Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

cognia™

Table of Contents

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	2
Building-Level Administrators	6
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	8
Certified Staff	23
Noncertified Staff	4
Students	6
Parents	4
Total	53

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 the 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

Fairdale High is in an emerging phase of continuous improvement. Evidence indicates that school leadership has recently clarified priorities, named expectations for adult practice and developed structures intended to support monitoring and adjustment. The principal overview presentation showed the school has organized its current improvement work around four focus areas: Expeditionary Learning (EL Education) as an instructional framework, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) language strategies for English learner (EL) students, literacy and numeracy. These focus areas reflect an intentional effort to build coherence in daily instruction and strengthen learner experiences.

As part of this emerging approach, the school leadership has focused on implementing the EL Education Core Practices to strengthen instructional consistency and shared language for teaching and learning. Interviews and a review of documents described the Core Practices as the "Instructional Bible" and the school's current emphasis includes planning effective lessons, delivering effective lessons, planning for and supporting high-quality student work and crafting and using learning targets. EL Education has three interconnected parts consisting of character, mastery of knowledge and skills and high-quality student work, which establishes an emerging picture of what the school expects learners to experience across classrooms. In addition, a review of curriculum materials identified myPerspectives as the adopted high-quality instructional resource (HQIR) for literacy and Illustrative Math (IM) as the HQIR for math in grades 9-11. Staff interview data indicate that the implementation of IM has been challenging, suggesting that the school will need consistent monitoring and support to ensure that instructional resources are implemented with fidelity and aligned with expectations for grade-level rigor and high-quality student work.

Stakeholder perceptions and interview evidence suggest the school has cultural conditions that can support continuous improvement work, particularly with respect to safety, respectful interactions and relationships. Survey results showed that 75% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make decisions to keep us safe (3)." Similarly, 87% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we think of everyone's safety when making decisions (3)", and 87% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." Survey results also showed that 91% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Interviews further reinforced that the school was focusing on building relational culture, including staff statements about the school feeling like home and descriptions of a family environment. The school's culture is supported by the CREW structure, which the school described as a 50-minute block scheduled on Tuesdays through Fridays, where each CREW has 12 to 15 students. CREW is designed to build community, mentorship and leadership over four years. Survey data aligned with these findings. For example, 74% of educators selected "welcoming", 73% selected "respectful" and 72% selected "safe" when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?" When asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?", 79% of families selected "safe", 77% selected "respectful" and 68% selected "welcoming."

Student performance data on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) provides a clear rationale for why the school's emerging improvement cycle must mature into consistent implementation and impact monitoring. In

2024-2025, 28% of 10th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, compared to the state average of 47%, and 21% in math, compared to the state average of 41%. In 2024-2025, 31% of 11th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing compared to the state average of 45%. ACT benchmark performance also remained below the state average in 2024-2025, with 22% of students meeting the English benchmark compared to the state average of 44%, 24% meeting the reading benchmark compared to the state average of 41% and 15% meeting the math benchmark compared to the state average of 30%.

Evidence indicates that school leadership has begun developing tools and routines intended to move from priority-setting to consistent implementation and monitoring. A review of walkthrough and professional learning community (PLC) documents (e.g., "Walkthrough Data Cycles 1–3 with Next Steps", "PLC Expectations", "Sample PLC Meeting 1", "Sample PLC Meeting 2", "Sample PLC Meeting 3", "Sample PLC Meeting 4", "Instructional Systems Monitoring Tool - Curriculum & Instruction") indicated the school has established structures intended to support common expectations, monitoring and feedback cycles. A review of the evidence shows that the "PLC Minutes Tracker with Context" is a system to capture teamwork. At the same time, interview evidence suggested that staff experience these systems inconsistently, and several staff expressed a desire for clearer communication, greater transparency and more shared leadership. Many staff members also indicated that more feedback would be appreciated, noting that individual feedback after walkthroughs is not always timely or actionable. Some staff were unclear about what walkthrough data are collected and how those data inform support and evaluation. Interview data revealed that communication systems related to scheduling and the volume of initiatives can be overwhelming, suggesting that school leadership may need to further align these systems so that staff receive clear priorities, consistent feedback and targeted support tied to evidence of learner outcomes.

Classroom observations further show the need to strengthen implementation consistency as the school's continuous improvement work matures. Observational results indicated that the school was working to establish strong foundational conditions for learning. The school has an opportunity to leverage those conditions to strengthen high expectations and learner-centered practices. It was evident/very evident in 74% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)", and that "learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)." In contrast, key learner-centered indicators were observed less consistently. It was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." These results indicate a learner-experience gap between intended responsiveness and the consistency of student experiences across classrooms.

In summary, evidence indicates the school is building an emerging continuous improvement foundation supported by improving climate conditions, defined improvement priorities and developing monitoring structures. The team suggests that the school take this opportunity to increase its implementation coherence, so systems and routines consistently translate into daily instructional practice that improves learner outcomes. School leadership can leverage existing relationships, the CREW structure and staff commitment to culture to strengthen shared expectations for instruction and increase the consistency of differentiation and learner responsiveness. By tightening monitoring and feedback loops, leadership can ensure teachers receive clear, actionable guidance connected to evidence of student learning and performance.

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 42 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.	55%	21%	17%	7%
A2	2.6	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	5%	43%	40%	12%
A3	2.8	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	2%	26%	60%	12%
A4	1.8	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.	50%	24%	19%	7%
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.	36%	40%	21%	2%
B2	2.1	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	29%	38%	31%	2%
B3	1.6	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	55%	31%	14%	0%
B4	2.0	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	31%	38%	31%	0%
B5	1.7	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	43%	40%	17%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.9**				

		C. Supportive Learning Environment				
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
C1	2.3	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	17%	45%	29%	10%
C2	2.3	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	17%	45%	31%	7%
C3	2.5	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	7%	48%	33%	12%
C4	2.7	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	7%	29%	48%	17%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.5**				

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
D1	2.1	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	21%	45%	31%	2%
D2	2.3	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	24%	38%	21%	17%
D3	2.4	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	10%	52%	26%	12%
D4	2.0	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks, and/or assignments.	36%	33%	26%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.2**				

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
E1	1.8	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	48%	31%	17%	5%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	17%	45%	33%	5%
E3	2.1	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	17%	55%	29%	0%
E4	1.6	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	60%	24%	17%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.9**				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
F1	2.9	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	5%	21%	55%	19%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	7%	19%	57%	17%
F3	2.3	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	21%	38%	31%	10%
F4	2.5	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	12%	40%	36%	12%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:	**2.6**					

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	71%	10%	19%	0%
G2	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	74%	12%	14%	0%
G3	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	74%	17%	10%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:	**1.4**					

eleot Narrative

Observational results reflect supportive relationships between learners and adults. The Supportive Learning Environment earned an overall rating of 2.5 on a 4-point scale, and it was evident/very evident in 65% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)." This evidence aligns with stakeholder survey results indicating relational trust and approachability, as 68% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)," and 88% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." However, interviews suggest that, while

the environment is positive, learning experiences are not consistently perceived as engaging. Student interview data showed themes of a positive climate alongside concerns about engagement, suggesting an opportunity to leverage strong relationships and the positive climate to increase cognitive engagement.

The team's primary instructional concern centered on the consistency of learner-centered practices, especially differentiation and engagement. The team found inconsistent learner-centered practices across classrooms. In the Equitable Learning Environment, the overall rating was 2.3, and it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." This observational data aligns with student survey results, as 46% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." In contrast, family survey results showed that 75% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child had instruction changed to meet their needs (15)", and 78% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child had learning experiences that were unique to their needs (17)." Stakeholder interview data also suggested a perception gap in how adults and students experience instructional responsiveness and engagement. Also related to engagement, the Active Learning Environment earned an overall rating of 2.2 and evidence of active learning practices remained inconsistent. It was evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms that "learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)", and it was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms that "learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)." Student survey results echoed this opportunity, as 60% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12)."

Observational data also identified a need to strengthen rigor, progress monitoring and feedback practices to support improved student outcomes. The High Expectations Learning Environment earned an overall rating of 1.9. It was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)." It was evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)", and it was evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment also earned an overall rating of 1.9. It was evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)", and it was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms that "learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)." This observational data aligns with educator survey evidence indicating inconsistency in expectations, as 63% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)." Further, the previously referenced student performance data on the KSA reinforces the need to strengthen rigor, monitoring and instructional coherence.

Finally, the Digital Learning Environment was rated lowest, with an overall rating of 1.4, indicating an opportunity to strengthen learners' use of technology for authentic learning tasks. It was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that "learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)." It was evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms that "learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)", and it was evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms that "learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)."

Collectively, observational results aligned with survey, interview and student performance data that indicate the school is building a strong climate foundation, but greater consistency is needed in differentiation, rigorous learner-centered instruction, progress monitoring, feedback and purposeful technology use to improve achievement and readiness 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

Strengthen and monitor the consistent delivery of rigorous, learner-centered instruction aligned to the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) by ensuring all teachers implement high-yield strategies that require grade-level thinking, produce high-quality student work and include routine instructional adjustments based on learner evidence.

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

Findings:

Evidence indicates that the school inconsistently implements rigorous, learner-centered instruction aligned with the KAS, even though school leadership has established tools and structures intended to guide instructional improvements. For example, the team reviewed the "EL Core Practices 32-37 Overview", "2 Day Review Standard 21 Response Plan" and "2025-26 Fairdale_30-60-90 Day Plan", which reflect an intentional focus on improving instruction through a shared framework and monitoring routines. Stakeholder interviews further indicate that teachers are expected to plan and deliver instruction with an emphasis on learning targets and high-quality student work. However, educator interviews also indicated that implementing IM has been challenging, suggesting that school leadership needs to monitor and more consistently support the use of HQIRs to ensure grade-level rigor and task quality across classrooms.

Student performance data reinforces the need for this improvement priority and indicates that the school lacks the level of instructional consistency required to build depth of knowledge, improve academic skills mastery and promote academic behaviors required for readiness outcomes. In 2024-2025, 28% of 10th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA, compared to the state average of 47% and 21% of students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math, compared to the state average of 41%. Student performance data shows graduation outcomes improved, as the four-year cohort graduation rate increased from 83.2% in 2022-2023 to 88.7% in 2024-2025, while the state four-year cohort graduation rate increased from 91.4% in 2022-2023 to 93.5% in 2024-2025. Postsecondary readiness declined from 73.2 in 2022-2023 to 61.3 in 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 83 in 2024-2025. At the same time, EL progress data reflected a relative strength. Thirteen percent of ELs received 100 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment in 2024-2025, surpassing the 11% state average. Four percent of ELs received 140 points on the ACCESS assessment in 2024-2025, exceeding the state average of 3%.

Classroom observational data indicated that the strongest instructional foundation is classroom management rather than consistent learner-centered instruction and high academic expectations. Observational data indicated that respectful and orderly learning environments were common, yet the instructional indicators most closely aligned with Cognia Standard 21 were seldom observed in classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." It was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)." It was evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." It was evident/very evident in 31% 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)." Evidence of learners monitoring their own learning progress was also limited, with it being evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms

that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)." These findings suggest that instructional expectations are not consistently translated into daily classroom practice across departments and course levels.

Stakeholder perception and interview evidence align with classroom observational data and further support the need to strengthen instructional responsiveness, task quality and learner ownership. Survey results showed that 46% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)", indicating that students inconsistently experience adjustments tailored to their needs. Educator perception results showed that 63% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)", suggesting inconsistency in the extent to which high expectations are experienced across classrooms. Survey data provide additional context for the lack of these practices. For example, when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?", 66% of students selected "safe", 58% selected "welcoming", 54% selected "boring" and 47% selected "fair." Collectively, these data suggest that students experience a predominantly positive climate but have limited academic engagement.

The team found little evidence of monitoring routines and feedback systems, suggesting that these practices lack the consistency needed to drive instructional changes across classrooms. A review of documents reveals descriptions of walkthrough cycles, PLC routines and instructional monitoring processes intended to support improvement. Stakeholder interviews indicated that staff value support from instructional coaches, assistant principals, counselors and teacher leaders. Most staff also reported that more individualized feedback is needed. Interview data indicated a need for additional feedback in coaching. Staff also described a need for improved monitoring and clearer feedback loops and some questioned whether instruction consistently matches the school's expectations for learning. This evidence indicates an opportunity to strengthen the clarity, frequency and impact of feedback so teachers receive actionable guidance tied to task quality, differentiation and evidence of student learning.

Collectively, student performance data, classroom observations, stakeholder surveys and interviews along with a review of evidence indicate the school has defined instructional tools and a positive school climate, while greater consistency is needed in rigorous, learner-centered instruction aligned to the KAS, including differentiation, high-quality student work, progress monitoring and routine instructional adjustments based on learner evidence.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Define the non-negotiables for high expectations and learner-centered instruction aligned to the rigor of the KAS and ensure they are internalized and operationalized schoolwide.

- Drive daily instructional consistency by establishing and communicating a concise set of instructional "look fors" that will be monitored through calibrated walkthrough cycles with timely, action-based feedback.

- Formalize intervention strategies and processes to support individual learner needs. Monitor differentiation during walkthroughs and team planning, and review evidence of how adjustments improve learning for identified students.

- Leverage PLCs as engines of rigor and measurable growth by establishing routines that consistently analyze learner evidence, plan standards-aligned lessons, design rigorous tasks, define what quality work looks like and plan for implementation of differentiation strategies for specific learners.

- Leverage CREW to reinforce academic goal setting, progress monitoring and readiness planning so students build ownership of learning and high expectations are reinforced daily across instructional and support structures.

Your Next Steps

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

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

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.

- Develop plans to address the Improvement Priorities identified by the Diagnostic Review Team.

- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.

- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The principal seeks to make the school more effective for all students, staff members, families and the broader community by intentionally establishing and refining conditions that support continuous improvement. Evidence indicates that demographic shifts beginning in 2023, coupled with declining student performance, heightened the sense of urgency for change. In response, the principal sought effective models of school transformation and engaged in professional learning through Buildership University in partnership with EL Education. This learning informed a revision of the school's vision, mission and collective commitments leading into the 2025–2026 school year. The revised vision emphasizes that all students pursue college and career readiness and is grounded in a whole-child philosophy integrating literacy, numeracy, character development and postsecondary pathways through the Academies of Louisville model. While artifacts reflect collective commitments to clarity and alignment, stakeholder feedback indicates that continued attention to role clarity and system implementation expectations will strengthen this work.

The principal uses methods of continuous improvement to advance the school's vision and mission. In response to demographic changes and instructional needs, the principal developed a multi-year improvement plan grounded in Expeditionary Learning Core Practices. This work reflects the principal's capacity to anticipate improvement needs and initiate forward momentum in the early stages of implementation. The plan supports phased implementation over five years, with current emphasis on planning effective lessons, delivering effective lessons, planning for and supporting high-quality student work and crafting and using learning targets. This approach establishes clarity toward a common set of expectations aligned with the instructional vision.

The principal established the Student Support Shared Leadership Team as a direct result of findings from the 2024–2025 Two-Day Review, which identified Cognia Performance Standards 7 and 21 as improvement

priorities. This structure is intended to provide opportunities for increased coherence across student support systems and strengthen shared instructional leadership as implementation continues. Administrative roles were realigned to sharpen the school's focus on instructional improvement and to provide targeted support for multilingual learners (MLs) and students with disabilities.

While maintaining a focus on improvement, the principal provides time and structures for the school community to process change through phased implementation plans, including 30-60-90 day plans, which prioritize mastery of knowledge and skills, character development and high-quality student work. CREW, embedded in the master schedule, supports relationship-building, mentorship and leadership development, reinforcing a positive school culture. HQIRs are aligned with Expeditionary Learning Core Practices to guide instruction, and the SIOP model is implemented across content areas to support MLs. Walkthrough tools and PLC protocols are used to monitor implementation and progress; however, staff feedback from interviews indicate a need for more consistent and individualized feedback, clearer use of data and a stronger emphasis on instructional impact rather than compliance.

Overall, the evidence demonstrates that the principal possesses the knowledge, skills and leadership capacity to guide the school's turnaround by establishing clear direction, managing change effectively and strengthening systems and coherence in alignment with PSEL Standard 10.

Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Senaca Baines	Senaca Baines has 25 years of experience as a teacher and administrator. He is currently the director of student services and science content specialist in Jasper County School District in Ridgeland, South Carolina. In that position, he coordinates alternative education, child welfare and attendance, discipline procedures, grant-funded programs, guidance services, school safety and science curriculum implementation. Seneca is endorsed as a Transformational Leader via his completion of the South Carolina Transformation Leadership Academy. Seneca spent 15 years as a middle and high school administrator.
Denva Smith	Denva Smith has over 27 years of experience in education, serving as a teacher, reading interventionist, instructional coach and district administrator. As an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), she leads improvement initiatives in CSI schools and state-managed districts and targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools. Denva is a certified trainer for Jim Shipley Systems & Associates and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL).
Amanda Abell	Amanda Abell is an educational leader with 27 years of experience in K-12 education. She began her career as a classroom educator and has since served as a curriculum resource teacher, associate director for Green River Regional Educational Cooperative, district administrator, assistant superintendent and superintendent. Amanda has led work in literacy, educator effectiveness, data-based decision making and professional growth systems.
Ben Fritz	Ben Fritz has served in education for 20 years. Previously, he taught business and marketing at East Carter High School in Kentucky. Following his tenure as a teacher, he served as an assistant principal during the school's turnaround. Ben then began his first tenure with the KDE, serving as an ERL for seven years. He also served as principal at Boyd County High School before returning to the KDE in 2024-2025. Ben is a certified trainer for Jim Shipley Systems & Associates and NISL.
Kimberly Whitt	Kimberly Whitt is the director of special education and preschool director for Bath County Schools. She has 34 years of experience in special education and 10 years in district leadership. Kim oversees Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) programming, early childhood services, after-school programming, school-based decision making (SBDM) initiatives that support inclusive, trauma-informed practices and multiple Kentucky All STARS 5-STAR rated preschool centers.

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.	3

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

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
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine	Leaders occasionally implement a process to	Leaders routinely implement a documented	Leaders consistently implement a documented	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
programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	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.	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.	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.	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.	
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.	3

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	2
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	2
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	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	29	46	24	46	28	47
10th-Grade Math	18	34	16	36	21	41
11th-Grade Science	*	11	*	6	*	22
11th-Grade Social Studies	23	38	15	38	20	38
11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	27	45	24	45	21	41
11th-Grade On Demand Writing	22	42	29	43	31	45

Plus

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

Delta

- While the percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 31% in 2024-2025, scores remained below the state averages.
- While the percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading and math increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025, scores remain below the state averages.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- For all available data, the school performed below the state average at all grades and all 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	68	64	66	62	52	59
Percent Score of 60-80	24	26	23	26	30	27
Percent Score of 100	6	8	9	9	13	11
Percent Score of 140	2	2	2	3	4	3

Plus

- The percentage of EL students who received 0 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 68% in 2022-2023 to 66% in 2023-2024 and from 66% in 2023-2024 to 52% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 6% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2024-2025 and exceeded the state average of 11%.
- The percentage of EL students who received 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 2% in 2022-2023 to 4% in 2024-2025 and exceeded the state average of 3%.

Delta

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

Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmarks on the ACT

Content Area	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
English	26	47	21	44	22	44
Reading	24	44	24	42	24	41
Math	13	33	14	30	15	30

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in English declined from 26% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024 and was below the state average for all three years.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in reading remained the same from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 at 24% and was below the state average.
- The percentage of students meeting the benchmark in math increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 15% 2024-2025 but was below the state average of 30%.

Graduation Rate

Year	School Four-Year	State Four-Year	School Five-Year	State Five-Year
2022-2023	83.2	91.4	86.7	92.5
2023-2024	88.9	92.3	86.6	93.4
2024-2025	88.7	93.5	90.9	94.2

Plus

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

Delta

- While the 4-year cohort graduation rate increased from 83.2% in 2022-2023 to 88.9% in 2023-2024, it was below the state average.
- While the 5-year cohort graduation rate increased from 86.6% in 2023-2024 to 90.9% in 2024-2025, it was below the state average.
- The 4-year cohort graduation rate decreased from 88.9% in 2023-2024 to 88.7% in 2024-2025.
- The 5-year cohort graduation rate decreased from 86.7% in 2022-2023 to 86.6% in 2024-2025.

Post-Secondary Readiness

Year	School	State	School w/ High Demand	State w/ High Demand
2022-2023	73.2	79.1	79.6	83.5
2023-2024	64	81	66.8	86
2024-2025	61.3	83	64	88.8

Plus

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

Delta

- Post-Secondary Readiness decreased from 73.2 in 2022-2023 to 61.3 in 2024-2025.
- Post-Secondary Readiness with High Demand decreased from 79.6 in 2022-2023 to 64 in 2024-2025.
- All Post-Secondary Readiness scores fell below the state averages in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	29	24	28
Female	36	27	29
Male	22	21	28
White	34	20	35
African American	16	25	17
Hispanic or Latino	29	21	24
Asian	36	50	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	28	23	26
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	11	*

Plus

- The percentage of 10th-grade African American and Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade female, male, Hispanic or Latino, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 10th-grade female, male, White, Hispanic or Latino, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 17% 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	18	16	21
Female	14	15	21
Male	22	16	21
White	21	19	31
African American	15	*	7
Hispanic or Latino	15	11	14
Asian	18	50	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	19	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	2	*
Economically Disadvantaged	17	14	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	9	*

Plus

- The percentage of 10th-grade female and Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade female, male, White, Hispanic or Latino, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 10th-grade male, White, Hispanic or Latino, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 7% 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	*	*	8
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	12
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

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

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	23	15	20
Female	22	14	21
Male	23	16	20
White	22	19	24
African American	27	*	11
Hispanic or Latino	22	13	16
Asian	*	*	33
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	8	*	6
English Learners plus Monitored	9	*	5
Economically Disadvantaged	19	12	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	16	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade female, male, White, Hispanic or Latino, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in social studies increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade female, male, White, Hispanic or Latino, economically disadvantaged and all students in grade 11 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade African American, ELs and ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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	27	24	21
Female	26	23	25
Male	27	25	18
White	30	28	28
African American	22	26	9
Hispanic or Latino	25	*	16
Asian	*	*	42
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	6	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	9	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	25	22	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	19	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 23% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade female, male, White, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade male, African American, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025.

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	22	29	31
Female	27	37	38
Male	*	21	25
White	23	37	36
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	24	18	30
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	29	30
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade female, White and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in on-demand writing increased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female, male, Hispanic or Latino, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in on-demand writing increased from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in on-demand writing decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in on-demand writing decreased from 37% in 2023-2024 to 36% in 2024-2025.

Schedule

Tuesday, January 20, 2026

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

Wednesday, January 21, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:40 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, January 22, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:40 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 #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Friday, January 23, 2026

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