



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Dr. J. Blaine Hudson Middle School

Feb. 17-20, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation2
 - Insights from the Review3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....5**
 - eleot Narrative8
- Improvement Priorities10**
 - Improvement Priority 110
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....11
 - Improvement Priority 212
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....13
 - Your Next Steps13
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review14**
- Team Roster16**
- Appendix17**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings17
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....17
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning19
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning21
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning23
 - Student Performance Data.....26
 - Schedule33

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	5
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	5
Certified Staff	38
Noncertified Staff	21
Students	55
Parents	2
Total	128

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

Artifacts, interviews and survey data revealed strengths in the school's identity, branding, community partnerships and empathy for students. According to the principal's presentation, Dr. J. Blaine Hudson Middle School will be "the first neighborhood middle school in West Louisville built in over 90 years." The 6th-grade campus has an interim principal overseeing it and is separate from the 7th- and 8th-grade campus. Construction of the new school is projected to be completed in two and a half years. District leadership indicated that the current middle school structure will remain in place until the new school building is completed. The Diagnostic Review Team found limited evidence of collaboration between the two campuses. Stakeholder interview data indicated that communication between the two school leaders has only recently increased.

Stakeholder interview data revealed a recurring theme that school leadership, teachers and support staff care about students and their well-being. Survey data reflected a commitment to respectful interactions with stakeholders, as 84% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." The "25-26 Character Strong Weekly Lesson Planner" indicated that a plan exists for systematic implementation of character education programming to positively influence student interactions. Stakeholder interviews revealed that a variety of sports and club offerings, including curling and lacrosse, are provided. Parent interview data identified sporting events as opportunities to volunteer and get involved. Stakeholder interviews showed community partnerships with a variety of institutions that provide student services (e.g., counseling, haircuts, mentorship, positive behavioral interventions and supports [PBIS] incentives).

The principal's presentation revealed that the school is addressing student behavior to ensure a safe and orderly learning environment. Stakeholder interviews showed that this school year, the focus shifted to instruction after addressing behavior last year. The principal's presentation also indicated a decrease in suspensions at the 6th-grade campus, and stakeholder interviews indicated a decrease in fights and other adverse student behaviors. Although suspension and school-based referral data increased in 6th and 7th grades, stakeholder interview data indicated a decrease in fights. Despite this progress, stakeholders reported that school safety remains a concern, and the school leader stated that addressing safety is an area of improvement. Family and student survey data also reflected safety concerns. Sixty-six percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make decisions to keep us safe (3)", and 58% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." Climate-related survey items found that 42% of educators selected "safe" when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?"

The "Vitals & ESZ Blueprint Design Overview & Reflection" indicated that school improvement focus includes leveraging the "Hudson 30-60-90 Day Plan" to progress monitor the implementation of learning targets, student discourse and differentiated learning. The vital signs document contained plans for feedback, coaching, professional learning, professional learning community (PLC) meetings and new teachers. Although the school had these plans, the team found little evidence of consistent practices in feedback and coaching. Stakeholder interviews suggested that classroom observations accompanied by actionable feedback were inconsistently practiced. The "Copy of Learning Walk Feedback" reflected inconsistencies in the frequency of observations,



ranging from six to 89 observations among school leadership (e.g., assistant principals, principals). Also, the team found limited evidence that a tiered coaching system was being implemented.

The team found evidence of multiple meeting structures (e.g., committees, dedicated PLC time, advisory leadership team). The “Hudson Middle School 6th Grade Meeting Schedule” reflected many of the meeting structures, and teachers indicated multiple opportunities to build leadership and provide input through assignment to committees and serving as content leads or team leads. Stakeholder interviews indicated that student behavioral data were reviewed to identify frequent behaviors and specific students for targeted behavior intervention. Teacher interview data suggested that Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data in reading and math and common formative assessment data were inconsistently reviewed in PLC meetings for whole group reteaching as opposed to small group identification.

Though the principal’s presentation identified differentiation as an instructional focus and student achievement data suggested the need for tiered instruction, the extent to which a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) was implemented was unclear. Stakeholder interview data suggested that while all teachers should know the five instructional focus areas (e.g., high-quality instructional resources [HQIRs], instructional direction, visual learning, differentiation and scaffolding, academic discourse), limited professional learning and coaching to build capacity in each of these areas was provided. The school leader indicated that implementation of instructional priorities was in its infancy and not aligned with the school’s 30-60-90-day plan.

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

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.8	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	56%	11%	33%	0%
A2	2.6	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology support.	4%	37%	59%	0%
A3	2.9	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	22%	70%	7%
A4	2.0	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.	33%	30%	37%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.3				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.9	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	26%	56%	19%	0%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	19%	59%	22%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	52%	44%	4%	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).	33%	63%	4%	0%
B5	1.9	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	22%	70%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.8				

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.	15%	59%	26%	0%
C2	2.1	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	15%	56%	30%	0%
C3	2.3	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	11%	44%	44%	0%
C4	2.5	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	11%	33%	52%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.3				



D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.6	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	48%	41%	11%	0%
D2	1.7	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	44%	41%	11%	4%
D3	2.0	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	19%	63%	19%	0%
D4	1.2	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	78%	22%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.6				

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.4	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	63%	33%	4%	0%
E2	2.1	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	22%	41%	37%	0%
E3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	15%	70%	15%	0%
E4	1.3	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	74%	19%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.7				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.6	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	15%	22%	56%	7%
F2	2.4	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	15%	37%	44%	4%
F3	2.0	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	41%	22%	33%	4%
F4	2.1	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	19%	52%	30%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.3				

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	74%	4%	22%	0%
G2	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	67%	19%	15%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.3				

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 27 classroom observations in core content classrooms and many informal observations in common areas throughout the school. The data from these observations provided the team with sufficient insight into instructional practices and classroom learning environments. Observational data revealed low overall indicator ratings, with 16 of the 28 student-centered practices evident/very evident in fewer than 30% of classrooms.

The highest-rated item was in the Equitable Learning Environment and related to treating students equitably. Instances of learners who are “treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)”, for example, were evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms. Similarly, in the Supportive Learning Environment, learners who “demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)” were evident/very evident in 56% of classrooms. In addition, learners who “speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)” were evident/very evident in 63% of classrooms. Stakeholder interviews confirmed that teachers frequently identified the students as the best thing about the school, and climate-related survey items found that 71% of educators selected “welcoming” when asked, “Which four words best describe, in general, your institution’s culture (24)?”

Some important student-centered practices were absent or inconsistently implemented across all seven learning environments. In the Equitable Learning Environment, for instance, learners who “engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” were evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms. Furthermore, instances where “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)” were evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms, and learners who “monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” were evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms. Stakeholder perception surveys confirmed the lack of student-centered practices, as 57% of students selected “listen to teachers talk” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” These results reinforce the lack of implementation of the school’s five instructional focus areas.

The team found low academic expectations in several classrooms with learners who “strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms. In addition, instances of learners who “engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)” were evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms. Additionally, the team seldom observed students using exemplars or rubrics to guide their performance task completion or differentiate their learning experience. It was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” Stakeholder perception surveys confirmed the lack of differentiated learning opportunities, as 60% of students selected “do the same work as everyone else” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?”

The team noted limited opportunities for student collaboration in learning, as it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Additionally, although the school implements a one-to-one technology program for students, learners who used digital tools/technology to “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)” were evident/very evident in 15% of classrooms and learners who use digital tools/technology to “communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)” were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms. Empowering students to use technology for communication and collaboration in learning can increase rigor, relevance and motivation.

Collectively, the team identified a lack of alignment between the school’s 30-60-90-day plan and its vision. Expectations for rigor, differentiation and student engagement were rarely reflected in practice and indicated a need for intentional action to improve instructional practice across classrooms. The school can leverage its commitment to students and instructional priorities to improve student learning outcomes.

Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement Priority 1

Establish, communicate and monitor a continuous improvement process to ensure safety and enhance student learning outcomes.

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

Findings:

The Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data revealed a lack of student growth in reading, indicating that continuous school improvement processes have been ineffective in meeting learners' needs. The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 8% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025. This outcome aligns with stakeholder interviews, stakeholder survey data, classroom observational data and a review of artifacts, which indicated inconsistent implementation and monitoring of a continuous improvement process to ensure student learning. Stakeholder survey data indicated that 53% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults try new things to improve our school (6)", while 53% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that the adults are "committed to trying new things to improve (6)." Similarly, 66% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)."

A review of documents and artifacts, as well as stakeholder interviews, indicates that elements of school improvement are present, such as protected time for PLC meetings, a comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) and identified systems for coaching, observations, feedback and professional learning, but implementation and monitoring were inconsistent. Stakeholder interview data suggested the presence of dedicated time for PLC meetings, but analysis of student performance, adjustment of instruction and planning for reteaching and scaffolding were inconsistently practiced across grade levels and content areas. The "Vitals & ESZ Blueprint Design Overview & Reflection" included a first quarter reflection for English language arts (ELA) and math. According to the quarter one reflection, "Most teachers are using HQIRs with some fidelity." Similar to the team's findings of inconsistent practice, the reflection for quarter two was incomplete.

The principal's presentation highlighted an instructional focus on HQIRs, instructional direction, visual learning, differentiation and scaffolding and academic discourse. The "Hudson Upper Next Steps" reflected a "continuous improvement plan," in which step one was to establish a sense of urgency; however, practices inconsistently demonstrated that sense of urgency. While the school identified a whole-school aim statement to increase student proficiency in reading and math by 15% by June 2026, the team found little progress toward meeting this goal and inconsistent communication of data to all stakeholder groups. Stakeholder interviews indicated that data are discussed with staff in small groups (e.g., committees, PLCs, team meetings), but schoolwide data were not consistently shared with the staff in faculty meetings. The principal's presentation reported the primary drivers as "effective PLC structure", "data-driven decision making" and "high-quality instruction." When asked about the progress of the school's 30-60-90-day plan, the school leader indicated minimal progress. Teacher interviews suggested that covering classes due to teacher absences contributed to inconsistent planning and professional learning.



Stakeholder interview data aligned with the finding of inconsistent implementation of instructional practices, as teachers frequently identified operational non-negotiables (e.g., being at their door) rather than instructional practices (e.g., the school's five instructional focuses). The "Learning Walk Observation Checklist (Physical Copy)" reflected the school's focus on communicating the learning target for lessons. Classroom observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)." Similarly, the school's observation form measured the "number of students engaged with the lesson (students on task/total number of students)", providing a data point for classroom walkthroughs. Although engagement was an area of focus for walkthroughs, it was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." These findings further support the lack of implementation of the school's instructional priorities. Similarly, climate-related survey items found that 61% of students selected "boring" when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?"

Stakeholder interviews, the principal's presentation, survey data and classroom observations indicate the continued need to focus on student behavior. Though stakeholder interviews indicated the presence of PBIS initiatives, also reflected by the "2025/2026 Hudson PBIS Matrix", the "Copy of PBIS Rewards Hudson for Students" and restorative discipline practices, classroom observations indicated that it was evident/very evident in 30% of classrooms that "learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)." The principal's presentation indicated that school-based referrals for discipline have increased along with suspensions in 7th and 8th grades. The school leader indicated in the principal interview that safety and order remain areas of focus and contribute to the lack of progress in aligning instructional priorities with the 30-60-90-day plan. Classroom observations indicated that behavior was also interfering with academic rigor, as it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)." The "Behavior Plan Primary" outlined a behavioral system that could serve as the foundation for advancing the school's approach to addressing student behavior. Leveraging community partnerships, establishing clear expectations, using consistent procedures and implementing PBIS with fidelity can help provide the stability needed for higher levels of rigor, participation and sustained academic growth.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Engage professional staff (e.g., administrators, coaches, educators) to collaboratively develop a formal continuous improvement process.
- Engage professional staff to collaboratively develop academic and behavioral goals that are clearly and consistently communicated to all stakeholders.
- Engage professional staff to disaggregate, analyze and effectively use data (e.g., walkthrough, PLC, intervention) to measure the effectiveness of professional practices and programs and determine needed adjustments.
- Implement and monitor classroom management and instructional expectations informed by observational and behavioral data.

Improvement Priority 2

Collaboratively develop and document a systematic process to monitor and adjust instructional practices to meet individual student needs through tiered instruction.

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

Findings:

An analysis of the 2024-2025 KSA student performance data indicated multiple areas of concern. The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025. The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading also decreased from 8% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025. While student performance data for other subgroups in reading were suppressed for public reporting and all subgroup data for math were suppressed for public reporting, student subgroup performance data align with classroom observations, stakeholder interviews, stakeholder perception data and artifacts, which indicate the need for an intensive and urgent focus in the areas of differentiation and tiered instruction.

Classroom observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 15% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)”, and evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” These observations were consistent with stakeholder perception survey data wherein 45% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)” and 47% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15).” Climate-related survey items also aligned, as 61% of families selected “all learners complete the same activity” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like in most of your child’s classes (23)?”, and 60% of students selected “do the same work as everyone else” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” Stakeholder interview data indicated that teachers discuss assessment data in PLC settings, but the team found limited evidence of consistent differentiation and instructional adjustments to meet the needs of student groups.

The “Running Math Agenda” outlined the PLC agenda for math but lacked alignment with the “Hudson PLC Cycle Protocol.” Elements were missing from the “Running Math Agenda”, such as the four critical PLC questions and data analysis. The “Hudson PLC Cycle Protocol” indicated dedicated time to “plan for intervention and enrichment,” but it remained unclear whether instruction was adjusted to meet the needs of individual students and student groups. The “Copy of Hudson TCT Math Agenda” included reflection on the four critical PLC questions, identified 70% as the common formative assessment (CFA) benchmark and differentiated lessons through scaffolding for students who did not meet the benchmark. Differences in the PLC protocol at the 6th-grade campus compared to the 7th- and 8th-grade campus indicated a lack of alignment in PLC practices between the two campuses. The artifact titled “Hudson One Stop Shop” reflected the PLC practice of the 6th-grade campus, and the four critical PLC questions were not indicated on the document. Expectations for instructional practices were communicated at the beginning of the school year, as evidenced in the “Hudson Upper Next Steps.” Classroom observations indicated that it was evident/very evident in 15% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)”, indicating a lack of alignment with the Journey to Success district initiative and likely contributing to the stakeholder perception survey data in which 59% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that will prepare me for my future (11).” Similarly, 55% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child had lessons that prepared them for their future (13).” Classroom observational data indicated that it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that “learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their



work is assessed (E4).” Climate-related surveys showed that 7% of students selected “use rubrics” when asked “Which four phrases best describe the ways your teachers measure your learning progress (24)?”, and 23% of teachers selected “use rubrics” when asked “Which four phrases best describe, in general, the ways educators in your institution monitor learners’ progress (28)?”

The school leader reported that an intentional focus on building teacher capacity through coaching and feedback will help meet the needs of individual learners and stated that the school needs to become more instructionally focused since behavior has improved. The school can leverage the identified strength of caring about students to foster buy-in and urgency in implementing instructional practices to improve student outcomes. Prioritizing high expectations, professional learning, coaching and data-driven instruction through daily action will enable the school to meet goals and improve student achievement.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Clearly communicate and consistently implement and monitor instructional expectations that promote rigorous instruction, high expectations and the strategic use of classroom data to provide tiered interventions that support academic growth.
- Integrate evidence-based instructional strategies into ongoing professional learning to build shared understanding and ensure consistent implementation across staff.
- Collect, analyze and use student learning data to adjust teaching strategies and interventions based on students’ needs.
- Develop and implement a system of coaching and feedback to increase teacher capacity to carry out instructional expectations to meet the needs of each student.

Your Next Steps

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. J. Blaine Hudson Middle School was established in 2023, with the principal leading the opening of the school. The school initially served 6th-grade students, with 7th and 8th grades added in consecutive years. Beginning in Aug. 2025, the school expanded to serve 6th to 8th grades across two campuses. During this transition, the principal received limited direction and support to manage the operational and instructional complexities of leading one school across two campuses, highlighting broader systemic gaps in district planning and the provision of timely leadership support.

The school received a Two-Day Review in Feb. 2025. While the principal has initiated actions aligned to the improvement priorities, inconsistent communication, minimal collaboration between the two building leaders, unclear next steps and insufficient follow up continue to impede effective implementation. Despite expressing a commitment to making the school more effective for students, teachers and staff, families and the community, the principal's tendency to become consumed by daily operational demands limits her ability to lead strategically and implement the action steps necessary to advance improvement efforts that positively impact student learning. The principal is not consistently present in hallways and classrooms, which reduces her visibility and limits her ability to model expectations, monitor instruction and support a culture of continuous improvement. Although the principal developed the five instructional expectations and there is evidence of walkthroughs occurring, she has not cultivated the mutual commitment and accountability required for consistent schoolwide implementation. Inconsistent walkthrough routines, limited coaching structures and variability in the quality and frequency of feedback provided to teachers indicate that key leadership systems for monitoring, supporting and reinforcing instructional expectations are not yet fully established.

While the school has a driver diagram and a 30-60-90-day plan, these documents were created largely by district support staff with minimal involvement from the principal and school leadership team. This limited collaboration has reduced shared understanding, alignment and ownership of these plans. The principal has not implemented or modeled a formal Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) improvement cycle, which limits the school's ability to engage in systematic planning, progress monitoring and evidence-based adjustments. Evidence and interviews indicate there is protected time for PLCs, and protocols exist; however, implementation is in the early stages. The principal does not consistently attend PLC meetings to model expectations or ensure that teams are engaging in the agreed-upon collaborative practices. As a result, PLCs operate with varying levels of implementation, and different protocols are used across the two buildings without clear alignment or accountability.

The principal needs targeted support to strengthen her role as the school's instructional leader by developing the knowledge, skills, and routines necessary to guide high-quality teaching and learning across both buildings. This includes establishing consistent instructional presence, protecting time for walkthroughs and feedback and ensuring alignment and coherence in collaborative practices. The principal requires support to design, implement and evaluate a walkthrough system that functions as an integrated component of the school's coaching and feedback structures, ensuring that evidence collected through walkthroughs directly informs instructional practices and student outcomes.

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
Stephen Hammock	Stephen Hammock is the principal of Newton High School in Covington, Georgia. During his 13 years in education, spanning K-12, Stephen has served as a general education teacher, special education teacher, bus driver, athletics coach, assistant athletics director, assistant principal, principal and district school improvement specialist. In the roles, he supervised attendance and engagement, climate and culture, special education, mathematics, social studies and teacher recruitment and retention.
Kim Bullard	Kim Bullard serves as the Educational Recovery Director (ERD) for both the north/east region and the Continuous Improvement Coaches for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). She has over 28 years of experience in education, spanning secondary classroom instruction, mathematics coaching, instructional leadership and administrative roles in curriculum, instruction and assessment. Throughout her career, Kim has collaborated with district and school leadership to design and implement strategic improvement plans, establish sustainable systems and strengthen processes that drive continuous improvement. Her expertise lies in building capacity across organizations to ensure long-term success in teaching, learning and student achievement.
Clint Graham	Clint Graham has over 17 years of experience in education and has been with KDE as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) for three years, where he supports CSI schools. He has held multiple leadership roles throughout his educational career, including serving as an assistant principal for three years and a high school principal for five years. While working for KDE, he has had the opportunity to present at state meetings on the efforts and successes of continuous improvement strategies.
Carlisha Kent	Carlisha (Carla) Kent serves as the principal of Shelby County High School. She brings extensive experience in secondary education, classroom instruction, instructional coaching and school leadership, having served in multiple administrative roles focused on curriculum, instruction and assessment. Throughout her career, Carlisha has collaborated with teachers and district leaders to design and implement new teacher mentorship programs, establish strong instructional systems and strengthen processes that drive continuous improvement.
Sarah Brown	Sarah Brown serves as a district instructional coordinator, focusing on mathematics and science in Owensboro, Kentucky. She has over 13 years of experience in education. Her specialty is in creating sustainable systems backed in research, driven by data and invested in collaboration. Prior to that, she taught in urban and rural high schools in Kentucky. In addition, she has served as an instructional coach of a large high school where she helped develop intervention programs and establish professional learning communities.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
3. Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.	Leaders establish conditions that rarely result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders seldom collaborate with stakeholders. Institutions choose areas of focus that are rarely based on data about learners.	Leaders establish conditions that occasionally result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus that are sometimes based on data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that regularly result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders routinely collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that consistently result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders consistently collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions implement a formal process to choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	2
5. Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners.	The institution's operating practices rarely cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members may or may not interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, or consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members rarely work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's operating practices somewhat cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members generally interact with respect and cooperation, periodically learn from one another, and somewhat consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members sometimes work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members regularly interact with respect and cooperation, often learn from one another, and routinely consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members often work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration and are monitored for fidelity of implementation. Professional staff members consistently interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, and consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members intentionally and consistently work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	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.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	2
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy 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.	1
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.	2
25. Leaders promote action research by professional staff members to improve their practice and advance learning.	Leaders rarely create a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution or learning environments. Professional staff members seldom engage in action research to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in few or no learning opportunities for professional staff members about action research.	Leaders occasionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, sometimes engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in some learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders regularly create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, routinely engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders intentionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, consistently engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities customized for professional staff members about action research.	1

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

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

Student Performance Data

An asterisk in a performance data chart indicates that the corresponding student performance level data have been suppressed for public reporting. Not Applicable (N/A) represents years when respective grade levels were not part of the school’s accountability.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Reading	N/A	48	8	49	7	52
7th-Grade Reading	N/A	45	N/A	47	*	48
6th-Grade Math	N/A	38	*	42	*	41
7th-Grade Math	N/A	37	N/A	39	*	43
7th-Grade Science	N/A	23	N/A	22	*	29

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 6th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 8% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025.

Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	N/A	68	93	66	71	60
Percent Score of 60-80	N/A	24	7	23	21	26
Percent Score of 100	N/A	7	0	8	8	10
Percent Score of 140	N/A	2	0	3	0	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 93% in 2023-2024 to 71% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 0% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of students receiving zero points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was 71%, which is higher than the state average of 60%.
- The percentage of ELs receiving 140 points for progress on the 2024-2025 ACCESS assessment was 0%, while the state average was 3%.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	N/A	8	7
Female	N/A	9	8
Male	N/A	*	*
White	N/A	*	*
African American	N/A	7	8
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	*	*
Asian	N/A	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	N/A	*	*
Two or More Races	N/A	*	*
English Learners	N/A	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	N/A	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	8	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	N/A	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 8% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Schedule

Tuesday, Feb. 17, 2026

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

Wednesday, Feb. 18, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 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

Thursday, Feb. 19, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 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

Friday, Feb. 20, 2026

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