school has a documented process for guiding continuous improvement. Despite this, the team found little evidence that many systems are actively monitored to ensure they are fully implemented or effective. Stakeholder interviews and additional artifacts did confirm that a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) is in place to address student needs. Evidence also points to successful interventions within this system, resulting in improvements in both chronic absenteeism and student behavior. Stakeholder interviews revealed a need for professional learning for staff members in data literacy, as interviews indicated little analysis of student formative and summative classroom data to guide instructional decisions, identify student-specific deficiencies or select appropriate interventions. Consequently, Cognia's survey data showed that 66% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)."

# 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 18 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	1.4	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	61%	33%	6%	0%
A2	2.6	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	44%	56%	0%
A3	2.9	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	11%	83%	6%
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.	61%	17%	17%	6%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		<b>2.2</b>				

<b>B. High Expectations Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
B1	1.7	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	39%	56%	6%	0%
B2	1.7	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	28%	72%	0%	0%
B3	1.3	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	72%	28%	0%	0%
B4	1.8	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	22%	78%	0%	0%
B5	1.7	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	39%	56%	6%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.6</b>			

<b>C. Supportive Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
C1	2.2	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	6%	67%	28%	0%
C2	2.0	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	28%	44%	28%	0%
C3	2.3	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	72%	28%	0%
C4	2.7	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	33%	67%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.3</b>			



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.	22%	67%	11%	0%
D2	1.5	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	61%	28%	11%	0%
D3	2.2	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	0%	83%	17%	0%
D4	1.6	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	50%	44%	6%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.8</b>			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.4	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	61%	39%	0%	0%
E2	2.1	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	6%	83%	11%	0%
E3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	22%	56%	22%	0%
E4	1.3	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	67%	33%	0%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.9	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	22%	67%	11%
F2	2.6	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	6%	33%	56%	6%
F3	2.5	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	6%	39%	56%	0%
F4	2.4	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	11%	39%	50%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.6</b>			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	61%	28%	11%	0%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	89%	11%	0%	0%
G3	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	94%	6%	0%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.2</b>			

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 18 formal classroom observations in core content areas and several informal observations in common areas across the school. Data from these observations provided meaningful insight into instructional practices, student expectations and learning environments experienced by students. The observational results revealed areas of celebration, such as student and teacher interactions and a welcoming school environment, and areas to strengthen instruction through high expectations, collaboration, student engagement and differentiation.

During classroom observations, students were observed in positive interactions with their teachers, even greeting and speaking to them in sign language. The Diagnostic Review Team observed teachers hugging students in the morning as they entered the classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 89% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” This is also supported by stakeholder survey data, as 90% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2).” Student responses further corroborated this, as 84% agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” Survey data revealed that 86% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we set aside time to build relationships with learners (4).”

The team identified behavior as an area that is improving based on discipline referral data, which reflects a positive response to schoolwide implemented supports. Based on the principal’s presentation, the number of referrals in 2024-2025 was 961 and decreased to 373, year-to-date. However, observational data suggests that further work is needed to ensure consistent behavior across all classrooms and settings. It was evident/very evident in 62% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” Some teachers were observed providing positive verbal reinforcement when students exhibited positive behaviors. According to the principal’s presentation, revised positive behavioral supports are a “big rock” focus for this school year.

The team identified high expectations for learners as a significant area of growth. It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1).” Also, learners who “demonstrate and/or are able to describe high-quality work (B3)” were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms. This data indicates that content delivery in Tier 1 instruction needs support. It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” and that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” The team observed minimal instances of higher-order thinking, and few questions were asked of students at a deep depth of knowledge level.

Another key area for growth identified by the team is differentiation, specifically in ensuring instruction meets the needs of all learners. It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” During most classroom visits in grades 3-5, students were engaged in whole-group instruction, completing the same task simultaneously. Survey data indicated that 66% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “At my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).” Based on observations and stakeholder interviews, the use of small-group instruction is inconsistent, leading to missed opportunities to differentiate instruction to address individual student needs. Observational data provided little evidence that progress monitoring and feedback practices were consistently embedded into instruction. 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).”

During classroom observations in primary grades, students worked at stations while the teacher pulled a small group during the skills block. However, students at the stations received minimal support, leading to off-task behavior, peer distractions and little work completion. It was evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3).” Also, learners who “understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)” were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms. Learning targets were posted in most classrooms; however, when asked, many students had difficulty articulating what they were learning or the lesson’s purpose.

Classroom observations revealed that opportunities for relevance and student-centered learning were inconsistent. It was evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1).” It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners



collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” The team observed several classrooms where instruction was delivered primarily in a lecture-style, which limited opportunities for students to turn and talk or collaborate with one another. This was supported by observational data, as it was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” Together, these data indicated that many lessons did not invite students to collaborate through meaningful discourse or create opportunities for engagement.



# Improvement Priorities

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

## Improvement Priority 1

Develop and implement a comprehensive walkthrough, coaching and feedback system to consistently monitor and strengthen rigorous, engaging, differentiated and evidence-based instruction, thereby improving professional practice and increasing student achievement.

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

### Findings:

Data from the KSA shows that in 2022-2023, 33% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, which declined to 16% in 2024-2025. In 2022-2023, 25% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, which declined to 20% in 2024-2025. The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 38% in 2022-2023 to 31% in 2024-2025. In mathematics, during the 2022-2023 school year, the percentage of 3rd-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished was 39% and 4th-grade was 15%, while the 2024-2025 data were suppressed. In 2022-2023, the percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished was 9%, which increased to 22% in 2024-2025. Results in both reading and mathematics in 2024-2025 were below the state averages in all grade levels.

The percentage of students who scored 0 points for progress was above the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment. The percentage of students who scored 140 points for progress was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 on the ACCESS assessment. These data suggest the need for regular walkthroughs, coaching and feedback to ensure strong, consistent instruction is happening in each classroom to support English learners (ELs). The school presented evidence of a continuous improvement review that was completed in 2024-2025. As a result of the previous review, the school received an improvement priority recommending a refinement of the walkthrough, coaching and feedback system to monitor the classroom environments and provide instructional coherence.

Classroom observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 0% 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).” Also, learners who “engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms. These results suggest a need for school-wide instructional non-negotiables that include high expectations, differentiated instruction and rigorous learning experiences. It was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” Instances of learners who “engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” were evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms. The observational data show a need for significant improvement in Tier 1 instruction and teacher professional practice, which can be improved through the use of a comprehensive walkthrough, coaching and feedback system.

A review of documents and artifacts and the principal interview revealed a walkthrough, coaching and feedback process to monitor classroom instruction and classroom environments. A review of documents and artifacts



revealed the school had two walkthrough instruments: “Instructional Practice Guide” to monitor the implementation of the HQIRs and “Walk-Through Tool on Cochran Look-Fors” to monitor the school’s high expectations and district-required look-fors. During the principal interview, a walkthrough schedule was presented for administrators, the academic instructional coach (AIC) and collaborative teachers serving as grade-level chairs; however, many stakeholders indicated inconsistency in the regularity of classroom visits. The principal indicated that when giving feedback, teachers received a copy of the completed eleot form or a note with 30-second feedback. Several stakeholders expressed a desire to receive high-quality feedback on instructional delivery and improving professional practices. The school would be well served to develop a single observation tool to capture students’ learning experiences and professional practices and to guide coaching and feedback sessions.

Stakeholder survey data revealed 74% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12).” Sixty-six percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).” These data highlight the need for coaching and feedback to deepen the level of rigor and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. According to the Impact survey administered in 2025-2026, when teachers were asked, “How knowledgeable are you regarding where to find resources for working with students who have unique learning needs?”, 26% selected “extremely knowledgeable” and “quite knowledgeable.” Further, when educators were asked, “Through working at your school, how many new teaching strategies have you learned?”, 19% selected “a great number of strategies” and 32% selected “many strategies.” These findings further indicate that the school would benefit from refinement of the current walkthrough, coaching and feedback system to routinely monitor classroom instruction and provide regular and timely feedback regarding observational data to improve individual teacher performance.

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

- Develop and communicate school-wide instructional non-negotiables (e.g., rigor aligned to KAS, use of evidence-based strategies, student engagement techniques, differentiation) to be implemented in every classroom.
- Develop an instrument to document teacher performance on the established non-negotiables and look-fors, provide timely and actionable feedback to teachers and calibrate observers to ensure reliability during walkthroughs.
- Develop and monitor a consistent and regular walkthrough schedule and hold each member of the observation team accountable for their responsibilities.
- Use observational data to guide coaching, feedback and professional learning sessions to meet the needs of each individual teacher’s professional practice to improve instructional delivery and increase student achievement.
- Monitor professional practices to determine the effectiveness of the professional learning, coaching and feedback that teachers receive.

## Improvement Priority 2

Revise, implement and monitor the MTSS and PLC systems to ensure instructional coherence and use of data-driven decision-making to ensure Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction enhances student academic outcomes.

**Standard 27:** Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.

### Findings:

In the 2024-2025 Two-Day Review, one improvement priority was identified: refining the school's PLC and MTSS systems to address instructional coherence, student learning experience and professional practice. As highlighted in Improvement Priority 1, the student performance data suggest a continuing need for these systems be established to develop a data-driven decision-making process that meets the needs of all students. The process can guide instruction and improve student outcomes.

Classroom observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Structured MTSS and PLC processes will help teachers design tiered instruction that meets the needs of all learners based on data. Instances of learners who "monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)" were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms. The revision and implementation of the PLC and MTSS processes will ensure progress monitoring by providing structured time for teachers to analyze data and adjust instruction and interventions in a timely manner.

Seventy-two percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Stakeholder survey data showed that 66% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)." Educator survey data also revealed that 77% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support learners need (10)." Documents and artifacts include PLC agendas that were developed by each grade level rather than having a streamlined, school-wide PLC process. Most stakeholder conversations revealed that PLC time is currently used for planning using the HQIRs, specifically EL for reading and IM for math. Educator conversations did not reference the use of data to identify which students should be placed in specific tiers. This was further confirmed by leadership interviews, which also did not mention the use of data to provide tiered support for students. District leadership interview data indicated the need for the school to provide professional learning in data literacy for all certified staff members, which can significantly support the PLC and MTSS process.

### Potential Leader Actions:

- Provide professional learning for all certified staff members in data literacy.
- Develop and deploy a data analysis protocol to guide all teachers in the collection, analysis and use of student performance data (e.g., MAP, ELC, formative and summative classroom data) to be used during the current PLC structure for decision making about Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction, including interventions.
- Establish and use clear entrance/exit criteria for Tier 2 and Tier 3.
- Develop a monitoring system to ensure a data-driven decision-making process is effectively implemented with fidelity by all certified staff members to guide the design and delivery of instruction.



## Your Next Steps

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

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

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



# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

- The team has chosen not to reflect on the principal's capacity to lead the school's turnaround efforts.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school and should be reassigned to a comparable position in the district.

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

The principal is in her third year leading Cochran Elementary. Since her arrival, enrollment has increased by more than 100 students, rising from 314 in 2023-2024 to 419 in the current school year, representing significant growth. The school proudly houses five self-contained classrooms: three deaf and hard of hearing instructional units and two classrooms serving students with moderate and severe disabilities. The principal's presentation highlighted several of these students, reflecting a strong commitment to inclusiveness and serving all learners.

In her first year, the principal focused on building trust, stabilizing the school and focusing on the HQIRs. During the second year, the school shifted its focus to climate, culture, strengthening behavior systems and improving small group instruction using the HQIRs. Currently, the school's three big rocks are quality staffing, a collective commitment to student growth, Tier 1 instruction and KAS alignment. Furthermore, the principal's presentation revealed the statement, "We are determined to #CTheSuccess on a daily basis as we endeavor to provide a caring, supportive and inclusive environment for all", and "We are focused on the four Cs: culture and climate, classroom, collaboration and community." The school has experienced some success from these efforts to improve climate and behavior, as the year-to-date data shows chronic absenteeism has declined by 17% and the number of office referrals has decreased by 61%.

Although the principal has clearly documented the roles and responsibilities for staff members and provides a quick links resource outlining key information, documents and processes, there is inconsistency in the planning and implementation of the strategies and activities aligned to the school's CSIP. While there are elements of the CSIP visible throughout the school, many lack oversight and a means to measure effectiveness. The team found



several systems (e.g., coaching and feedback, MTSS, PLCs) in various stages of implementation; however, most lack a process to monitor and evaluate effectiveness.

A review of artifacts revealed electronic data sheets used by some staff members to track student performance data; however, stakeholder interviews revealed that some staff members were unaware of this tool and its purpose. Stakeholder interviews also indicated inconsistency in the implementation of the walkthrough, coaching and feedback system designed to monitor the instructional practices within the school. Furthermore, the team found little evidence of a system to collect current and trend data about classroom instruction to guide the coaching and feedback process to improve professional practice.

Finally, the principal would be well served to seek support in developing and deploying methods for continuous improvement to achieve the school's mission and vision. Moreover, to move the school forward, the principal should seek guidance on developing a data-rich culture that supports the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of systems and provides feedback to its stakeholders.



# Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>David Copeland, Jr.</b>	David Copeland, Jr., has served for 18 years in the field of education. He began his career teaching 4th-grade math and science, during which he served as chair of the school improvement council and the faculty advisory committee. After teaching in the classroom, he became an assistant principal. David has received an endorsement for having completed the South Carolina Department of Education’s (SDE) Transformational Leadership Academy (SCTLA). He currently serves as a principal of an elementary school in South Carolina.
<b>Tim Huddleston</b>	Tim Huddleston is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), assisting targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools. Also, he supervises university students at the University of the Cumberlands. With 33 years in education across elementary to collegiate levels, Tim has held roles as a classroom teacher, assistant principal, principal, university supervisor and school improvement specialist. For the past decade, he has coached school improvement efforts at both the building and district levels, bringing extensive expertise in data analysis, curriculum, instruction, assessment and school turnaround systems.
<b>Christian Gibson</b>	Christian Gibson is an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS) for KDE. Christian is in his second year as an ERS and is currently supporting two CSI schools. With 10 years of experience in education, Christian has served as a high school science teacher, department chair, instructional coach and now an ERS. In his current role, he assists with data analysis, systems design and coaching of school leaders to help them meet their instructional improvement goals.
<b>Tonya Holt</b>	Tonya Holt is a retired educator who served students in rural, urban and suburban communities over the past 31 years. She began her educational journey in Massac County, Illinois as a special education teacher. In 1998, she transitioned to Kentucky, serving students in Christian, Bullitt and Jefferson counties and Paducah Independent. She has served as an instructional coach, assistant principal (elementary and middle), preschool associate principal and ERL with KDE, supporting CSI schools in Jefferson County, Kentucky. Tonya concluded her educational journey by serving students, staff and the community as the principal of Overdale Elementary School in Bullitt County Public Schools.

# Appendix

## Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

### Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

## Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

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

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

# Student Performance Data

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

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	33	46	17	47	16	47
4th-Grade Reading	25	48	28	50	20	50
5th-Grade Reading	38	48	*	46	31	50
3rd-Grade Math	39	43	12	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	15	42	28	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	9	41	13	41	22	43
4th-Grade Science	21	35	*	34	13	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	18	42	*	39	15	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	16	47	20	47	26	47
5th-Grade On-Demand Writing	20	39	9	39	13	38

### Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 28% during the 2023-2024 school year.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 41% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2024-2025.

## Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 33% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 35% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 38% in 2022-2023 to 31% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 39% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science decreased from 24% 2022-2023 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentages of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 3rd-, 4th- and 5th-grade reading were below the state average in 2024-2025.
- The percentages of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 5th-grade math, social studies, editing mechanics, and on-demand writing were below the state average in 2024-2025.
- The percentages of students in 3rd-grade reading, 4th-grade reading and science, 5th-grade reading, math, editing and mechanics and on-demand writing scoring Proficient/Distinguished were below the state average in 2024-2025.



### Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	35	26	43	29	61	30
Percent Score of 60-80	48	35	21	35	29	35
Percent Score of 100	9	24	26	23	5	22
Percent Score of 140	9	14	9	13	5	13

#### Plus

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

#### Delta

- The percentage of EL students who received 0 points for progress was above the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 on the ACCESS assessment. The percentage of EL students who received 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was below the state average in 2022-2023 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 140 points for progress was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 on the ACCESS assessment.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	33	17	16
Female	30	28	28
Male	37	7	7
White	50	*	*
African American	29	18	9
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	26	18	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 37% compared to 33% of all students in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 28% compared to 17% of all students in 2023-2024.

#### Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students in the groups of all students, female, male, African American and economically disadvantaged scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	39	12	*
Female	35	17	*
Male	43	*	*
White	50	*	*
African American	34	*	*
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 3rd-grade students in the all students and female groups scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	25	28	20
Female	38	21	24
Male	14	35	17
White	46	55	38
African American	*	19	6
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	19	23	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 38% compared to 25% of all students in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 24% compared to 20% of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 35% compared to 28% of all students in 2023-2024.

### Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading in the groups of all students, female and White declined from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	15	28	*
Female	21	24	*
Male	*	32	*
White	31	45	*
African American	*	19	*
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	*	24	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 45% in 2023-2024.

### Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade female and African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 24% and 19%, respectively, compared to 28% of all students in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	21	*	13
Female	21	*	12
Male	*	*	14
White	46	*	23
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

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

**Delta**

- The percentage of 4th-grade students in the groups of all students, female and White scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	38	*	31
Female	45	*	34
Male	30	*	28
White	43	*	61
African American	38	*	20
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	30	*	28
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 45% compared to 38% of all students in 2022-2023.

**Delta**

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the groups of all students, female, male, African American and economically disadvantaged scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	9	13	22
Female	*	26	*
Male	9	*	25
White	*	31	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	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the groups of all students and male scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 9% in 2022-2023.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	18	*	15
Female	27	*	*
Male	9	*	23
White	21	*	33
African American	20	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the groups of male and White scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

<b>Group</b>	<b>Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)</b>	<b>Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)</b>	<b>Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)</b>
All Students	16	20	26
Female	*	30	24
Male	17	13	28
White	21	46	44
African American	*	6	20
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	16	22
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the groups of all students, male and White scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 6% in 2023-2024, compared to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 16% in 2023-2024, compared to 22% in 2024-2025.

**Delta**

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 30% in 2023-2024, compared to 24% in 2024-2025.

## 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	20	9	13
Female	*	*	21
Male	26	*	*
White	*	23	*
African American	*	*	7
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	14	6	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 21% compared to 13% of all students in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 20% in 2022-2023, compared to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 14% in 2022-2023, compared to 12% in 2024-2025.

# Schedule

## Tuesday, Feb. 17, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3:45 p.m.	Team arrives at institution	School	
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:15 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, Feb. 18, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:30 a.m.– 5:45 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6:15 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, Feb. 19, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:30 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:15 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #4	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Friday, Feb. 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

