



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:**  
**Conway Middle**

Jan. 12-15, 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>6</b>
eleot Narrative .....	9
<b>Improvement Priorities .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	13
Improvement Priority 2 .....	15
Potential Leader Actions:.....	16
Your Next Steps .....	17
<b>Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention Schools .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Team Roster .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....	23
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	23
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....	25
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning .....	27
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....	29
Student Performance Data.....	33
Schedule .....	45

# Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	9
Certified Staff	28
Noncertified Staff	2
Students	20
Parents	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>

## 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:**

Conway Middle School was designated as a comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) school during the 2018-2019 school year and has remained a CSI school since that time. The school underwent a previous Diagnostic Review on Jan. 16-19, 2024. Also, the school is identified for more rigorous intervention (MRI). These contextualize both the urgency and complexity of the school's improvement work and underscore the importance of disciplined and consistent systems execution and progress monitoring.

During their time onsite, the Diagnostic Review Team found that the school possessed several foundational strengths that, if strategically leveraged, can serve as critical levers for school transformation. A review of documents and interviews, classroom observations and surveys indicates that the school community is deeply committed to student well-being and rebuilding coherence following years of disruption associated with staff turnover, CSI and MRI designations and the COVID-19 pandemic. The team also found that attendance has improved earlier this year than in prior years, and systems are in place to identify students who require additional academic or behavioral support, suggesting movement toward a more responsive, data-informed culture.

The current principal has served since 2022, resulting in leadership stability that has emerged as a modest but meaningful strength. This continuity has provided a degree of stability in the principalship; however, the school has experienced consistent turnover in the assistant principalship and teaching staff. The consistent turnover complicated implementation fidelity and slowed the institutionalization of critical systems. Despite these challenges, stakeholder interviews reflected confidence in the staff's commitment to improvement and turnover has leveled off this academic year, with a staff retention rate of 79.1%.

One of the most noticeable areas of progress since the 2024 Diagnostic Review was the intentional focus on improving school climate and behavioral systems. The school leadership has prioritized creating a positive, open, safe, engaging and welcoming environment by implementing the positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) program and the Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation, Success (CHAMPS) framework. The Diagnostic Review Team also examined PBIS and CHAMPS protocols, including the establishment of an articulated "CHAMPS-aligned Behavioral Framework." Artifacts, such as the "Conway Behavior Flowchart - Jeannie Lett", "Conway Progressive Discipline Plan 2025-26 updated 6-10-25" and "PBIS Expectations" illustrate a deliberate effort to define consistent expectations across classrooms and school settings. A review of artifacts, along with interview and observational data, indicated emerging positive change in behavior management, including a reduction in inappropriate student behaviors compared to the 2024 Diagnostic Review Report. It was evident/very evident in 45% of classrooms that learners both "speak and interact respectfully with teachers and each other (F1)" and "demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)." These observation findings indicate progress compared to conditions described in the 2024 Diagnostic Review Report and suggest that the school has begun addressing one of the foundational prerequisites for an improved instructional environment.

The 2024 Diagnostic Review Report identified two improvement priorities. Improvement Priority 1 called for the school to "[e]mploy learner performance data to design, implement and monitor systems that ensure curriculum and instructional practices are aligned, relevant, rigorous, inclusive and effective for all learners." Improvement

Priority 2 emphasized the need to “[d]esign, implement and document formal processes to continuously evaluate academic and organizational programs and services using student performance data and research-based criteria.” These improvement priorities aligned closely with those identified in the 2019 Diagnostic Review Report, which also emphasized instructional rigor, curriculum fidelity and the formalization of professional learning community (PLC) meetings.

The school has made some progress toward addressing Improvement Priority 1 from 2024, particularly in establishing and regularly scheduling PLCs and adopting high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. The Diagnostic Review Team noted evidence that PLCs now meet weekly, that common assessments are administered and teachers have access to data analysis tools. Additionally, the school has invested in instructional coaching positions and support structures intended to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. However, evidence from classroom observations, interviews and artifact reviews indicate that PLCs remain in the early stages of implementation and lack the necessary structure to be fully operationalized. While data are collected, the team found limited evidence that data are systematically analyzed, translated into instructional adjustments or monitored for impact. As a result, curriculum and instructional practices remain inconsistently aligned while differentiation and rigor continue to require significant growth.

Moreover, evidence collected and reviewed by the Diagnostic Review Team suggests that while additional efforts (i.e., “Unit Internalization focus,” “Tight and Loose Expectations”) have been initiated to address the 2024 improvement priorities, these efforts have not been implemented with sufficient fidelity or consistency to produce sustained academic gains. Classroom observational data reinforced this conclusion. The Diagnostic Review Team observed persistent challenges related to instructional quality and consistency. Classroom observations also revealed that while HQIRs were present and generally used, instructional practices vary considerably across classrooms. In many observed lessons, cognitive demand was low, student engagement was limited and instruction was predominantly teacher centered. Formative assessment practices were infrequently observed, and opportunities for productive struggle, academic student discourse and higher-order thinking were also inconsistent. These patterns indicate that while instructional systems are articulated, they have not consistently produced rigorous learning experiences for all students.

The school has demonstrated initial steps toward evaluating the effectiveness of instructional programs and school-wide initiatives, particularly in behavior and staffing. The Diagnostic Review Team observed emerging strengths in the school’s use of data to inform decision-making. Evidence included the use of a centralized data wall, attendance analyses and Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) growth data review protocols. These tools indicate that multiple sources of information are being examined to understand student performance, engagement and behavior. However, the team found little documented evidence of a formal, systematic cycle for evaluating academic programs, instructional strategies or organizational initiatives. In addition, interviews across stakeholder roles revealed a shared perception that initiatives are frequently introduced but not consistently monitored, sustained or evaluated for impact. As a result, programs, such as PLCs, curriculum implementation, PBIS, CHAMPS and instructional coaching are inconsistently monitored for fidelity or effectiveness, limiting their impact.

Parents were not interviewed as part of the Diagnostic Review because the school was unable to convene a parent group and arrival and dismissal procedures did not allow for meaningful discussions with families. In addition, family survey participation was limited, with only 26 families (out of 652 students) responding. Forty-six percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make us feel welcomed (1)” and “treat us with respect (2).” Conversely, 54% of families chose the word “agitating” when asked, “Which four words best describe, in general, the interactions you have with the adults in your child’s school (24)?” The limited participation in interviews and surveys, combined with the perceptions reported by participating families, suggests that family engagement is an area of growth. These findings indicate a need to strengthen structures and practices that promote a consistent, welcoming and affirming environment and encourage meaningful partnerships with families.

The school has made discernible progress in stabilizing leadership, strengthening behavioral systems and establishing foundational structures for collaboration and data use. At the same time, the persistence of the same improvement trends across multiple review cycles indicates that the school remains at a critical inflection point. To

move beyond compliance and toward sustained improvement, the next phase of work must focus on deepening instructional rigor and effectiveness, clarifying and enforcing expectations and institutionalizing continuous improvement cycles with clear monitoring, feedback and adjustment mechanisms. The Diagnostic Review Team suggests the school proceeds with greater coherence, disciplined follow-through, consistent implementation and robust accountability structures to best position itself to build on its foundation and make measurable progress toward exiting CSI and MRI status.

# 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 on 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 29 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

<b>A. Equitable Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
A1	1.1	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	90%	7%	3%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	3%	41%	34%	21%
A3	2.8	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	3%	28%	52%	17%
A4	1.2	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.	86%	7%	7%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b> <b>2.0</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.	45%	45%	7%	3%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	31%	41%	24%	3%
B3	1.6	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	55%	28%	17%	0%
B4	1.9	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	38%	41%	17%	3%
B5	1.9	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	31%	52%	17%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>1.8</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	1.9	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	31%	48%	21%	0%
C2	1.8	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	45%	38%	14%	3%
C3	2.1	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	21%	48%	28%	3%
C4	2.3	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	14%	45%	38%	3%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.0</b>				

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.8	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	41%	45%	10%	3%
D2	1.8	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	55%	21%	17%	7%
D3	2.0	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	21%	55%	24%	0%
D4	1.6	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	59%	31%	7%	3%
<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.	69%	28%	0%	3%
E2	1.7	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	41%	48%	10%	0%
E3	1.9	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	28%	62%	10%	0%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	72%	17%	7%	3%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>1.6</b>				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.4	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	10%	45%	38%	7%
F2	2.4	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	10%	45%	38%	7%
F3	1.9	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	38%	41%	17%	3%
F4	2.1	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	24%	48%	24%	3%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.2</b>				

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.7	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	59%	24%	7%	10%
G2	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	86%	7%	3%	3%
G3	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	86%	7%	3%	3%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>1.4</b>				

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 29 classroom observations in core content classes using the eleot. The team also conducted informal observations in non-core content classrooms and common areas. Collectively, these data provided insight into the school's learning environment.

The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an overall average rating of 2.2 on a 4-point scale, suggesting that promising practices exist in some classrooms, which could be leveraged across all classrooms. For instance, respectful interactions were noted in some classrooms, as learners who "speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)" were evident/very evident in 45% of classrooms. Additionally, in 45% of

classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” While the Diagnostic Review Team observed structured management practices in some classrooms, other classrooms struggled to maintain consistent routines and instructional momentum. The team also observed lost instructional time due to limited classroom procedures and minimal learner engagement. For example, it was evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms that “learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)” and evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).”

The Well-Managed Learning Environment earned the highest rating of the seven. Staff who have been at the school for five or more years reported that behavior has improved over the past several years, while newer staff expressed concerns about student behavior and variations in how discipline referrals are handled. Observations confirmed that, in most classrooms, student behavior and disruptions, along with the school-wide behavioral management protocol for escorting students to and from the restroom, consumed a substantial amount of instructional time. The team also found evidence that a behavioral management system has been developed; however, the observational, perception and interview data suggest that the system is not being implemented with fidelity or meeting the school's current needs. Thus, the team found that this domain could be improved with focused, consistent effort across all stakeholder groups.

The Equitable and Supportive Learning Environments each received an average rating of 2.0. It was evident/very evident in 3% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 31% of classrooms that “learners were supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3).” Similarly, the student survey data revealed that 46% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past thirty days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13),” while 35% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that in the past 30 days, “my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)” and “my child engaged in lessons that improved their desire to learn new things (14).”

The use of digital tools “to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)” was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms. Learners who use digital tools/technology “to conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)” and “to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)” were evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms. Additionally, learners who “collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)” were evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms. These observational data demonstrate the need for the school to foster collaboration, both with and without technology. It was also evident/very evident in 3% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” The team encourages the school to leverage digital tools to help students monitor their own progress and advance their learning.

The Diagnostic Review Team identified a need for increased academic rigor, relevance and learner engagement across classrooms, as instructional practices were not consistently designed to promote deep learning or connect content to students' lived experiences. It was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that learners both “make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)” and “are actively engaged in learning activities (D3)”, indicating that many students were passive participants in instruction. Opportunities for cognitively demanding work were also limited, as it was evident/very evident 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)” in 20% of classrooms and “learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback) (C2)” in 17% of classrooms. Although learners engaged “in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” were evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms, observations and interview data suggest that these tasks were often teacher-directed and inconsistently supported by structures that promote collaboration, inquiry or productive struggle. Student interview data further revealed a desire for more hands-on learning, peer collaboration and experiential activities that would increase engagement and challenge. These instructional patterns are reinforced by student, family and educator survey data, which reflected relatively low levels of agreement on items related to instructional rigor, clarity of expectations and responsiveness to feedback. For example, when students were

asked “Which four phrases best describe what adults in your school consider to be the most important for students (23)?”, the highest response was “do what you are told” with 66% of students choosing that statement, which was followed by “finish your work on time” with 56% of students selecting it. Forty-six percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “At my school, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).” Collectively, these findings mirror concerns raised in the 2024 Diagnostic Review and indicate that instructional practices have not shifted at the depth or scale necessary to sustain improvements in student achievement.

The team noted concerns about teachers' expectations for student achievement. It was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)” and in 10% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2).” This correlation indicates that without consistent feedback, students' ability to demonstrate or describe high-quality work is limited.

In summary, the Diagnostic Review Team encourages the school to closely examine classroom observational data and identify immediate priorities for growth while building upon existing strengths. School leaders are advised to increase the frequency of classroom walkthroughs, identify pockets of effective teaching and use those examples to model expected instructional practices. Providing timely and meaningful coaching and feedback to educators, identifying schoolwide instructional non-negotiables and consistently and faithfully implementing them will also help build a stronger learning environment that supports student success.

# Improvement Priorities

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

## Improvement Priority 1

Establish a clear vision for high-quality and engaging instruction using the “Tight & Loose Expectations” as the foundation and develop and implement a coherent, schoolwide system of instructional expectations that ensures all students experience rigorous, standards-aligned, differentiated and learner-centered instruction in every classroom. Regularly revisit and internalize both the vision and the system, ensuring they include aligned collateral (e.g., observation forms, student-work protocols), clearly defined instructional look-fors, non-negotiables and student engagement expectations.

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

### Findings:

Classroom observations, interviews and a review of the “Tight & Loose Expectations” artifact provided by the school indicated the school has articulated instructional expectations intended to promote rigorous, standards-aligned instruction; however, the team found that these expectations were inconsistently reflected in learner-centered classroom practices. Instruction across classrooms varies widely in rigor, cognitive demand and student engagement, limiting access to high-quality learning experiences.

The absence of clearly defined and internalized instructional “look-fors,” engagement expectations and non-negotiables has contributed to instructional inconsistency. Without a coherent system to monitor implementation and provide actionable feedback, instructional practices remain teacher-dependent rather than system-driven. This variability further undermines the school’s ability to ensure that all students experience high expectations and learner-centered instruction.

During the team’s observations, it was evident across multiple classrooms that instruction was predominantly teacher-centered, with limited opportunities for student discourse, inquiry or collaboration. Students were frequently engaged in low-level tasks such as copying information, completing worksheets or responding to recall-based questions. Opportunities for productive struggle, application of learning and higher-order thinking were inconsistently observed. Classroom observational data supported this, as it was evident/very evident in 20% 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).” Learning targets were posted in several classrooms, though they were rarely referenced during instruction or used to guide student self-monitoring or reflection. Teachers often provided answers when students struggled rather than adjusting instruction or facilitating reteaching, and it was evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” As a result, instruction was not consistently responsive to student understanding, limiting opportunities for learner-centered decision-making. These patterns indicate that instructional practices inconsistently reflect high expectations for student thinking and engagement and seldom embed HQIRs with fidelity.

Observational data further indicated variability in student engagement expectations. Although CHAMPS expectations were visible in many classrooms, they were not consistently used to support active participation, collaboration or accountability for learning. Group work, when present, often lacked clear structure or roles, leading to off-task behavior or uneven participation. It was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” These findings suggest that staff lack full

understanding of engagement expectations and how these expectations can serve as instructional non-negotiables across classrooms.

Student performance data indicate persistently low proficiency levels across content areas, reinforcing concerns about instructional rigor and coherence. The Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) results show that in 2024-2025, the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was below the state average across all tested grades and subjects, including reading, math, science, social studies and writing. Although the percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025, performance in math declined in multiple grade levels. These outcomes align with observed instructional variability and limited cognitive demand across classrooms.

Interview data also reinforced these findings, with educators describing uncertainty about what constitutes effective HQIR training, which had been introduced but inconsistently monitored or sustained. Several staff members expressed that expectations related to rigor, differentiation and student engagement are inconsistently reinforced through feedback or coaching, contributing to instructional inconsistencies across classrooms. While PLCs meet regularly to review data, the team found limited evidence of instructional adjustments that elevate rigor, promote differentiation or increase learner-centered practices. Professional learning and coaching systems have also been established but are insufficiently aligned and lack implementation fidelity. Without clear instructional “look-fors” and feedback loops tied to learner-centered practices, professional learning has not consistently improved classroom instruction.

Student and family perception data further indicate that instructional practices lack high expectations for student learning. Students frequently described learning experiences focused on listening, completing assigned tasks and preparing for assessments, with limited opportunities for choice, voice or application of learning. Similarly, student survey data revealed that 46% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” Comparably, 35% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)” and “engaged in lessons that improved their desire to learn new things (14).” These perceptions align with observational findings and suggest that high-quality, learner-centered practices are not embedded across the school.

Collectively, the evidence indicates that Conway Middle has yet to implement consistent high-expectations and learner-centered instruction. Instructional expectations are articulated but not internalized or implemented with fidelity across classrooms, resulting in variable learning experiences for students, inconsistent rigor and limited student engagement. Addressing these gaps requires a coherent, schoolwide system of instructional expectations anchored in clearly defined “look-fors,” engagement norms, data-use protocols and feedback cycles to ensure that all students experience rigorous, standards-aligned and learner-centered instruction in every classroom.

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

- Develop a robust implementation and monitoring plan that includes aligned professional learning objectives and a timeline for teachers and administration, a differentiated teacher support plan, protocols for PLCs and embedded professional development (EPDs), a timeline for milestone checks, protocols for real-time adjustments and systems of accountability at all levels.
- Refine the principal and assistant principal roles and responsibilities to include collective commitments and non-negotiables around effective teaching and learning. This includes developing a comprehensive plan for consistent principal and assistant principal visibility through informal observations focused on high-quality instruction, resulting in timely, meaningful and actionable feedback on instructional expectations and processes. Provide follow-up support for teachers and coaches.
- Analyze data trends to identify professional learning opportunities for instructional staff that focus on intentional lesson design, high-yield and learner-centered strategies, effective higher-order questioning techniques and robust checks for understanding, while simultaneously guiding teachers through a

process of unpacking the standards to determine the most suitable high-yield instructional strategies within the curricula for each lesson.

- Complement the support from the Educational Recovery (ER) staff by engaging in professional learning with the school leadership team, specifically on best practices in school turnaround.

## Improvement Priority 2

Clarify the current coaching system, implement a consistent coaching plan that provides organized, actionable feedback to guide teachers for improving student-centered instruction and monitor the effectiveness through regular learning walks.

**Standard 6:** Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.

### Findings:

The evidence reviewed indicates that the school has established multiple structures intended to support professional practices; however, these structures do not function as a coherent, consistently implemented coaching system aligned with improving student-centered instruction. While PLCs, walkthroughs and professional development opportunities are present, the absence of a clearly articulated coaching framework, with consistent feedback and monitoring opportunities, limits the collective impact on instructional quality and student outcomes. This misalignment substantiates the need for Improvement Priority 2, which focuses on developing a structured coaching process.

Student performance data also demonstrate persistent instructional challenges that require targeted support for teachers. KSA results show that the school performed below the state average across all grades and content areas over the past three school years, and several content areas showed inconsistent year-to-year trends. These data suggest that isolated gains are not supported by systematic instructional improvement, reinforcing the need for sustained coaching to strengthen instructional practices across classrooms.

Additional student performance evidence highlights the need for instructional differentiation and targeted instructional support. The Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) data indicates that while the percentage of English learner (EL) students receiving zero points for progress decreased from 74% in 2022-2023 to 63% in 2023-2024, progress plateaued in 2024-2025. This stagnation suggests that instructional strategies are inconsistently adjusted to meet diverse learner needs, underscoring the importance of coaching teachers to analyze data, adjust instruction and monitor the effectiveness of their practices over time.

Stakeholder perception data further indicate uneven professional support. Educator survey results show that 75% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22).” However, student survey results revealed that 65% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults know and do their work well (9)” and 57% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults try new things to improve the school (6).” These perceptions suggest that professional learning may be inconsistently translating into observable instructional improvements for students, pointing to a need for coaching that emphasizes application and follow-up rather than participation alone.

Stakeholder interview data also reinforced the need for greater coherence and consistency in professional support. Teachers and administrators described coaching and feedback as unevenly distributed, and teachers expressed a desire for more actionable feedback. Teachers consistently mentioned in interviews that feedback is often delivered informally or secondhand, limiting its usefulness for improving practice. Others noted that feedback does not consistently include clear next steps or opportunities for reflection and refinement. These perceptions indicate that the current system lacks the clarity and stability needed to sustain instructional improvement, and a structured coaching plan emphasizing timely, specific and actionable guidance is required.

The review also identified gaps in professional learning and coaching systems. While professional learning and walkthroughs were occurring, evidence of a structured, differentiated coaching model was limited. Educators also described feedback as inconsistent and often informal, with little connection to clearly defined instructional expectations or follow-up support. Without a coherent coaching cycle aligned to instructional “look-fors” and student outcomes, professional learning investments are less likely to translate into improved classroom practices

at scale. Strengthening these feedback mechanisms represents an opportunity to align stated values with lived experiences and deepen trust and shared accountability.

Classroom observational data corroborate these perceptions, indicating that student-centered instructional practices were inconsistently implemented across classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 31% of classrooms that "learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)", while it was evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)." These data also suggest that teachers would benefit from structured coaching focused on implementing collaborative learning strategies, scaffolding support and engaging students more actively in the learning process.

A review of documents and artifacts further supports this conclusion. While the "Conway Middle School 2025-26 Professional Development Plan" outlines planned learning aligned to instructional priorities and behavioral supports, the team found little evidence of individualized coaching cycles, structured feedback loops or monitoring tools that track changes in instructional practice over time. Similarly, walkthrough forms and lesson plan links referenced in organizational documents were either unavailable or inaccessible, limiting evidence of how observational data are used to inform coaching and professional learning adjustments.

The absence of documented coaching cycles is particularly notable given the presence of other foundational systems. Artifacts such as "PLC agendas", "data analysis protocols" and the "data wall" demonstrate that the school collects and reviews multiple data sources, including assessment, attendance and behavioral data. However, without a structured process to connect this data to individualized feedback and follow-up coaching, teachers may struggle to consistently translate insights into improved instructional practices across classrooms.

The Diagnostic Review Team also heard concerns around the instructional leadership capacity within the school leadership team, and interview data suggest that district-level training and supports for school leadership related to effective coaching and school turnaround have been limited. Although the principal has received targeted and intensive support from the assigned ER staff, interview data and a review of documents indicated that the administration has not received direct supervisory training in these areas for the past two years. While training is planned for this year, the team recommends that support be intensively sustained and expanded to include the entire school leadership team (i.e., principal, assistant principal). Further, the district should consider partnering with external agencies with demonstrated expertise in school turnaround to provide intensive and ongoing leadership development, coaching and mentorship to school leadership.

Collectively, the evidence demonstrates that the school has invested in professional learning structures but lacks a cohesive coaching system that ensures all professional staff receive consistent, targeted support. Student performance trends, stakeholder perceptions, classroom observations, document reviews and stakeholder conversations all point to the same conclusion: strengthening instructional practices will require clarifying the current coaching system, implementing a consistent coaching plan with organized feedback and monitoring effectiveness through regular learning walks. Addressing these needs is a critical lever for improving both professional practice and student outcomes.

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

- Collaboratively (e.g., school leadership, district, ER and instructional staff) and formally select, adopt and operationalize a research-based coaching framework by establishing a consistent coaching cycle that includes monitoring and accountability structures with learning walks; focused observations; timely, written and verbal feedback; opportunities for practice and reflection and follow-up observations to monitor impact.
- Build administrative and instructional leaders' capacity to deliver effective coaching by providing targeted training and ongoing mentorship and coaching for administrators, instructional coaches and department leaders on effective coaching practices, including observation techniques, actionable feedback, goal setting and progress monitoring.

- Use the adopted coaching framework to establish differentiated coaching pathways for novice, developing and advanced teachers aligned with the current (or a newly created) vision. 2.

## 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.

# Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention Schools

703 KAR 5:280(9) requires that Diagnostic Reviews for MRI-designated schools will include “Other information deemed necessary by the commissioner, or his designee, to assess the functionality of the district to support school improvement”. Teams reviewing MRI-designated schools must consider the following additional elements:

- A review of how the school and district have managed and expended the relevant school improvement funds previously awarded with a specific focus on the impact of the funding decisions;
- A review of the progress made towards accomplishing any improvement priorities recommended by prior Diagnostic Review reports and/or Two-Day Reviews;
- A review of prior year turnaround plans and related documentation;
- A review of existing improvement efforts and initiatives and data documenting the results of the initiative;
- A comprehensive resource allocation review;
- A review of stakeholder involvement in the improvement process; and
- A review of district support on the implementation of the school’s turnaround plan.

Conway Middle underwent a Diagnostic Review in 2024. This review considered the specific actions and steps taken by the school since its prior review. Since that time the school has retained the same leadership and continued to stay in MRI status. The teacher retention rate remained relatively high at 79.1%. The school’s prior Diagnostic Review yielded two improvement priorities.

Improvement Priority 1 instructed the school to employ learner performance data to design, implement and monitor systems that include PLC meetings and ensure curriculum and instructional practices are aligned, relevant, rigorous, inclusive and effective for all learners. After a review of evidence, interviews and observations by the Diagnostic Review Team, there is evidence to suggest that the school has minimally addressed the specified compliance criteria for Improvement Priority 1 by providing structures that allow time for collaborative team meetings for the purpose of improving instructional practices for learners. Evidence demonstrates the need for more consistent and clear expectations and monitoring of this system. Stakeholder interviews revealed little evidence of Improvement Priority 1 being implemented with fidelity.

The school has continued to involve stakeholders in decisions that affect them in their daily routines and job responsibilities. Through evidence review and stakeholder interviews, there is an indication that the principal continues to involve school staff in decision-making and is open to suggestions and advice from others involved. One example of this is the principal’s ability to secure personnel to provide core content teachers with two planning periods each day to implement grade-level PLCs. These PLC meetings focus on unit/lesson internalization and benchmark data analysis to provide literacy intervention for students as well as EPDs on Wednesdays during one planning period to support teacher development which occurs at the school on a regular basis. Classroom observations and interviews provided limited evidence of these PLCs having a significant impact on classroom instruction.

Improvement Priority 2 directed the school to design, implement and document formal processes to continuously evaluate all academic and organizational programs and services using student performance data and research-based criteria to generate evidence, apply obtained evidence to ensure programs and services are implemented effectively and with fidelity (e.g., PLC, PBIS, Illustrative Math, EL) and formally document and communicate evaluation results to make data-based decisions (e.g., adjust, add or eliminate programs, practices, initiatives). The team’s review of evidence and stakeholder interviews yielded little evidence of implementation of this priority.

While the previous review mentioned a significant emphasis on implementing PBIS and CHAMPS to assist teachers and staff with a whole school behavior intervention plan, and a decline in behavior incidents, this team's review of evidence, interviews and observations has shown an increase in behavior incidents and limited enforcement and use of the behavior plan in classrooms.

The school received \$186,115 of school improvement funds (SIF) in the school year 2021-2022 as part of SIF Cohort 3, and in the 2022-2023 school year the school received \$151,513 as part of SIF Cohort 4. The school did not spend a combined amount of \$31,566.65 from SIF Cohort 3 and 4. Funds were spent on programs and personnel to help the teachers deliver quality instruction to the students as well as other training focused on behavior and school improvement. The school also received school improvement funds for the 2023-2024 school year as part of SIF Cohort 5 in the amount of \$256,464. The remaining balance for the SIF Cohort 5 funds is \$93,566.17. The school continues to spend the funding on programs and professional learning to help enhance instruction in the classroom as well as PLC implementation. The funds spent up to this point, according to the evidence from interviews and artifact reviews, show these initiatives have had minimal impact on the school for sustainable improvement, especially those funds supporting behavior initiatives. Additionally, the part-time math coach funded with SIF Cohort 5 money has been cut for the 2025-2026 school year per district directives due to a lack of sustainability of that position; however, the academic instructional coach has remained in place.

The school has had limited support from the district for the principal's turnaround leadership development; however, evidence suggests that addressing school needs is often a team effort involving both the school and district resources. While the district is supportive of helping the school, there were indications that some procedures and processes should be streamlined to quickly provide assistance on an as needed basis and in a timely manner. The school's resource allocation self-study showed that the leadership team has been thoughtful in how they have allocated staff within the building. The team's findings indicate that the school has utilized its improvement funds in alignment with the awarded guidelines.

# 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 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 at Conway Middle exhibits a disconnect from the reality of instructional practices and systemic challenges currently facing the school. While the school possesses a formal mission statement, the principal has not translated it into a functional vision for continuous improvement. There is a lack of clarity regarding the school's direction, and daily operations are disconnected from long-term goals, leaving staff confused about their priorities. The principal does not clearly communicate how specific improvement efforts contribute to the school's success; therefore, initiatives lack the necessary buy-in to be effective. This disconnect makes it impossible to build a unified culture where every stakeholder understands the improvement efforts of the school and works toward the same high standards.

To achieve excellence, the principal must lead a continuous improvement process by building sustainable school systems. This includes providing teachers with targeted instructional coaching and establishing a culture of mutual accountability, where all stakeholders are held to high standards for student success. The principal must move away from a passive leadership style to one of active leadership. The current lack of urgency with continuous improvement efforts, clarity in following the mission and consistency in using data prevents the school from making measurable progress. Without the consistent use of clearly designed cyclical systems to manage and analyze data for school improvement, the principal cannot accurately monitor progress or provide necessary feedback to move the school toward excellence.

To ensure improved school performance, the principal requires a mentor or executive coach with a proven record in school turnaround. This support should focus on proactive planning, moving away from reactive crisis management toward a 30-60-90 day leadership plan, as well as training on how to conduct difficult conversations and hold staff accountable to high instructional standards and practices.

While a PBIS system was developed with the guidance of ER staff assigned to the school, a significant gap remains between written policy and classroom execution due to the lack of ownership and follow-through from the principal and administrative team. To boost student achievement, leadership must take ownership and prioritize the rigorous implementation and monitoring of the behavior system. Providing targeted mentorship and professional development from the district or an outside organization with oversight from the district, will be essential to operationalizing strategic plans developed by the school leadership. By ensuring consistent application and staff accountability, the school can minimize instructional disruptions and foster deeper student engagement.

Furthermore, the principal requires intensive support in cultivating a highly visible and reflective instructional leadership presence. To strengthen instructional leadership, the principal must increase her and the administrative team's presence in classrooms. While teachers currently utilize dual planning periods for focused PLCs on unit/lesson internalization and some data analysis, the principal's active participation in these sessions has been minimal; however, her participation is crucial for school improvement. This shift will allow the principal to move beyond data oversight to provide direct, actionable feedback and coaching that ensures HQIRs are implemented effectively and student outcomes-both academic and behavioral-are monitored for effectiveness.

# 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>Tauheedah Baker-Jones</b>	Tauheedah Baker-Jones is a systems leader with over 20 years of experience. She began her career as a teacher in Los Angeles and later served in New Jersey as a teacher, principal and district superintendent. Tauheedah has also served as an adjunct professor at Harvard University Graduate School of Education, teaching instruction, systems thinking and strategic leadership courses. As a senior fellow at the Georgia Governor's Office of Student Achievement, she supported the design of a statewide leadership development program for turnaround principals. She also served as the chief equity officer for Atlanta Public Schools. Currently, she is an adjunct professor in the Education Leadership Department at Kennesaw State University. She also serves as the Southeast Regional Director for the National Center on Education and the Economy.
<b>Felicia Bond</b>	Felicia Bond has over 30 years of experience in education, including 13 years with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL), supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching high school math for over 20 years and serving as district curriculum specialist and building assessment coordinator. She is a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) and for Jim Shipley & Associates in School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence and Classroom Continuous Improvement. Felicia has presented at state and national conferences on successful continuous improvement practices in schools.
<b>Denise Strange</b>	Denise Strange currently serves as an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS) in the Office of Continuous Improvement with KDE. Prior to her most recent role as ERS, Denise served as an elementary teacher, reading interventionist and a district math instructional coach. She has served in the education profession for 29 years.
<b>Carrie Wade</b>	Carrie Wade has extensive expertise in curriculum implementation, school-wide assessment coordination and data-driven instructional practices. She has led school-wide continuous improvement efforts, including the adoption of and the development of data-driven decision-making to enhance student outcomes. A published author on educational leadership and action research, she is also an active member of the Kentucky Association for School Administrators (KASA) and the Kentucky Women in Educational Leadership (KWEL). Carrie is currently serving as a school-based curriculum and instructional coach for Fayette County 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.	
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: <b>Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.</b>	Level 2: <b>Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.</b>	Level 3: <b>Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.</b>	Level 4: <b>Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.</b>	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	1
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	2



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

## 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.	2
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	1

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	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	1

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

# Student Performance Data

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

## 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)
6th-Grade Reading	17	48	12	49	21	52
7th-Grade Reading	15	45	18	47	15	48
8th-Grade Reading	14	44	17	41	15	42
6th-Grade Math	10	38	*	42	8	41
7th-Grade Math	12	37	15	39	15	43
8th-Grade Math	*	36	9	37	*	40
7th-Grade Science	*	23	*	22	4	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	8	35	13	35	11	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	14	49	22	47	14	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	45	*	49	*	49

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished for the reading portion of the KSA increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- For all available data, the school performed below the state average in all grades and content areas on the KSA in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

## Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	74	68	63	66	63	60
Percent Score of 60-80	21	24	20	23	25	26
Percent Score of 100	4	7	14	8	9	10
Percent Score of 140	1	2	3	3	3	3

Plus

- The percentage of students receiving zero points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment decreased from 74% in 2022-2023 to 63% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 1% in 2022-2023 to 3% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of students receiving zero points for progress on the ACCESS assessment stayed the same in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 at 63%.
- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment stayed the same in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 at 3%.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	17	12	21
Female	21	14	27
Male	14	10	16
White	21	23	32
African American	14	*	14
Hispanic or Latino	30	*	16
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	17	12	19
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade female, male, White, and economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was stagnant from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	10	*	8
Female	9	*	7
Male	11	*	8
White	*	*	11
African American	5	*	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	10	*	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math increased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of all subgroups in 6th grade, except for African American students, scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	15	18	15
Female	21	18	15
Male	9	19	15
White	16	23	29
African American	10	12	7
Hispanic or Latino	*	25	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	17	5	*
English Learners plus Monitored	17	17	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	17	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished increased on the KSA in reading in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of 7th grade students in the all students, female, male, African American and economically disadvantaged subgroups scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading decreased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	12	15	15
Female	13	12	*
Male	11	17	19
White	*	20	24
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	25	10
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	4
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	5
Economically Disadvantaged	*	13	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math increased in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math decreased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	4
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	5	6
White	*	*	10
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	8	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	4	4
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in science increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	14	17	15
Female	16	22	16
Male	13	12	14
White	23	21	23
African American	*	9	10
Hispanic or Latino	14	18	15
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	4
Economically Disadvantaged	14	15	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade male, White and African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students in the all students, female, Hispanic or Latino and economically disadvantaged subgroups scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading decreased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	9	*
Female	*	10	*
Male	9	9	13
White	8	9	*
African American	*	8	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	15
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	9	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	6	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade male and economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

### Delta

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

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	8	13	11
Female	8	13	10
Male	9	12	12
White	9	*	14
African American	5	8	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	18	12
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	9	12	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students, female, male, African American and economically disadvantaged subgroups scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in social studies increased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students, female, Hispanic or Latino and economically disadvantaged subgroups scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in social studies decreased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	14	22	14
Female	16	27	20
Male	13	*	10
White	18	32	23
African American	*	*	10
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	15
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	16	33	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	11	20	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students, female, White, two or more races and economically disadvantaged subgroups scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in editing and mechanics increased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students, female, White and economically disadvantaged subgroups scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in editing and mechanics decreased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	*
Female	*	15	17
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	9
Hispanic or Latino	*	18	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	11	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in on-demand writing increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

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

# Schedule

## Monday, January 12, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3:30 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School Library	Diagnostic Review Team
5:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

## Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team
7:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

## Wednesday, January 14, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team
7:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

## Thursday, January 15, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m. – 9 a.m.	Interviews	Virtual	Diagnostic Review Team
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team
9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Final Team Work Session #3	School	Diagnostic Review Team

