



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Doss High

March 2-5, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	6
eleot Narrative	9
Improvement Priorities	12
Improvement Priority 1	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	13
Improvement Priority 2	13
Potential Leader Actions:.....	15
Your Next Steps	16
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	17
Team Roster	19
Appendix	20
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	20
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	20
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	22
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	24
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	26
Student Performance Data.....	29
Schedule	40

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	2
Building-Level Administrators	6
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	8
Certified Staff	34
Noncertified Staff	4
Students	22
Parents	3
Total	79

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:

Data from the principal's presentation, interviews and observations showed that a pledge to diversity, meaningful relationships and opportunities to build teacher capacity are potential school strengths.

Stakeholder interviews revealed that the diversity of the student population affords students and staff the opportunity to share experiences and learn from one another. One stakeholder indicated that the school's diversity allows one to take a trip around the world every day. In classrooms and common areas, the team observed appreciation for diversity throughout the building. For example, celebrations of Black History Month were evident through posters, quotes and displays in hallways, classrooms and common areas. These displays reinforce a message of belonging and shared history.

Stakeholder interviews revealed meaningful relationships among stakeholders. Several students reported having at least one trusted adult in the building. These connections serve as an important foundation for stronger academic systems and expectations.

Stakeholders also reported that strong bonds exist among teachers within their respective academies. Staff members reported supporting one another within these smaller, structured academies, such as having one another's backs and providing emotional and professional support. This sense of belonging within academies represents a strength that could be leveraged to build broader schoolwide cohesion.

Stakeholder interviews and school-provided artifacts also revealed that teachers participate in professional development every Monday and Tuesday, which demonstrates a commitment to ongoing learning. However, while the structure for regular professional learning exists, refinement is needed to ensure alignment with data, such as differentiated teacher needs and measurable impact of student outcomes.

While the school demonstrates some strengths, several systemic challenges significantly impede student learning and organizational effectiveness. Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data, included in the appendix to this report, indicate low levels of student proficiency across grade levels and content areas. These outcomes highlight the need to strengthen schoolwide instructional practices to build teacher capacity in instructional design, delivery and assessment and to create the conditions for learning.

Across most classrooms observed, instruction lacked rigor, coherence and intentional alignment to standards. In many instances, there was minimal direct instruction. In most classrooms, students were provided with tasks such as worksheets or other compliance-based activities to complete independently, and many students did not engage with the work. The instructional model described by leadership was not reflected in classroom practice.

Although the school promotes standards-based grading, classroom observations revealed that standards were rarely posted, referenced or unpacked with students. Learning targets were generally absent or not meaningfully connected to instruction. This misalignment raises concerns about the clarity of expectations for both teachers and students.



These observations are supported by stakeholder perception data, as 36% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statements, “At my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)” and “At my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).”

During the principal’s presentation, project-based learning (PBL) was referred to as the school’s instructional model. However, the team rarely observed instructional practices aligned with PBL during observations. Students were largely engaged in compliance-oriented tasks rather than in self-directed, active, collaborative, inquiry-based and authentic learning experiences characteristic of PBL. Subsequent interviews revealed that while a small group of leaders and teachers attended PBL training during the summer of 2025, the broader faculty had not been trained, nor had expectations for implementation been clearly communicated, supported or monitored.

Similarly, while the principal identified professional learning community (PLC) meetings as the primary driver for addressing previous improvement priorities, stakeholder interviews revealed inconsistent implementation. Although PLC structures appear well-designed on paper (e.g., meeting times, dashboards for entering data, meeting agendas and minutes), fidelity varies widely across classrooms. Data entry into PLC dashboards is inconsistent (i.e., both in frequency and content), and the team found limited evidence that staff members are held accountable for participation or follow-through on the PLC action steps. Further, multiple stakeholder interviews revealed PLC time is widely spent providing support to newer staff rather than collaboratively growing as a team to support student learning and progress.

Concerns were also raised regarding the implementation of standards-based grading. Stakeholders reported that students may complete minimal work throughout the year yet still earn high grades if they demonstrate mastery at the end of the term. This practice has led to frustration among teachers and may contribute to diminished academic urgency among students.

Student behavior was frequently observed to be detrimental to learning. Students often arrived at class significantly after the bell rang without urgency or consequence, resulting in lost instructional time. On many occasions, the Diagnostic Review Team observed groups of students wandering the halls during class time, with no adult supervision or consequence.

During classroom instruction, students were frequently off task, engaging in unrelated conversations, sleeping, watching videos, listening to music without headphones or using cell phones despite district policy prohibiting their use during the school day. Profanity was prevalent in classrooms, including in conversations directed toward teachers, with minimal adult intervention observed. In many cases, students left classrooms without permission or explanation, and there was little evidence of follow-up or accountability.

Stakeholder interviews revealed that the lack of consistent consequences for student misbehavior has led many teachers to disengage from enforcement efforts. Some stakeholders reported feeling unsafe due to student threats and injuries sustained by staff while attempting to intervene in student conflicts.

The school previously engaged in a climate and culture audit with an external consultant. While the findings were not shared directly with the Diagnostic Review Team, stakeholder interviews indicated that the audit results aligned with the team’s observations, specifically identifying student discipline, staff morale and accountability as significant concerns.

In several observed instances, teachers chose not to address inappropriate behaviors. For example, students openly used profanity in front of teachers and even directed it toward them without receiving any redirection. Students also used racially derogatory language in the presence of teachers with no correction or consequence. Students frequently walked in and out of classrooms at will, with little to no teacher intervention, which both reflects and deepens low morale. At times, it appeared that staff had simply given up on enforcing expectations or maintaining classroom norms. Taken together, these patterns suggest that many teachers may feel overwhelmed, discouraged or resigned to the current climate. Many stakeholders reported remaining at the school primarily for the students or due to financial incentives. This level of disengagement contributes to an environment where expectations are unclear, and students lack consistent boundaries or guidance.



The school operates in silos. While academies demonstrate internal cohesion, there is limited shared ownership or collective accountability across the school. Stakeholder interviews revealed a perception that decision-making authority rests primarily with the executive principal, the assistant principal of instruction and one additional assistant principal. This perception has contributed to resentment, diminished trust and discord, even within the administrative team. Stakeholders also described a disconnect among members of the leadership team as a barrier to collaboration, citing a lack of trust, professional competition and feelings of being pitted against one another. Many indicated that stronger alignment between assistant principals and counselors would positively impact the building's overall climate.

A recurring theme in stakeholder interviews was the lack of transparency in decision-making. Staff reported limited involvement in decisions and insufficient communication of the rationale behind changes. While leadership referenced data-driven decision-making, stakeholders indicated that data are rarely shared broadly, making it difficult for staff to connect decisions to measurable needs. While stakeholders said they are asked to provide feedback on new initiatives and changes, their input is rarely used, leading to the perception that the decisions have already been made and that soliciting feedback is merely a formality. Furthermore, stakeholders reported that initiatives are often implemented for a short period before abrupt decisions are made for change, and it was unclear whether these changes are grounded in measurable data or success criteria.

Professional development structures exist; however, these weekly sessions are self-selected rather than assigned based on data or identified instructional needs. The team found a lack of consistent mechanisms to monitor implementation or measure the impact of professional learning, which is particularly concerning given the high number of alternatively certified and novice teachers on staff who may require targeted, differentiated support to develop effective instructional and classroom management practices. The team found it especially concerning that the principal shared that she had only recently discovered that teachers need tiered support.

The school underwent a Two-Day Review in 2022-2023 and received two improvement priorities related to two Cognia Performance Standards: Standard 7, which states, "Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs" and Standard 21, which states, "Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices."

Based on current classroom observations, stakeholder interviews, perception surveys, student performance data and artifacts provided by the school, the team found limited evidence that the school is addressing these priorities. Behavioral concerns, inconsistent accountability, lack of rigorous instruction, low morale and fragmented leadership structures contribute to conditions that significantly impede student learning and educator effectiveness.

Without systemic attention to instructional quality, student discipline, leadership coherence and shared accountability, sustained improvement will remain difficult to achieve.

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 48 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	1.2	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	83%	15%	2%	0%
A2	2.3	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	15%	42%	42%	2%
A3	2.5	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	6%	38%	54%	2%
A4	1.3	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.	79%	17%	4%	0%

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.6	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	42%	52%	6%	0%
B2	1.8	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	33%	52%	15%	0%
B3	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	63%	31%	6%	0%
B4	1.7	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	40%	52%	8%	0%
B5	1.8	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	33%	50%	17%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.1	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	29%	38%	31%	2%
C2	1.5	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	63%	21%	17%	0%
C3	2.1	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	19%	50%	31%	0%
C4	2.1	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	21%	44%	35%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.7	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	46%	40%	15%	0%
D2	1.6	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	52%	35%	13%	0%
D3	2.0	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	25%	50%	25%	0%
D4	1.5	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	60%	25%	15%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.5	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	56%	40%	4%	0%
E2	1.6	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	50%	38%	10%	2%
E3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	33%	50%	17%	0%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	71%	21%	8%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.6			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.2	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	17%	48%	33%	2%
F2	2.1	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	15%	58%	25%	2%
F3	1.5	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	60%	29%	8%	2%
F4	1.8	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	33%	52%	13%	2%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	77%	15%	8%	0%
G2	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	83%	15%	2%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	96%	4%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 48 observations in core content classrooms. The team also conducted informal observations in non-core content classrooms, the cafeteria and hallways.

The Supportive Learning Environment and Well-Managed Learning Environment emerged as the highest-rated of the seven learning environments, receiving an overall rating of 2.0 and 1.9, respectively, on a 4-point scale. The team observed collegial relationships among some students and some positive interactions between teachers and students. In 35% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” In 33% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners

demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1).” Instances of learners being “supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)” were evident/very evident in 31% of classrooms. Also, it was evident/very evident that “learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback) (C2)” in 17% of classrooms.

The team observed that learners who “speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)” were evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms. Also, learners who “demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)” were evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms. In 15% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).” Instances of learners who “transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)” were evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms. The team identified student behavior as a significant concern during classroom observations, noting disrespectful language, frequent disruptions, off-task behavior and inconsistent adult intervention.

Overall findings for the Supportive and Well-Managed Learning Environments reveal an opportunity to strengthen consistent behavioral expectations and accountability to foster cohesive classroom communities where students support one another in learning and increase student engagement and investment in instruction.

The Equitable Learning Environment earned the third-highest overall average rating of 1.8. In 56% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners are treated in a fair, clear or consistent manner (A3).” In 44% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2).” The team observed a lack of differentiated instruction. For example, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” in 2% of classrooms. Tasks were assigned universally, with minimal adjustment for students’ individual readiness, interests or learning needs.

To better meet the diverse learning needs of students, it is recommended that school leadership provide teachers with targeted support, including professional development, curriculum tools and resources, classroom observations and feedback and instructional coaching to ensure differentiated learning experiences are consistently implemented and monitored for impact.

The Active Learning Environment earned an average overall rating of 1.7, indicating an area for improvement. The team observed that a few learners were actively participating in lessons. Students were primarily completing tasks independently without clear instructional delivery, modeling, guided practice or ongoing monitoring. In 25% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” In 15% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners’ discussion/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate (D1)”, and that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Learners who “make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)” were evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms.

The High Expectations Learning Environment also rated 1.7, as it was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1).” In 15% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)”, and in 17% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5).” Also, in 6% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” In 8% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” To address the improvement priorities outlined in this report, it is imperative that educators consistently communicate, model and uphold high expectations for student learning and performance.

The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment was rated 1.6. The team observed that some teachers provided feedback during classroom instruction. For example, in 17% of classrooms, learners who “demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)” were evident/very evident. Instances of



learners who “receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)” were evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms, and learners who “understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)” were evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms. In 4% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Ensuring that teachers consistently post, discuss and revisit standards and learning targets throughout lessons is important to help students monitor their progress toward meeting expectations and advocate for themselves when additional support is needed.

While students have access to technology in the form of district-issued Chromebooks and personal laptops, few students use technology for learning. In 8% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that learners used digital tools or technology “to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)”, and in 2% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that learners used digital tools or technology to “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2).” Learners using digital tools or technology “to communicate and collaborate for learning (G3)” were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms.

Providing teachers with targeted professional development focused on the effective integration of digital resources into instruction can significantly enhance the quality of classroom learning. When equipped with these skills, teachers can design lessons that promote active engagement, foster collaboration, and strengthen students’ critical-thinking skills while aligning technological use with instructional goals.

Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement Priority 1

Develop, implement and monitor a process to strengthen stakeholder engagement, focusing on data analysis and using two-way communication structures that go beyond information-sharing to ensure families, staff and students clearly understand and actively support the school's academic priorities and staff and students' well-being.

Standard 3: Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.

Findings:

Student performance data indicate persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across assessed content areas, underscoring the importance of establishing strong, collaborative engagement structures that ensure stakeholders clearly understand and support the school's academic priorities. In reading, the percentage of all 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 14% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024 and to 10% in 2024-2025, while the state average remained relatively stable. Similarly, in mathematics, 11% of all 10th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 and 7% in 2024-2025, compared to state averages of 34% and 41%, respectively. These persistent performance gaps highlight the need for a coordinated, transparent process in which stakeholders collaboratively examine data, understand the school's improvement priorities and support learner success and well-being.

Evidence gathered through stakeholder surveys, interviews, artifacts and classroom observations suggests that while structures exist that could support stakeholder engagement, they are often implemented in ways that emphasize information sharing rather than authentic collaboration and shared ownership of improvement efforts. Stakeholder survey data reflect moderate levels of collaboration and responsiveness to student needs, with 50% of educators who agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)" and that "at my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)." Additionally, 45% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults try new things to improve the school (6)." While these responses indicate that some stakeholders report efforts to improve the institution, they also show considerable opportunity to strengthen engagement processes so that stakeholders more clearly understand and actively support the school's academic and well-being priorities.

Artifacts provided by the school illustrate a variety of structures designed to engage stakeholders, including PLCs; weekly team and faculty committee meetings focused on areas such as culture and climate, literacy, math, multilingual learners (MLs), positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), racial equity; and social media. However, evidence from stakeholder interviews suggests that these structures inconsistently function as vehicles for authentic collaboration or shared decision-making. For example, team meeting agendas indicate that these meetings are frequently used to disseminate information rather than to facilitate collaborative dialogue or collective problem solving. Similarly, while PLC documentation outlines a comprehensive framework intended to promote collaboration around essential standards, common formative assessments and intervention planning, stakeholders reported inconsistencies in the fidelity of PLC implementation and limited accountability for maintaining the established processes. These perceptions were further reinforced during interviews, where educators indicated that although they are often asked to provide feedback on initiatives, leadership typically presents pre-developed plans and solicits input only after key decisions have been made.



Artifacts and interviews also reveal that communication with families is largely one-directional. For example, communication logs show the number of messages sent to families, demonstrating that information is regularly shared; however, the communication primarily consists of announcements rather than mechanisms to gather parent and family feedback or encourage dialogue. Parent interviews further confirmed that families receive information about school events and are contacted when student concerns arise, but there are limited proactive efforts to solicit parent perspectives on school initiatives or academic priorities. Parents also noted concerns about inconsistent academic communication, particularly regarding the timeliness of grade updates within the Infinite Campus system, which can create confusion about students' academic progress. Additionally, although the school has a school-based decision-making (SBDM) council, parents indicated that participation is determined through staff nominations, and it is unclear how families can express interest in serving or how the selection process is communicated.

Stakeholder interviews further highlighted concerns regarding the consistency and transparency of school processes and decision-making. Multiple stakeholders reported that new initiatives, policies and structures are frequently introduced without clearly defined success criteria, shared data or collaborative planning. When initiatives appear not to produce immediate results, they are often discontinued or revised without clear communication regarding the rationale for the changes. For example, artifacts and interviews related to the school's tardy policy reveal that the policy has undergone numerous revisions this school year, leading to stakeholder frustration and uncertainty about expectations and accountability. Stakeholders expressed concern that feedback is frequently solicited but rarely used to shape final decisions, leading some to disengage from the process altogether.

Interviews also revealed concerns regarding collaboration within the school's leadership team. Stakeholders consistently indicated that a small number of administrators are responsible for most major decisions, with limited involvement from other members of the leadership team. Stakeholders reported that in some cases, assistant principals and other leaders learn about decisions at the same time as faculty members. Stakeholders suggested that this lack of internal alignment among leaders contributes to inconsistent communication and inhibits the development of a cohesive, collaborative school culture.

Overall, the evidence indicates that while structures intended to support stakeholder engagement are present, they are not consistently implemented to foster meaningful two-way communication, shared decision-making or collective ownership of the school's academic and well-being priorities. Strengthening processes that promote transparency, collaborative data analysis and authentic stakeholder voice are essential to building trust, improving organizational coherence and ensuring that families, staff and students actively support the school's continuous improvement efforts.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Develop and implement a stakeholder engagement plan aligned to the goals articulated in the school's turnaround plan.
- Develop the advisory leadership team to solicit input about academic and non-academic priorities and initiatives.
- Establish and implement a process to ensure consistent, intentional two-way communication with stakeholders prior to finalizing decisions. Use multiple data sources to monitor the impact of this process.
- Develop and implement a structured feedback cycle, in which feedback is analyzed and stakeholders are a part of two-way communication about the results and next steps.

Improvement Priority 2

Develop, implement and monitor a system to collect and analyze data from multiple sources, resulting in clearly defined action steps that are communicated to all stakeholders in a timely manner.



Standard 24: Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.

Findings:

Student performance data, as detailed earlier in this report, reflects persistent and significant gaps between the school and state averages across content areas, illustrating the lack of a systematic process for collecting, analyzing and using multiple sources of data to inform decision-making and guide improvement efforts. Despite these ongoing academic challenges, evidence from classroom observations, artifacts, stakeholder surveys and interviews suggests that the school has not developed or implemented a cohesive system for using data to guide instructional practices, develop policies or build the capacity of educators. While references to data use were present in presentations and documentation provided by the school, the Diagnostic Review Team found limited evidence demonstrating how data from multiple sources are consistently analyzed, translated into clearly defined action steps and communicated to stakeholders in a timely manner.

Evidence from classroom observations indicates that instructional practices are not consistently informed by data collected during instruction. Across observed classrooms, the team found little evidence that formative assessment data were being collected or used to inform instructional adjustments. Instances of learners who "monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)" were evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms, while in 12% of classrooms it was evident/very evident that "learners receive/respond to feedback from teachers, peers or other resources to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)." Additionally, in 8% of classrooms it was evident/very evident that "learners understand and are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)", and it was evident/very evident in 2% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." These findings suggest that the systematic use of instructional data to guide next steps in teaching and learning is limited. Stakeholder interviews further reinforced these observations, as educators indicated that while summative and formative assessment data should inform instruction, the team found little evidence of a clear schoolwide process for collecting, analyzing and using data to adjust instruction to meet students' learning needs.

Evidence related to enrollment and course placement further illustrates the absence of a structured process for using data to guide decision-making. According to the principal's presentation, the school has increased enrollment in Advanced Placement (AP) and advanced courses; however, the team found little evidence that objective data are used to determine whether students are prepared for enrollment in these courses or to evaluate the effectiveness of expanded access once students are enrolled. While dual enrollment opportunities require students to meet criteria established by partner colleges or universities, advanced courses offered within the school are available to all students without clearly defined data-based criteria for placement or monitoring student success. Given the school's overall academic performance data, the absence of clearly defined measures to evaluate readiness, monitor progress and determine outcomes raises concerns regarding how data are used to support student success in advanced coursework.

The use of behavioral data to inform schoolwide policies and practices also appears limited. During the principal's presentations and interviews, the collection and analysis of behavioral data were referenced; however, the Diagnostic Review Team rarely observed evidence demonstrating how such data are systematically analyzed or used to guide decision-making. Throughout the review, significant behavioral concerns were observed, including frequent tardiness, students leaving classrooms without permission, profanity in classroom interactions and physical altercations among students. Despite these concerns, the team found minimal evidence of a comprehensive system for collecting and analyzing behavioral data to identify trends, inform the development of discipline policies or monitor the effectiveness of interventions. Although the PBIS framework was referenced by members of the leadership team, the Diagnostic Review Team found little evidence demonstrating how PBIS implementation is monitored or how behavioral data are used to measure its impact on school climate or student behavior. Stakeholder interviews further suggested that behavioral data may not always be reported accurately, as some stakeholders expressed concern that incidents are occasionally underreported due to concerns about

disciplinary reporting trends. These perceptions undermine trust in the integrity of behavioral data and further limit its usefulness for informed decision-making.

Evidence also suggests that data are not consistently used to guide the development of faculty and staff capacity. Artifacts indicate that walkthrough data are collected and that teachers receive feedback following classroom observations; however, the team found little evidence that this information is systematically analyzed to identify schoolwide instructional trends or to inform targeted professional learning. Professional development opportunities are regularly offered to teachers; however, stakeholders reported that educators select sessions based on personal preference rather than data-informed needs identified through observational data, student performance data or other indicators of instructional effectiveness. Additionally, there was limited evidence demonstrating how the implementation of strategies introduced during professional development is monitored or evaluated for impact on student learning. During the principal interview, it was noted that the need for tiered professional development based on teacher experience and skill level had only recently been identified, suggesting that data have not historically been used to differentiate professional learning in ways that support educator growth and development.

Artifacts provided by the school further illustrate the presence of processes and policies, but there is no clear evidence linking them to data-informed decision-making. Documents such as professional development plans, standard operating procedures, cell phone policies, tardy protocols and staff duty assignments demonstrate that structures and expectations exist; however, the artifacts did not consistently show what data were used to inform the development of these policies, how implementation is monitored or what success criteria are used to determine effectiveness. For example, the tardy protocol has undergone multiple revisions this school year, yet documentation did not clearly identify the specific data sources used to justify policy changes or the process for evaluating the effectiveness of each iteration. Similarly, meeting agendas for counselor and assistant principal meetings and district support meetings demonstrate that meetings occur regularly, but they inconsistently document the use of specific data sources to drive discussion, decision-making or next steps.

Stakeholder interviews reinforced these findings, as staff members frequently described initiatives that were implemented and later discontinued as ineffective, despite a lack of clear data demonstrating whether incremental progress had occurred. Stakeholders also indicated that, while surveys are frequently administered to gather feedback, these instruments primarily capture perceptions rather than objective performance indicators. Although perception data can provide valuable context, relying heavily on surveys without pairing them with quantitative and observational data limits the school's ability to make informed, evidence-based decisions. Additionally, stakeholders reported experiencing survey fatigue, noting that feedback is frequently requested but that results and subsequent actions are not consistently shared with staff.

Stakeholder survey results present a somewhat contrasting perspective, as 70% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the last 30 days, we used a variety of information for decision-making that affected my area of responsibility (21)." However, findings from interviews, artifacts and classroom observations suggest that while some data collection occurs, the school lacks a clearly defined, systematic process for analyzing data from multiple sources and translating those analyses into coordinated action steps that are consistently communicated and monitored across the organization.

Overall, the evidence indicates that although data are collected in various forms throughout the school, the school lacks a comprehensive, systematic process for integrating multiple data sources to guide instructional improvement, policy development, behavioral interventions and professional learning. Strengthening processes for collecting, analyzing and communicating data and ensuring that clearly defined action steps are developed, implemented and monitored will be critical to improving organizational coherence and supporting the academic growth and well-being of both learners and staff.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Use findings from data analysis to determine and communicate rationale for the school's initiatives and priorities.



- Provide professional development for school leaders, faculty and staff regarding the use of data as a tool to inform continuous improvement.
- Present data summaries to faculty and other stakeholders (as appropriate) with clearly defined actions and next steps.
- Establish structures to monitor the impact of major initiatives, including creating measurable success criteria, creating and implementing fidelity checks to ensure strategies are carried out as planned, having structured feedback sessions with stakeholders (i.e., two-way communication, not just surveys) and adjusting action steps based on progress monitoring results.

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 does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school and should be reassigned to a comparable position in the district.

Upon assuming the role of executive principal four years ago, her primary focus was the establishment of a new vision, mission and core beliefs intended to steer the school toward systemic improvement, as stated during her presentation. However, while these foundational elements are physically present in classrooms and hallways, they have failed to change the school's professional culture. While many interviews revealed that staff enjoy working together, this does not translate into providing needed supports to students, as survey results indicated 50% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)" and "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)."

A critical component of effective leadership is the promotion of coherence among improvement efforts. While the district has provided high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) and the master schedule includes dedicated PLC and academy planning times, there is a lack of systems perspective in their execution. PBL was highlighted as the school's instructional model; however, the team did not observe instructional practices aligned with PBL during classroom visits. Students were largely engaged in compliance-oriented tasks as opposed to the self-directed, active, collaborative, inquiry-based and authentic learning experiences characteristic of PBL.

During classroom observations, the Diagnostic Review Team noted minimal utilization of district-mandated HQIRs. Although "Acceleration Blocks" exist on the master schedule, artifacts and interviews suggest these periods are not utilized for data-driven interventions based on individual student needs. There is no evidence that teachers are systematically planning for student support based on multiple sources of assessment data. This indicates the lack of effective feedback loops; without monitoring or evaluating the effectiveness of these scheduled times, the school's resources remain underutilized and disconnected from student success.

The principal has struggled to build the administrative and instructional capacity necessary to improve the delivery of high-quality instruction. Effective school improvement requires a system of shared responsibility and distributed leadership, yet evidence suggests that the administrative team does not collaborate and lacks trust within the team. The principal has not involved the full administrative team to develop protocols that include a cycle of actionable steps, progress monitoring and explicitly communicated expectations.

A systematic approach to coaching and feedback is absent. Documents and interviews confirm that classroom observations are infrequent and lack the actionable feedback required to improve teaching practices. Furthermore, the principal has not engaged the full leadership team in developing protocols that include setting clear, measurable expectations for staff, tracking the impact of feedback and empowering administrators to lead their respective academies. The lack of consistency, communication and safety were three themes identified by the Diagnostic Review Team.

The current leadership approach at Doss High is characterized by a severe lack of systemic coherence. While structural elements (e.g., schedules and resources) are in place, the principal lacks the ability to monitor, adjust and lead these initiatives toward meaningful improvement primarily due to the absence of consistent follow-through. Without a transition toward a collaborative, data-driven and feedback-rich environment, the school remains unable to reverse the downward trend in student achievement and staff retention.

Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Staci Kimmons	Staci Kimmons has over 20 years of experience as an educator, serving as a school counselor, as well as an administrator at the elementary, middle and high school and district levels. Staci currently serves as a Diagnostic Review lead evaluator for Cognia and as an educational technology partnership manager in Georgia.
Felicia Bond	Felicia Bond has over 30 years of experience in education, including 13 years with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL), supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching high school math for over 20 years and serving as district curriculum specialist and building assessment coordinator. She is a certified facilitator for Jim Shipley & Associates in School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence (SIPPE). Felicia has presented at state and national conferences on successful continuous improvement practices in schools.
Rachael Havey	Rachael Havey has over 20 years of experience in education, including five years at the Indiana Department of Education and eight years with Cognia. Her background includes roles as a classroom teacher, department chair, team leader and building-level coach. She has contributed to statewide school improvement efforts, supporting intervention schools and overseeing federal funding and programs tied to school improvement grants. In her current position as senior director of professional learning – events and state contracts, Rachael leads initiatives that support institutions in professional learning, school improvement and strategic planning. She coordinates and delivers professional learning experiences and partners with state education agencies to advance continuous improvement efforts. Rachael has been engaged in Diagnostic Review work since 2014.
Deidra Hightower	Deidra Hightower is an educator with over 15 years of experience in public education. She currently serves as a Continuous Improvement Coach with KDE, a role she has held for seven years, where she supports schools and districts statewide. Her work centers on strengthening instructional practices and supporting sustainable improvement. Her background includes teaching at the elementary and middle school levels and working with districts to support instruction through the Instructional Transformation Grant.

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.	1
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.	1
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.	1
6. Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.	Professional staff members receive few or no resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members rarely receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive some resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members periodically receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members consistently receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. A formal structure ensures that professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	1

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	1
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	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
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	2
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	1

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.	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
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.	1
25. Leaders promote action research by professional staff members to improve their practice and advance learning.	Leaders rarely create a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution or learning environments. Professional staff members seldom engage in action research to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in few or no learning opportunities for professional staff members about action research.	Leaders occasionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, sometimes engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in some learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders regularly create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, routinely engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders intentionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, consistently engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities customized for professional staff members about action research.	1

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

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

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
10th-Grade Reading	14	46	13	46	10	47
10th-Grade Math	11	34	*	36	7	41
11th-Grade Science	*	11	*	6	*	22
11th-Grade Social Studies	14	38	7	38	8	38
11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	20	45	13	45	10	41
11th-Grade On Demand Writing	17	42	*	43	12	45

Plus

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

Delta

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

High School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	53	64	71	62	58	59
Percent Score of 60- 80	33	26	18	26	22	27
Percent Score of 100	11	8	7	9	15	11
Percent Score of 140	4	2	4	3	5	3

Plus

- The percentage of students receiving zero points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment decreased from 71% in 2023-2024 to 58% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was above the state average for the last three school years.

Delta

- The percentage of students receiving zero points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 53% in 2022-2023 to 71% in 2023-2024.

Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmarks on the American College Test (ACT)

Content Area	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
English	19	47	12	44	13	44
Reading	20	44	19	42	12	41
Math	5	33	8	30	8	30

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentages of students meeting benchmark on the ACT in the areas of English, reading and math were below the state averages for the last three years.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT in English decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT in reading decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2023-2024 and to 12% in 2024-2025.

Graduation Rate

Year	School Four-Year	State Four-Year	School Five-Year	State Five-Year
2022-2023	81.3	91.4	89.9	92.5
2023-2024	86.2	92.3	84.5	93.4
2024-2025	88.9	93.5	89.9	94.2

Plus

- The four-year graduation rate has increased each school year for the past three years.

Delta

- The four-year graduation rate has been below the state average for the past three years.
- The five-year graduation rate has been below the state average for the past three years.

Post-Secondary Readiness

Year	School	State	School w/ High Demand	State w/ High Demand
2022-2023	60.9	79.1	64.7	83.5
2023-2024	65.9	81	70.7	86
2024-2025	70.1	83	79.2	88.8

Plus

- The percentage of students who achieved post-secondary readiness has increased over the past three years.
- The percentage of students achieving post-secondary readiness with high demand has increased over the past three years.

Delta

- The percentage of students who achieved post-secondary readiness has been below the state average for the past three years.
- The percentage of students who achieved post-secondary readiness with high demand has been below the state average for the past three years.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	14	13	10
Female	12	14	11
Male	16	13	10
White	15	27	17
African American	*	*	7
Hispanic or Latino	19	6	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	29
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	11	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	5

Plus

- The percentage of White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 10th-grade reading on the KSA increased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 27% for 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of all 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	11	*	7
Female	*	*	8
Male	13	11	6
White	*	22	*
African American	*	*	6
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	27
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	10	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2024-2025.



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

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

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	14	7	8
Female	15	5	9
Male	14	10	8
White	30	10	15
African American	6	*	7
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	4	*
Economically Disadvantaged	11	5	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	4

Plus

- The percentage of all 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 7% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 5% in 2023-2024 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 10% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 6% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 5% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 30% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	20	13	10
Female	20	14	11
Male	19	11	9
White	44	23	21
African American	*	5	*
Hispanic or Latino	21	18	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	18	12	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 44% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	17	*	12
Female	14	9	11
Male	20	*	12
White	28	*	*
African American	*	*	10
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	15	*
English Learners	9	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	9	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	16	*	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA decreased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.

Schedule

Monday, March 2, 2026

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

Tuesday, March 3, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:45 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, March 4, 2026

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

Thursday, March 5, 2026

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

