Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

cognia™

Table of Contents

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	2
Building-Level Administrators	4
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	7
Certified Staff	18
Noncertified Staff	10
Students	43
Parents	11
Total	95

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:

Documents, artifacts, interviews and survey data revealed strengths in the school's culture and climate, as evidenced by consistent, positive perceptions across student, family and educator stakeholder groups and the effective implementation of positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS). Overall, the evidence reflects an intentional environment grounded in respect, recognition and support.

Survey results showed that 84% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make me feel welcome (1)" and 88% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat me with respect (2)." Family survey results mirrored these perceptions, as 90% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make me feel welcome (1)" and 93% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat me with respect (2)." Interview data from students and families further supported these findings, indicating that the school is perceived as inclusive and responsive.

Educator survey results also reflected a positive culture, as 85% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)" and 88% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." The Educator Upbeat Survey reinforced these results, with equal opportunities at 96%, care and commitment at 96% and inclusive practices at 97%, rated as the highest categories. In addition, classroom observations indicated PBIS was implemented in most classrooms. The Well-Managed Learning Environment received an average rating of 2.6 on a 4-point scale, and it was evident/very evident in 74% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)." Collectively, the evidence indicates a strong and positive culture and climate supported by consistent PBIS practices, respectful relationships and stakeholder perceptions of inclusivity, providing a solid foundation for continuous improvement.

The school has outlined clear improvement expectations in its 2025-2026 30-60-90 day plan and the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP). The 30-60-90 day plan is anchored in three "Big Rocks": Tier 1 instruction, professional learning community (PLC) collaboration and multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) implementation, while the CSIP outlines three long-term goals focused on increasing proficiency in reading and math and closing achievement gaps.

While initial MTSS structures and Tier 1 systems are in place, including a defined MTSS team, interventionists, consistent curriculum implementation and deconstructed learning targets, classroom-level implementation of differentiated instruction remains an area for growth. Classroom observational data indicated that it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Although pull-out interventions are provided in reading and math, Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data indicate that the number of students requiring support exceeds the current capacity of available interventionists, further underscoring the need to strengthen classroom-based differentiation.

Student achievement data further emphasize the need to improve differentiated instructional effectiveness. The CSIP goals target increases in reading proficiency from 18% to 33% and math proficiency from 16% to 31% by 2030; however, KSA trends from 2022-2023 through 2024-2025 show declining proficiency across grade levels and subgroups. While PLC meeting time is embedded in the schedule, classroom instruction would benefit from a more structured PLC protocol that emphasizes data analysis and classroom-level application strategies to drive

responsive instruction. Strengthening teachers' ability to use assessment data to adjust instruction, scaffold learning and target interventions will be critical to improving outcomes.

To address these gaps, the school should expand targeted professional learning and sustained coaching aligned to differentiated instructional practices. Interview and artifact data revealed that staffing vacancies and teacher certification status have impacted instructional consistency and student outcomes, suggesting that targeted professional learning systems and sustained coaching will be essential to improving student performance. Focusing professional development on differentiated instruction, small-group implementation and Tier 1 MTSS strategies will support consistent translation of CSIP and 30-60-90 day plan goals into classroom practice. By aligning instructional improvements, MTSS implementation and professional learning to clearly defined improvement objectives, the school can strengthen Tier 1 effectiveness, improve MTSS fidelity and increase student achievement across all grades and subgroups.

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

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	**1.8**	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	27%	62%	12%	0%
A2	**2.7**	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	8%	23%	65%	4%
A3	**2.9**	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	4%	8%	81%	8%
A4	**1.6**	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.	54%	31%	15%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.3**				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
B1	**2.3**	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	8%	54%	38%	0%
B2	**2.4**	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	12%	42%	42%	4%
B3	**1.8**	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	31%	58%	12%	0%
B4	**2.0**	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	27%	50%	23%	0%
B5	**2.0**	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	23%	54%	23%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.1**				

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
C1	**2.5**	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	4%	46%	46%	4%
C2	**2.4**	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	8%	42%	50%	0%
C3	**2.6**	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	4%	35%	58%	4%
C4	**2.7**	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	38%	58%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.5**				

		D. Active Learning Environment				
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
D1	**2.4**	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	12%	35%	54%	0%
D2	**1.8**	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	50%	27%	19%	4%
D3	**2.4**	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	4%	54%	42%	0%
D4	**1.8**	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	35%	54%	12%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.1**				

		E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment				
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
E1	**1.7**	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	38%	50%	12%	0%
E2	**2.5**	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	4%	46%	50%	0%
E3	**2.1**	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	15%	62%	19%	4%
E4	**1.5**	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	58%	38%	4%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.9**				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
F1	**2.7**	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	12%	15%	62%	12%
F2	**2.6**	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	12%	31%	46%	12%
F3	**2.7**	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	4%	42%	38%	15%
F4	**2.5**	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	12%	38%	35%	15%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.6**				

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
G1	**1.8**	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	31%	62%	8%	0%
G2	**1.1**	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	88%	12%	0%	0%
G3	**1.1**	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	92%	8%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.3**				

eleot Narrative

The team conducted 26 observations in core content classrooms, revealing both strengths and opportunities for growth. The team observed a strength in how adults treated students. For example, in 89% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." The Support and Well-Managed learning environments earned the highest overall ratings, scoring 2.5 and 2.6, respectively, on a 4-point scale. Student-teacher interactions were generally respectful, and teachers were frequently observed supporting students. It was evident/very evident in 62% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teachers (C4)." It was evident/very evident in 74% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)." It was also evident/very evident in 69% of classrooms

that "learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2)." These findings are consistent with interview data from staff, who identified the supportive, community-oriented culture as one of the school's stronger aspects. Overall, the learning environment mostly reflects a positive climate where students and staff feel valued, supported and respected.

The team identified a need for the school to strengthen instructional expectations and the level of cognitive engagement consistently experienced by learners across classrooms. Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." It was also evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teachers (B1)" and in 23% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)." Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 44% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." These results indicate that learning experiences do not yet consistently reflect strong expectations or sustained cognitive engagement. Strengthening instructional planning and clearly communicating expectations for quality work will be essential to improving student outcomes.

The team also identified a need to strengthen classroom-based progress monitoring to ensure learners clearly understand their progress and next steps. It was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)." It was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)." Similarly, mechanisms for students to track their own learning were limited. It was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)" and it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." It was also evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that "learners receive/respond to feedback to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)." Interviews revealed some students' awareness of their Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) scores; however, understanding the connection among classroom performance, MAP and KSA data remains limited, highlighting the need for clearer progress-monitoring systems within daily instruction.

Finally, the team identified a need to strengthen instructional practices to ensure learning experiences are responsive to students' individual needs, interests and readiness levels. Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that "learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)." It was evident/very evident in 42% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." Strengthening intentional differentiation and relevance in daily instruction will be essential to increasing student engagement and improving learning outcomes across classrooms. Observational data highlights the need to strengthen instructional practices that promote student awareness, collaboration and differentiated support to ensure learning experiences are meaningful, accessible and foster improved student outcomes.

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

Implement a Tier 1 instructional framework in which teachers consistently use multiple sources of student data (e.g., formative assessments, academic screening results, KSA results) to monitor learning and adjust classroom instruction, including targeted small-group instruction and differentiation, to respond to the needs of students.

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

Findings:

An analysis of student performance data from the KSA indicates multiple areas of concern across grades 3-5, with proficiency rates in reading and mathematics consistently remaining below state levels from 2022-2023 through 2024-2025. These outcomes are aligned with classroom observational data and stakeholder feedback, including interview findings, which point to limited differentiation, inconsistent student understanding of learning expectations and uneven instructional responsiveness to student needs. Interview data and a review of artifacts indicated that, although multiple data sources are collected and reviewed during meetings, consistent instructional adjustments based on those data were not evident.

In reading, KSA results for 3rd grade showed no sustained improvement. The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was 24% in 2022-2023, declined to 17% in 2023-2024 and returned to 24% in 2024-2025. Fourth-grade reading scores declined steadily over the three-year period, from 33% in 2022-2023 to 30% in 2023-2024 and to 12% in 2024-2025. Fifth-grade results reflected inconsistent growth, with 26% of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023, 30% in 2023-2024 and a decline to 18% in 2024-2025. These trends mirror classroom observational data, which revealed that it was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)" and in 38% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)." Interview data further suggest that teachers often referenced small-group instruction in general terms; however, when asked to describe what this looks like in practice, they provided limited specificity about how instruction is adjusted to address identified skill gaps.

Similarly, math scores remained low and inconsistent across grade levels. The percentage of third-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 31% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2023-2024, then rose slightly to 25% in 2024-2025. Fourth-grade math scores decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2023-2024, with minimal growth to 16% in 2024-2025. Classroom observational data provides additional context for these outcomes, as it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)" and in 4% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." Interview findings indicated that instructional support is delivered through pull-out services provided by interventionists, with less clarity on how classroom instruction is differentiated to support students below grade level.

Declining performance on the KSA was also evident in additional content areas. The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies declined steadily from 19% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024 and then to 8% in 2024-2025. Similarly, 5th-grade performance in editing and mechanics declined from 22% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025. These outcomes align with survey feedback indicating

inconsistencies in how instructional practices are monitored and adjusted to meet learners' needs, as well as interview data suggesting that reteaching is the most commonly used classroom intervention rather than targeted adjustments informed by specific skill deficits.

Educator survey results further indicate the need to align student performance with instructional practices. Reading and math proficiency rates were below state levels in 2022-2023 and 2024-2025, despite educator survey data indicating that staff provide instruction based on students' needs. For example, 78% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)", 81% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I used a variety of resources to meet learners' needs and interests"(19)" and 81% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on the learners' needs (5)." Additionally, 67% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)" and 78% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I used a variety of information to determine learners' progress (20)." Interview data reinforced these findings, indicating that while the school has multiple data sources, there is a need to strengthen data literacy and teachers' ability to match identified skill deficits with appropriate instructional strategies, highlighting an opportunity to improve the consistency and effectiveness of classroom-level implementation.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Develop and implement a structured data analysis protocol aligned with the MTSS model for classroom use, including analyzing multiple sources of student data, determining student intervention groups, identifying targeted skills interventions (i.e., both standard-based and skill-based) and establishing clear success criteria for monitoring progress.

- Conduct weekly instructional walkthroughs using a defined tool to monitor the implementation of Tier 1 expectations, differentiation strategies and small-group instruction.

- Facilitate teacher training on using multiple student data sources (e.g., formative assessments, academic screening programs, KSA) to inform daily instructional decisions and small-group planning.

- Implement and monitor the use of adaptive programs with associated incentives to ensure engagement and data-driven usage.

- Establish progress monitoring measures, including review of student growth reports, formative assessment outcomes, intervention group performance and classroom observation data, to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instructional adjustments.

Improvement Priority 2

Leverage existing professional development structures (e.g., PLCs, coaching cycles) to engage teachers in a continuous action research process in which they analyze student data, implement evidence-based instructional strategies, monitor the impact on student learning and adjust their instruction based on the findings to improve student achievement.

Standard 25: Leaders promote action research by professional staff members to improve their practice and advance learning.

Findings:

Student performance data, as previously discussed, revealed areas of concern related to the achievement of multiple student subgroups on the KSA, indicating persistent achievement gaps and declining trends across grades 3-5, particularly in reading, math and social studies. A review of the artifacts provided limited evidence of monitoring the use of differentiated instruction. These patterns are consistent with student survey results, educator feedback and classroom observational data, which collectively indicate uneven implementation of instructional practices designed to meet the diverse needs of learners. Interviews and a review of artifacts revealed that professional development structures, including PLCs, one hour per week of embedded professional development and documentation structures for coaching cycles (e.g., "digi-coaching") are in the initial stages of implementation. These findings reveal an opportunity for the school to conduct action research to determine the impact of implementation on student learning. Third-grade students showed inconsistent growth across content areas. In reading, the percentage of African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 20% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024 and remained low at 18% in 2024-2025. In math, the percentage of male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 30% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2023-2024, before increasing slightly to 29% in 2024-2025. Similarly, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in grade 3 math declined from 29% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2023-2024, then rose slightly to 26% in 2024-2025. These outcomes align with student survey data, in which 74% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)" and 73% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had different tools to help me learn about things I like (16)", suggesting current differentiation practices may not be producing consistent gains for all subgroups. Interviews revealed that current interventions for underperforming students mainly consist of pull-out support provided by the interventionists.

Fourth-grade students reflected more pronounced declines, particularly in reading. The percentage of female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 48% in 2022-2023 to 35% in 2023-2024 and then to 18% in 2024-2025. The percentage of male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading remained unchanged at 24% in both 2022-2023 and 2023-2024, then declined to 6% in 2024-2025. Additionally, the percentage of African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading remained at 30% in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 but declined sharply to 13% in 2024-2025. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 4th-grade reading decreased from 31% in 2022-2023, to 28% in 2023-2024 and to 14% in 2024-2025. These trends mirror classroom observational data, which showed that it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)" and that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." Interview data also indicated that current curricular resources and the school schedule do not provide sufficient time to support students who are multiple grade levels below, limiting teachers' ability to address student needs.

Performance remained low among subgroups of 4th-grade math students. The percentage of male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 27% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025, while the percentage of African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was 15% in 2024-2025. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 20% in 2022-2023 to

16% in 2023-2024, then rose slightly to 18% in 2024-2025, indicating limited growth. These outcomes correspond with educator survey results, in which 76% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10)", indicating that while systems exist, they may not be consistently or effectively implemented to support all subgroups. Interviews and artifact reviews indicated that PLC meetings are structured and data are reviewed; however, the team found little evidence that instructional practices are consistently adjusted to meet student needs.

Fifth-grade subgroup data also revealed declining trends across multiple content areas. In reading, the percentage of female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 36% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025, while the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 28% to 15% over the same period. Observational data provided additional context, as it was evident/very evident in 42% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)" and in 50% of classrooms that "learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)." Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that "learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)", indicating opportunities to strengthen feedback practices. Interview data further indicated a common need to ensure that teachers can match skill deficits with appropriate instructional strategies.

Overall, student subgroup performance data indicate persistent and widening achievement gaps, with particularly low performance among African Americans, economically disadvantaged students, males and English Learners (EL) across multiple grade levels and content areas. While stakeholder surveys showed that 78% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)" and 79% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I followed a process where I tried and assessed different strategies to improve my practice (23)", the combined evidence underscores the need for more targeted professional development and coaching focused on the consistent use of evidence-based instructional strategies to improve student achievement for all subgroups. Interviews and document reviews also revealed that while structures for PLCs, embedded professional development and coaching cycles exist, the school is still developing capacity in data literacy and instructional decision-making, emphasizing the importance of focusing on student needs to improve overall performance.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish a school-wide walkthrough tool with defined look-fors to monitor evidence-based differentiation strategies and other high-impact instructional practices.

- Conduct action research to develop and implement a structured PLC protocol that guides teacher teams to collaboratively analyze data, plan lessons and ensure the consistent integration of evidence-based strategies to meet the needs of all learners.

- Develop and implement a school-wide focus on classroom differentiation, including training sessions during Educator Professional Development (EPD) days to build teacher capacity in differentiated instruction.

- Use targeted coaching cycles to provide ongoing support to teachers, including goal setting, classroom observations, feedback and reflection, emphasizing the implementation of differentiated instructional strategies.

- Facilitate mentor teacher and specialist-led sharing of effective differentiation practices and resources during PLCs, EPD and staff meetings to promote consistent instructional improvement across grade levels and content areas.

Your Next Steps

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The principal assumed the leadership of Crums Lane Elementary in the 2022-2023 school year. Each year the principal has prioritized initiatives focusing on creating a culture for continuous improvement, seeking to make the school more effective for each student, teacher, staff, family and the community. The principal initiated a PBIS program with refinement of the system each successive year to increase the program's effectiveness. This year, the Character Strong curriculum was introduced to further enhance student culture.

The principal has established clear expectations for teacher collaboration through the PLC process. This process continues to be refined and strengthened by ongoing coaching and guidance from the administrative team, using methods for continuous improvement to achieve the vision and mission of the school. Additionally, the master schedule was adjusted to provide protected time for PLCs as well as embedded professional learning. The principal has hired an instructional assistant principal who works with the academic instructional coach to provide support and professional learning. Stakeholders indicated they feel their input is valued through the PLC process, with opportunities to help form meeting agendas and discuss areas of success and growth with their PLCs, grade level teams and the administration.

The leadership team is highly visible within the building and interacts with students and staff throughout the school day. Each administrator has a group of specific teachers for whom they are assigned to provide direct support, in addition to regular classroom walkthroughs, which provide positive feedback for teachers. The principal is seeking to develop the capacity of staff to assess the value and apply appropriate emerging educational trends. Stakeholder interviews indicated that most teachers experienced a walkthrough at least bi-weekly, if not more often.

While the principal has identified the school's three big rocks as PLCs, Tier 1 instruction and MTSS, there is a disconnect within the current intervention system. The school's MTSS existing protocol is primarily pull out for students who need additional support. Stakeholder interviews indicated that struggling students receive reteaching as an in-class intervention. If that is unsuccessful, students are sent to one of the academic interventionists for academic support. The principal needs to develop the capacity of staff to develop technically appropriate systems of data collection, management and analysis to ensure that classroom teachers can use appropriate MTSS applications in their individual classrooms.

Perhaps the greatest strength of the principal is the commitment to grow as an instructional leader, while also helping to grow and develop the school's staff. The implementation of multiple teacher-focused initiatives, such as peer learning walks, a teacher mentor program, staff shoutouts, random acts of appreciation and Caught Being Awesome, are just some of the ways this leader values the school staff. This school leader truly exemplifies the qualities of integrity, reflection and transparency.

Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Tonya Addison	Tonya Addison has served as a teacher, assistant principal and principal in secondary schools for over 20 years. She has also served as the district coordinator of attendance and MTSS to increase student achievement and provide support for attendance, behavior and social-emotional learning through the implementation of MTSS. She currently serves as the Director of Teacher Quality. In this role, she supports schools by enhancing teachers' collective and individual instructional capacity to improve student achievement.
Chris Mueller	Chris Mueller has over 38 years of experience as a teacher, administrator and Educational Recovery Leader (ERL). Chris has taught at the middle, high school and collegiate levels. While serving as an ERL, Chris worked with administrative teams and school leadership teams to facilitate turnaround efforts in Kentucky's central region. Additionally, he has served as an associate lead evaluator on multiple Diagnostic Reviews. He has also led monitoring reviews in CSI schools for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). He is a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) for the Lead-KY initiative. Also, Chris has experience as an adjunct instructor in political science for Campbellsville University and as a University Supervisor for the University of the Cumberlands.
Cassie House	Cassie House has over 15 years of experience as a teacher, administrator and ERL. Cassie has taught and served as an administrator for an elementary school and been an instructional coach for K-12. While currently serving as an ERL with KDE, Cassie has received certification for NISL, Cognitive Coaching, improvement science training and other KDE-lead trainings to support curriculum implementation.
Hubert Schroer	Hubert Schroer has over 10 years of experience in education. Currently, he serves as a principal for a large elementary school in Kentucky and as an adjunct college professor. His past experiences include being a high school, middle school and elementary school Spanish teacher. Before becoming principal, Hubert served as an assistant principal. Also, he coaches multiple sports teams and volunteers his time at a local clinic.

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.	3
2. Learners' well-being is at the heart of the institution's guiding principles such as mission, purpose, and beliefs.	Staff members seldom demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions may not be based on its stated values.	Staff members occasionally demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members routinely demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented, and are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members continually demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented and regularly reviewed for consistency with its stated values.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
3. Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.	Leaders establish conditions that rarely result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders seldom collaborate with stakeholders. Institutions choose areas of focus that are rarely based on data about learners.	Leaders establish conditions that occasionally result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus that are sometimes based on data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that regularly result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders routinely collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that consistently result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders consistently collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions implement a formal process to choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	3
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.	3
6. Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.	Professional staff members receive few or no resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members rarely receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive some resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members periodically receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members consistently receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. A formal structure ensures that professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	2

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders seldom use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders sometimes use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use analyzed current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use a formal, systematic process for analyzing current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	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.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	2
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	2
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving	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)
3rd-Grade Reading	24	46	17	47	24	47
4th-Grade Reading	33	48	30	50	12	50
5th-Grade Reading	26	48	30	46	18	50
3rd-Grade Math	31	43	23	43	25	43
4th-Grade Math	22	42	15	43	16	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	16	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	19	42	16	39	8	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	*	47	22	47	8	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	*	38

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading showed no increase from 24% in 2022-2023, to 17% in 2023-2024 and to 24% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading showed a decrease each year from 33% in 2022-2023, to 30% in 2023-2024 and to 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 26% in 2022-2023, 30% in 2023-2024 and 18% in 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 31% in 2022-2023, 23% in 2023-2024 and 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 22% in 2022-2023, 15% in 2023-2024 and 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 19% in 2022-2023, 16% in 2023-2024 and 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 22% in 2023-2024 and 8% in 2024-2025.

Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
% Score of 0	31	26	22	29	31	30
% Score of 60-80	36	35	38	35	28	35
% Score of 100	24	24	17	23	27	22
% Score of 140	10	14	22	13	14	13

Plus

- The percentage of all ELs scoring 100 points for progress increased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of ELs scoring 0 points for progress increased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 31% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of ELs scoring 140 points for progress decreased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	24	17	24
Female	24	25	31
Male	*	9	17
White	*	*	27
African American	20	17	18
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	36
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	32
English Learners plus Monitored	*	18	32
Economically Disadvantaged	20	17	23
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	20

Plus

- The percentage of female students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 24% in 2022-2023, to 25% in 2023-2024 and to 31% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of male students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL plus monitored students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 32% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished showed no increase from 24% in 2022-2023, to 17% in 2023-2024 and to 24% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of African American students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 20% in 2022-2023, to 17% in 2023-2024 and to 18% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	31	23	25
Female	31	*	*
Male	30	24	29
White	*	*	45
African American	32	25	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	29	23	26
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- In 2024-2025, 45% of White students in grade three scored Proficient/Distinguished in math.

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 31% in 2022-2023, 23% in 2023-2024 and 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of male students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 30% in 2022-2023, 24% in 2023-2024 and 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grade three scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 29% in 2022-2023, 23% in 2023-2024 and 26% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	33	30	12
Female	48	35	18
Male	24	24	6
White	*	*	*
African American	30	30	13
Hispanic or Latino	*	25	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	20	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	20	*
Economically Disadvantaged	31	28	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 33% in 2022-2023, 30% in 2023-2024 and 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 48% in 2022-2023, 35% in 2023-2024 and 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 24% in 2022-2023, 24% in 2023-2024 and 6% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 30% in 2022-2023, 30% in 2023-2024 and 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 31% in 2022-2023, 28% in 2023-2024 and 14% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	22	15	16
Female	*	15	*
Male	27	*	18
White	17	*	*
African American	*	*	15
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	20	16	18
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 4th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 22% in 2022-2023, 15% in 2023-2024 and 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 27% in 2022-2023 and 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring proficient/distinguished in math was 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 20% in 2022-2023, 16% in 2023-2024 and 18% in 2024-2025.

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

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	26	30	18
Female	31	36	19
Male	*	27	*
White	*	60	*
African American	*	27	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	25	28	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 30% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 36% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 28% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	16	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	16	*
White	*	20	*
African American	*	14	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	12	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 12% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 14% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	19	16	8
Female	27	*	*
Male	*	18	10
White	*	40	*
African American	19	13	5
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	12
Economically Disadvantaged	22	15	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024 and to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of male students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of African American students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 19% in 2022-2023, to 13% in 2023-2024 and to 5% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL plus monitored students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 22% in 2022-2023, to 15% in 2023-2024 and to 5% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	*	22	8
Female	*	25	8
Male	*	20	7
White	*	40	*
African American	*	17	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	19	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of female students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of male students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 5% in 2024-2025.

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

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

Schedule

Tuesday, January 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
5 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, January 21, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 a.m.- 3 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m.- 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, January 22, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:45 a.m.- 3 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m.- 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Friday, January 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m.- 12 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members