



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:  
Fayette County**

Jan. 20-23, 2026

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results</b> .....	<b>5</b>
eleot Narrative .....	8
<b>Improvement Priorities</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	10
Potential Leader Actions:.....	11
Your Next Steps .....	11
<b>District Capacity in Diagnostic Review</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....	15
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	15
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....	17
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning.....	21
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning.....	23
Student Performance Data.....	27
Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress.....	28
Schedule .....	29

# 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.

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	14
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	1
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	8
<b>Certified Staff</b>	2
<b>Noncertified Staff (Board Members)</b>	2
<b>Students</b>	7
<b>Parents</b>	6
<b>Total</b>	40

## 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:**

Across interviews, stakeholders shared a common theme: Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS) has substantial resources to ensure students receive a world-class education. The district uses its "Strategic Plan," "Portrait of a Graduate (POG)" and mission and vision statements to meet the needs of all students in the district. During interviews, district staff members, parents, and students revealed that the district and Russell Cave Elementary School have welcoming environments. Family and student survey results confirmed that 91% of families and 89% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that the adults "make us feel welcomed (1)." Stakeholders took pride in the district's diverse educational programs and career pathway opportunities. This was evident in the district's vision statement: "All Fayette County Public Schools students will receive a world-class education." In interviews, stakeholders noted the community strongly supports and believes the district is committed to meeting student needs, maintaining high expectations for learning. Family survey results and student enrollment data further substantiated the district's commitment. For example, 97% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that the school has "high expectations for learning (10)", and 93% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that adults "provide resources children need for learning (8)." Collectively, these findings demonstrate a high level of community trust and confidence in the district, as evidenced by strong family survey results.

The Diagnostic Review Team also noted the district established several strategies to promote employee retention, professional development, organizational excellence, and student achievement. The district has invested fiscal resources to recruit, retain and develop its employees. For example, the district has created a "Grow Your Own" (GYO) program to recruit, develop and retain educators who are connected to their community and share lived experiences with the students they serve. Furthermore, the district has created an "Aspiring Leaders Program for Certified Staff", which offers opportunities for certified employees who are interested in pursuing leadership roles in the district; an "Aspiring Leaders Program for Classified Staff" that increases the capacity of classified hourly staff through development and leadership skills; an "Aspiring Principals Program" and a "GYO (Grow Your Own) University Partnership." Interview data indicated that the district has created a professional learning plan outlining opportunities for administrators and professional staff to engage in a variety of learning experiences to improve their professional knowledge and skills.

Interviews with district leadership indicated a commitment to providing students with educational experiences that not only engage learners but also intentionally connect them to career pathways through rigorous coursework, hands-on learning experiences, internships, and industry-recognized certifications. The district provides students with a variety of educational pathways as evidenced by interviews, review of artifacts and survey data. Through these pathways, the district provides students with culturally diverse K-12 offerings in art, music and world languages that stimulate creativity and foster global citizenship; specialized and magnet programs that support exploration in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), language immersion, liberal arts and international studies; Advanced Placement (AP), dual credit, International Baccalaureate (IB) and career pathway courses that prepare students for future success.

Data from stakeholder interviews, survey data and a review of artifacts illuminated both strengths and opportunities for improvement. For instance, the district has allocated additional human capital resources (e.g., English language instructional specialist, school-based instructional coaches) to support teachers and improve



their instructional practices. Educator survey results indicated that 78% agreed/absolutely agreed that they “participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22).” Additionally, Upbeat survey results revealed that 65% of faculty agree that “the professional development available to me helps me improve my teaching (Q5)”, and 61% of faculty agree that “the professional development available to me is a good use of my time (Q6).” However, the team found a lack of evidence that a systematic process was in place for the communication between district-based support services personnel (e.g., student support, special education, multilingual) to ensure core content teachers at Russell Cave Elementary received coordinated, targeted support focused on instructional strategies for English learners (ELs). A review of artifacts revealed the district has established a professional learning community (PLC) framework and, as outlined in the comprehensive district improvement plan (CDIP), identified PLC implementation as a priority area with the expectation that all schools effectively use the Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle to improve student learning. Educator survey data revealed that 85% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they “work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6).” Furthermore, interview data suggested that implementation fidelity of the PLC framework was inconsistent among schools throughout the district. Although grade-level teams had dedicated time to collaborate, the absence of a consistent, systematic process to monitor the effectiveness of PLC implementation limits the collective capacity of professional staff to engage in continuous improvement. Establishing such processes could further strengthen instructional coherence and help ensure that students consistently experience learning environments that allow them to thrive. This finding is supported by educator survey results, which indicate that 66% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they “provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).”

# Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 31 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	1.5	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	61%	32%	3%	3%
A2	3.0	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	3%	19%	48%	29%
A3	3.2	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	3%	13%	48%	35%
A4	1.7	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.	55%	26%	16%	3%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.3</b>				

<b>B. High Expectations Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
B1	2.5	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	3%	45%	45%	6%
B2	2.7	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	3%	29%	58%	10%
B3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	39%	45%	16%	0%
B4	2.4	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	13%	42%	35%	10%
B5	2.4	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	10%	52%	32%	6%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.4</b>			

<b>C. Supportive Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
C1	2.9	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	0%	32%	42%	26%
C2	2.8	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	0%	42%	35%	23%
C3	3.0	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	23%	58%	19%
C4	3.0	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	23%	52%	26%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.9</b>			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.8	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	0%	32%	55%	13%
D2	2.0	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	26%	52%	19%	3%
D3	2.7	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	0%	39%	48%	13%
D4	2.3	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	19%	32%	45%	3%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.5</b>			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.6	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	52%	39%	10%	0%
E2	2.8	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	0%	39%	45%	16%
E3	2.5	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	6%	52%	32%	10%
E4	1.7	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	52%	32%	13%	3%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.1</b>			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.2	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	13%	55%	32%
F2	3.1	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	13%	68%	19%
F3	3.0	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	6%	16%	52%	26%
F4	3.0	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	0%	26%	45%	29%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>3.1</b>			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	81%	19%	0%	0%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	94%	0%	6%	0%
G3	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	87%	10%	3%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.2</b>			

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team at Russell Cave Elementary School conducted 31 formal classroom observations in all core content areas, as well as informal observations in other classrooms and prevalent areas throughout the school. Data derived from these observations provided the Fayette County Schools Diagnostic Review Team with clear insights regarding instructional practices and student learning at the school. Across seven learning environments from the 2023 to the 2026 Diagnostic Review, 25 of the 28 indicators had slightly improved, while three declined. Overall, classroom observational data slightly improved compared to that collected in 2023.

Classroom observational data from the 2023 to the 2026 Diagnostic Reviews indicated some improvement, though the overall rate of progress was limited. Of the seven learning environments, five overall average ratings increased and two remained the same. The Digital Learning Environment decreased from 1.3 in 2023 to 1.2 in 2026.

Data from these observations provided the team with insight regarding student learning and instructional practices at Russell Cave Elementary School. Both interview and observational data disclosed a positive and well managed learning environment. It was evident/very evident in 87% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” Family survey results were congruent with observational data, indicating that the school was welcoming and respectful. Team members noted, based on conversations with various stakeholders, that the school administration, teachers, and support staff consistently displayed compassion and care for students. Teachers treated students with respect, as indicated by observational data, finding it to be evident/very evident in 83% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 87% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (F2).”

Interview data indicated that the district has made significant investments in instructional resources, resulting in most classrooms being well resourced. Also, in 77% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2).” Additionally, team members noted, based on conversations with multiple stakeholders, that most learners were supported and the overall environment was warm, caring and inviting. Observers noted it was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms that “learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)”, and in 78% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” While classroom observational data revealed most classrooms were well-resourced and relationally supported learning environments, student achievement data from Accessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) and stakeholder interview data highlighted a need for more targeted allocation of instructional and human capital resources for English Learners to close the achievement gap.”

The review team observed most learners being treated fairly and in a consistent manner. However, the “opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures and/or other human characteristics, conditions and dispositions (A4)” were evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms. There was little differentiated instruction observed, as it was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Furthermore, classroom observational data indicated that the use of digital tools by learners to support research, problem solving and the creation of original work was rarely observed. It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)”, and in 6% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2).”

Observations further revealed that students were often unable to describe high-quality work or have mechanisms to monitor their learning progress. In 16% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that students understood “or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Opportunities for students to “monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” were evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms. It was also evident/very evident in 3% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” Overall, observational data revealed limited evidence of consistent structures and instructional practices that supported learner self-assessment, progress monitoring, and collaborative use of digital tools.



# 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

Clearly define, communicate, and monitor a systematic process for allocating human, fiscal and instructional resources based on student data to ensure individual learners' needs are met.

**Standard 15:** Learners' needs drive the equitable allocation and management of human, material, digital and fiscal resources.

### Findings:

Interview data and a review of artifacts (e.g., PLC framework, CDIP, "Student Support PLC") indicated that the district identified a need to use PLCs to improve student learning. In addition, the "Lau Plan" identified the district's design for supporting ELs in accordance with state and federal law. Furthermore, stakeholder interviews showed the growing EL population in the district (e.g., at Russell Cave Elementary School) and the need to provide differentiated support to schools based on students' diverse needs. The Diagnostic Review Team saw evidence of PLC documents (e.g., "Student Support PLC," "Professional Learning Taskforce," "Professional Learning Plan"); however, the team observed little evidence of professional learning plans and/or documents that address effective strategies to support the diverse needs of ELs. Observational data showed little evidence that learners have opportunities to develop an appreciation for the differences in abilities, backgrounds, and dispositions. For example, it was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that "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 (A4)." The Diagnostic Review Team found limited evidence of a formal plan other than the Lau Plan. While some documents (e.g., PLC meeting agendas) showed that discussions about EL support and ELlevation were occasionally referenced, the team found little evidence showing the extent to which strategies were embedded or consistently implemented. Although EL teachers shared instructional methods during meetings, the team was unable to observe a structured process to build teachers' understanding of the underlying instructional strategies.

Disaggregated data on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) in 2024-2025 revealed that the percentage of students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 was below the state average in all content areas and in all assessed grade levels with reportable numbers. In addition, 37% of EL students did not progress on the Accessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment and received zero points. Furthermore, 16% of EL students received a score of 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment, which was below the state average. Observational data suggest a lack of rigorous coursework, as it was evident/very evident in 45% 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)." Moreover, it was evident/very evident in 61% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)."

Survey data showed that educators reported using a variety of resources to meet learners' needs. Educator survey data revealed that 80% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they "used a variety of resources to meet learners' needs and interests (19)" and 85% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they "use learner information to make decisions about distributing resources (7)." In addition, the family survey data revealed that 91% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that students "used a variety of resources to learn about things that interest them (18)" and 93% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that educators "provide resources children need



for learning (8).” Furthermore, survey data revealed that 88% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that adults “make sure we have what we need to learn (8)” and 76% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “adults use different tools to help me learn about things I like (16).” Classroom observational data and stakeholder interview data, however, differed from survey data. For instance, observational data illustrated that it was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Additionally, stakeholder interviews revealed a lack of resources and strategies to meet the learning needs of ELs. These findings suggest a need to strengthen core teacher training in EL instructional strategies, expand meaningful involvement of non-English-speaking families and community members and provide additional human resources beyond standard district allocations to ensure EL needs are effectively addressed.

Some interview data suggested immediate responsive support services when requested. However, additional evidence suggested that the system for acquiring resources and materials was not clearly defined for all appropriate stakeholders. Some interview data also suggested proactive support service responses to school data; however, this was not a consistent theme among all stakeholder interviews.

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

- Develop an internal and external communication plan that allows for clear communication of resource contacts and procedures, as well as overall communication within the district office.
- Collaborate with school leadership to implement a structured, recurring data-driven routine to inform staffing decisions, targeted professional development, and support systems for staff to guide equitable allocation of human, material, and fiscal resources to improve student outcomes, including staff serving ELs and students with disabilities.
- Continue to review the allotted resources at the comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) school to determine an appropriate and effective level of district support.

## **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.



# District Capacity in Diagnostic Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the functioning and capacity of the district to determine its ability to manage an intervention in each school identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI). As outlined in 703 KAR 5:280, Section 4, the determination of the district's level of functioning and ability is based on an assessment of capacity in the following areas:

- The district demonstrates maintenance and communication of a visionary purpose and direction committed to high expectations for learning as well as shared values and beliefs about teaching and learning;
- The district leads and operates under a governance and leadership style that promotes and supports student performance and system effectiveness;
- The district establishes a data-driven system for curriculum, instructional design, and delivery, ensuring both teacher effectiveness and student achievement;
- The district ensures that systems are in place for accurate collection and use of data;
- The district ensures that systems are in place to allocate human and fiscal resources to support improvement and ensure success for all students; and
- The district ensures that a comprehensive assessment system, which generates a range of data about student learning and system effectiveness and uses the results to guide continuous improvement, is implemented.

Following its review of extensive evidence and in consideration of the factors outlined above, the Diagnostic Review Team submitted the following assessment regarding the district's capacity to the Commissioner of Education:

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district has the capacity to manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district requires intensive support in order to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district does not have the capacity to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the Fayette County district has the capacity to lead the turnaround of Russell Cave Elementary School.

The district administration has demonstrated the ability to lead and support a visionary purpose for teaching and learning. In artifacts, the institution leader's presentation and the stakeholder interviews, the district articulates a vision and mission, which have been consistent for at least seven years and to which multiple stakeholders referred. Additionally, district and school leadership regularly calibrate through principal and assistant principal cadre meetings. The district provides guidance and expectations around PLCs, which are monitored through running minutes and regular site visits. Instructional frameworks align high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS). Also, the district has demonstrated a commitment to the continuous improvement process by attempting to provide additional support to schools with federal designations, as well as by a one-year CSI exit timeline for their last three CSI schools; however, the sustainability of resources and support was not immediately evident.



The district leads and operates under a governance and leadership style that promotes and supports student performance and system effectiveness. Kentucky School Board Association (KSBA) policies were listed in the uploaded evidence. Some school board members confirmed that board policies and procedures have created a strong foundation for governance. Some board members also noted strong student data literacy in some schools, and student data are shared quarterly at board meetings. Conversely, some board members articulated a desire for more specific school-level communication.

The district establishes a data-driven system for curriculum, instructional design, and delivery, ensuring both teacher effectiveness and student achievement using a district-wide PLC expectations document for guidance. While the extent to which the PLC expectations are followed with fidelity at every school was not immediately evident, multiple stakeholders referred to sharing and use of a variety of student academic and non-academic data in board meetings, PLCs, District Leadership Team (DLT) meetings and principal and assistant principal cadre meetings to inform next steps. Additionally, stakeholders noted that a structure exists for regular revision of district instructional frameworks.

The district creates systems for the accurate collection and use of data. Upbeat survey responses indicated strong agreement that principals use data to monitor student progress. Additionally, multiple stakeholders noted collecting a variety of data (e.g., formative, summative, benchmark). Common assessments are administered and collected data are reviewed (e.g., in PLCs); however, the extent to which data are used to change instruction remains unclear.

The district ensures that systems are in place to allocate human and fiscal resources as shown in evidence and artifact review, as well as in multiple stakeholder interviews. Many stakeholders noted the number of district resources as the institution's primary strength, adding that requests for additional resources are rarely denied. However, responses regarding knowledge and ease of accessing resources in every school varied. The CSI school is supported by three EL teachers; the school's EL population is approximately 70%.

Finally, based on artifacts and interviews, the district has continued to revise a balanced assessment system with the goal of using results to guide continuous improvement. Schools continue to use Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) as its universal screener and regularly use MAP data. The i-Ready Assessment Suite is also currently being piloted. Common assessments are administered via Pear Assessment, and some stakeholders noted that the common assessment process had recently been streamlined to help ensure consistency throughout the district; however, others gave conflicting reports regarding the continued use of teacher-made assessments.



# Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>James Driscoll</b>	James Driscoll currently serves as the superintendent for the Tempe Elementary School District. His previous experience includes teacher, dean of students, assistant principal, principal, director of special education, district hearing officer, assistant superintendent for East Area Schools and assistant superintendent of human resources. James serves as a lead evaluator for Diagnostic Reviews.
<b>Tom Stewart</b>	Tom Stewart has 30 years of experience in Kentucky public education. He has taught at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Additionally, he has four years of experience in school district administration, serving as instructional supervisor, district assessment coordinator, teacher quality and professional learning coordinator and personnel director. He has also served as an assistant professor of teacher education and an associate professor of educational administration, research, and leadership. Tom is currently an Educational Recovery Director (ERD) for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).
<b>Donna Bumps</b>	Donna Bumps is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the KDE, where she supports turnaround schools across the state in developing and implementing sustainable systems of continuous improvement. She has 26 years of experience as an educator, having served as a middle and high school teacher, assistant principal and high school principal. Donna is trained in Jim Shipley Systems and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL). She has also contributed to multiple Diagnostic Review teams over several years, serving as both a team member and an associate lead.
<b>Deloreon Burton</b>	Deloreon Burton has over 15 years of experience as a teacher and administrator in K-12. He is currently an ERL for KDE. In that role, he facilitates turnaround work and activities with principals, district leaders, and Educational Recovery (ER) staff. He collaborates with numerous stakeholders to build effective systems to support CSI schools. Before joining KDE, Deloreon was a teacher and school administrator in Louisville, Kentucky.
<b>Amy Compton</b>	Amy Compton has 27 years of educational experience, including as the director of secondary education for Bullitt County Schools. She has served as a high school and elementary school principal, an assistant principal, a guidance counselor, and a teacher. Amy is a Kagan professional learning associate trainer, a Cognitive Coaching leader, and a member of AASA's Principal Support Academy. She serves on the Board of KASA and contributes to statewide innovation through the High School Transformation Network.
<b>Michael Melton</b>	Michael C. Melton has 30 years of experience in Kentucky public education. He taught high school social studies and was a school and district administrator for 11 years as superintendent of three districts, director of physical operations, pupil personnel, safe schools, health services, counseling, Family Resource Youth Services Centers (FRYSCs), and athletics. He was also a high school assistant principal and K-8 principal. He serves on the KASA superintendent faculty. Michael is currently the superintendent of Bath County Schools.

# Appendix

## Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

### Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
1. Leaders cultivate and sustain a culture that demonstrates respect and fairness for all learners and is free from bias.	Leaders rarely model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members seldom implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders occasionally model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders regularly model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	Leaders consistently model the attributes and implement practices that shape and sustain the desired institution culture, clearly setting expectations for all staff members. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision-making that embody the values of respect and fairness for all learners and are free from bias.	3
2. Learners' well-being is at the heart of the institution's guiding principles such as mission, purpose, and beliefs.	Staff members seldom demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions may not be based on its stated values.	Staff members occasionally demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members routinely demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented, and are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members continually demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented and regularly reviewed for consistency with its stated values.	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.	3
6. Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.	Professional staff members receive few or no resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members rarely receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive some resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members periodically receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members consistently receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. A formal structure ensures that professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	4

## 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
8. The governing authority demonstrates a commitment to learners by collaborating with leaders to uphold the institution's priorities and to drive continuous improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate minimal commitment to learners and rarely support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders seldom collaborate on the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate some commitment to learners and sometimes support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to focus the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions demonstrate a commitment to learners and support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to collaboratively further the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions are regularly reviewed to ensure an uncompromised commitment to learners and the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to consistently and intentionally collaborate to further the institution's improvement.	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
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.	3
10. Leaders demonstrate expertise in recruiting, supervising, and evaluating professional staff members to optimize learning.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members without consideration of contribution to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders rarely use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders seldom supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders sometimes use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders routinely use data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders regularly implement practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	Leaders intentionally and consistently identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders consistently use analyzed data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders implement and monitor documented practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	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
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	2
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	2

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
15. Learners' needs drive the equitable allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources.	Professional staff members rarely analyze learners' needs and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources. Resources are rarely allocated in alignment with documented learners' needs or to ensure equity for learning.	Professional staff members sometimes analyze learners' needs, current, and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are sometimes based on current or updated data.	Professional staff members routinely analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are routinely based on current data and at predetermined points in time.	Professional staff members engage in a systematic process to analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are consistently based on current data at any point in time.	2

## Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
17. Learners have the support and opportunities to realize their learning potential.	Professional staff members give little or no consideration to individual learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Academic and non-academic opportunities are limited and standardized according to grade levels or a predetermined sequencing of courses. Learners frequently encounter a variety of barriers when accessing academic and non-academic offerings that would be well-suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are rarely challenged to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members consider varying learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access to some variety in academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners may encounter barriers when accessing some academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are sometimes challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members know their learners well-enough to develop and provide a variety of academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access and choice in most academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners rarely encounter barriers when accessing academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members develop relationships with and understand the needs and well-being of individual learners. Academic and non-academic experiences are tailored to the needs and well-being of individual learners. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards maximal levels of achievement and self-efficacy without barriers or hindrances by schedules or access to academic and non-academic offerings.	3
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.	3
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	2

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	3
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.	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
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.	3
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.	3
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.	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
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.	3

# Student Performance Data

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

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	19	46	20	47	28	47
4th-Grade Reading	33	48	10	50	19	50
5th-Grade Reading	24	48	*	46	19	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	*	43	24	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	10	43	17	44
5th-Grade Math	21	41	17	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	7	34	14	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	*	42	*	39	4	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	*	47	*	47	8	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	10	38

### Plus

- The percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

### Delta

- The percentages of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 were below the state averages in all grades and content areas.

### Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	20	26	25	29	37	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	31	35	27	35	34	35
Percent Score of 100	33	24	24	23	16	22
Percent Score of 140	16	14	23	13	13	13

#### Plus

- The school exceeded the state average for EL students who received 100 points for progress from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- EL students who received 140 points for progress in 2024-2025 scored at the same level as the state average.
- The school exceeded the state average for EL students who received 140 points for progress assessment from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

#### Delta

- Thirty-seven percent of EL students received 0 points for progress in 2024-2025, compared to the state average of 30%.
- Sixteen percent of EL students received 100 points for progress in 2024-2025, compared to the state average of 22%.



# Schedule

## Tuesday, January 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3 p.m.- 4:10 p.m.	Superintendent Presentation	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:10 p.m.- 4:25 p.m.	Team returns to the hotel		
5 p.m.- 6:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, January 21, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:50 a.m.	Team arrives at the institution	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:15 a.m.- 2:30 p.m.	Interviews / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
2:30 p.m.- 3 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
3:30 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, January 22, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:50 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:50 a.m.- 9:30 a.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:50 a.m.- 2:30 p.m.	Team returns to district office/ Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Friday, January 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.- 3 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members