



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South

Jan. 12-15, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	5
eleot Narrative	8
Improvement Priorities	10
Improvement Priority 1	10
Potential Leader Actions:	11
Improvement Priority 2	12
Potential Leader Actions:	13
Your Next Steps	13
Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention (MRI) Schools	14
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	16
Team Roster	18
Appendix	19
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	21
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	23
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	25
Student Performance Data	29
Schedule	41

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	1
Building-Level Administrators	4
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	8
Certified Staff	23
Noncertified Staff	11
Students	54
Parents	2
Total	103

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 team's findings. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned with research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

Strengths and Continuous Improvement:

The Diagnostic Review Team identified strengths at Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South through the review of multiple data points, including perception surveys, stakeholder interviews, classroom observations and a review of artifacts provided by the school. For example, stakeholder interview data indicated that 83% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "Learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)." Students stated in interviews that negative consequences result when they are not welcoming or inclusive toward others. Also, students reported that the diversity of the student body, faculty and staff was an additional strength. Survey data showed 81% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)." Classroom observations reflected the use of translation devices and assistance from staff or peers to communicate with multilingual learner (ML) students. The school pledge found in the "School Handbook" and a document titled "Olmsted Academy South" reflect inclusivity and read in part, "At OAS, we all matter" and "Together, we will rise."

Findings from observational and stakeholder survey data collectively indicate safety as a notable strength. Specifically, stakeholder perception data revealed 84% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." In alignment with this perception, a review of artifacts and observations confirmed multiple structural systems that support a safe learning environment. The "Admin/Resource Meeting Agenda" identified an upcoming meeting between the principal and the school resource officer (SRO), reinforcing collaborative safety planning. Additionally, observational data indicated the presence of the "Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Matrix" in classrooms, which outlines safety as one of the three PBIS focus areas. Further supporting these findings, the team noted the presence of safety administrators in each hallway, as well as the morning arrival process, during which all students, guests, faculty and staff were required to pass through a weapons detection system. Beyond physical safety measures, stakeholder interview data highlighted a strong emphasis on learner well-being and mental health. The "Student Support Meeting Agenda" and the "Trauma Informed Care Training Menu" indicated a focus on mental health and support for the whole child. Moreover, stakeholders reported that advisement time is used for character education, further promoting a safe and supportive school climate.

An additional school strength is the focus on equity, as evidenced by the district's requirement of a racial equity plan. The "Olmsted Academy South Racial Equity Plan 2025-2026" outlines the school's goal for improving the sense of belonging for students of color by 5% and highlights clubs, surveys for understanding and staffing as efforts to meet the goal.

The principal overview presentation suggested that previous continuous improvement elements included a focus on professional learning community (PLC) time, differentiation, coaching and feedback. However, stakeholder interview data indicated that a system of PLC engagement with a focus on data and planning was inconsistently implemented. While the "PLC Planning Agenda 24-25" confirmed that PLC meetings are scheduled during the current school year, implementation fidelity varied. Further review of artifacts revealed that "OAS 30-60-90" identified PLC documentation as a method for measuring implementation of the school's high-quality instructional resources (HQIR). Stakeholder interview data suggested that PLC meetings are held more consistently and are facilitated by the academic instructional coach; however, the Diagnostic Review Team observed that PLC activity



appeared to be in its infancy, with development and implementation still underway. These findings align with interview data acknowledging significant investment in planning and resources over the past few years, yet they also indicate that full implementation and instructional impact have not been realized.

The Diagnostic Review Team was unable to identify multiple data points indicating the implementation of a continuous school improvement process. Though elements of school improvement exist, stakeholder interview data, stakeholder perception data and Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data from 2024-2025 suggested a lack of efficacy in implementing previous improvement priorities and inconsistent practices. The 2024-2025 KSA reading data revealed that reading scores for grades 6, 7 and 9 either decreased or remained the same compared to 2022-2023 KSA reading data. Additionally, 2024-2025 KSA math data showed that math scores for grades 6 and 7 decreased compared to 2022-2023 KSA results. Though 8th-grade math scores on the 2024-2025 KSA increased to 17% from 11% on the 2023-2024 KSA, this falls below the state average of 40% on the 2024-2025 KSA.

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 19 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	1.4	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	74%	16%	11%	0%
A2	2.3	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	16%	37%	47%	0%
A3	2.6	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	16%	5%	79%	0%
A4	1.5	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.	58%	37%	5%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.9				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.7	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	42%	47%	11%	0%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	26%	47%	26%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	53%	42%	5%	0%
B4	1.7	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	47%	37%	16%	0%
B5	1.9	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	26%	58%	16%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.8			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.2	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	16%	53%	32%	0%
C2	1.9	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	42%	21%	37%	0%
C3	2.2	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	21%	37%	42%	0%
C4	2.4	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	16%	26%	58%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.2			

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.	26%	42%	32%	0%
D2	1.8	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	47%	21%	32%	0%
D3	2.2	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	16%	47%	37%	0%
D4	1.8	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	37%	47%	16%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

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.	47%	47%	5%	0%
E2	1.9	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	26%	58%	16%	0%
E3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	37%	42%	21%	0%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	68%	21%	11%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.5	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	16%	21%	63%	0%
F2	2.2	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	26%	32%	42%	0%
F3	2.1	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	32%	32%	37%	0%
F4	1.9	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	32%	42%	26%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.2			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	74%	0%	26%	0%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	89%	11%	0%	0%
G3	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	95%	0%	5%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 19 observations in core content classrooms and many informal observations in common areas throughout the school. Data from these observations provided the team with sufficient insight regarding instructional practices and classroom learning environments. The school had a previous Diagnostic Review in Jan. 2023. Overall, 16 of the 28 indicators across all seven learning environments increased from the previous review. The results from observations during this visit revealed low overall indicator ratings, where 17 of the 28 student-centered practices were evident/very evident in less than 30% of classrooms.

The highest-rated item was found in the Equitable Learning Environment and related to treating students equitably. Instances of learners who were “treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)”, for example, were evident/very evident in 79% of classrooms. In addition, in the Supportive Learning Environment, learners who “demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)” were evident/very evident in 58% of classrooms. Similarly, in the Well-Managed Learning Environment, it was evident/very evident in 63% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” Stakeholder interviews confirmed that teachers want to specifically serve the school’s student demographic and find fulfillment in doing so. Survey data showed 84% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that adults “care about children’s well-being (7).”

The Diagnostic Review Team found some important student-centered practices absent or inconsistently implemented across all seven learning environments. In the Equitable Learning Environment, for instance, learners who “engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” were evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms. Furthermore, instances where “Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)” were evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms, and learners who “monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” were evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms. Stakeholder perception surveys confirmed the lack of student-centered practices, as 63% of students selected “listen to teachers talk”, when asked, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” These results underscore the need for intentional strategies to promote personalization, transparency in assessment and student ownership of learning. Addressing these areas will be essential to creating environments where all students are actively engaged and supported in achieving high levels of success.

The Diagnostic Review Team found low academic expectations in several classrooms with learners who “strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” being evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms. In addition, instances of learners who “engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)” were evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms. Additionally, the Diagnostic Review Team observed few students using exemplars or rubrics to guide them in reaching proficiency or having mechanisms in place to monitor their own learning. It was evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” Stakeholder interview data confirmed that the school’s name and claim protocol is based on Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data rather than classroom formative and summative data. These findings provide the school with an opportunity to increase the complexity and rigor in instructional practices, integrate those expectations into teaching and learning and clearly communicate those high expectations to students to improve their achievement.

Finally, student use of digital tools was identified as an area the school could leverage to improve motivation, collaboration and student achievement. The Diagnostic Review Team noted limited opportunities for student collaboration in learning as it was evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Additionally, although the school implements a one-to-one technology program for students, learners who used digital tools/technology to “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)” were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms and learners who use digital tools/technology to “communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)” were evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms. Empowering students to use technology for communication and collaborative learning can significantly enrich their engagement and deepen their understanding.

The data from these observations reveal meaningful trends in classroom practices. Emerging strengths were noted in the Equitable, Supportive and Well-Managed learning environments. These findings indicate a foundation for creating positive, student-centered learning environments. However, opportunities remain to enhance differentiation, academic rigor, collaboration and student ownership. By leveraging these insights, the school can implement focused strategies to strengthen instructional practices and ensure all learners experience engaging and high-quality learning opportunities.

Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement Priority 1

Implement a systemic approach to monitor instruction, provide high-yield coaching practices and ensure a continuous feedback loop that will inform professional practices to increase student achievement.

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

Findings:

The improvement priority identified during the Jan. 2023 Diagnostic Review focused on developing, implementing and monitoring a data-driven continuous improvement process centered on high-yield instructional strategies, consistent monitoring of instruction and meaningful coaching and feedback to strengthen professional practices and increase student achievement. Evidence reviewed during the current Diagnostic Review indicates that this priority has not been implemented with sufficient fidelity or consistency, as the school has realized minimal measurable improvement since the previous review.

The Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South 2024-2025 KSA data revealed a lack of student growth in math and reading, indicating that continuous school improvement processes have been ineffective in meeting learners' needs. The school performed below the state average in all areas, with multiple grade levels either declining or remaining flat on the KSA compared to previous years.

A review of documents and artifacts as well as stakeholder interview data indicated that elements of school improvement are present, such as PLC meetings and a comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP). Though these elements are present, stakeholder interview data suggests that consistent PLC meetings were not implemented consistently until this school year, and previous PLC practices did not result in measurable improvement in KSA performance. The "OAS 30-60-90" identified progress relative to the PLC protocol as partial implementation according to the Sept. 22 through Nov. 7 cycle. The "OAS 25-26 ISMT as of 12/15" indicated that progress relative to collaborative teams engaging in planning, data analysis and internalization of lessons and protocols was emerging. The "DR: Professional Learning Community/Embedded Professional Development Schedule 25-26" indicated the presence of professional learning, but stakeholder interview data suggested that professional learning offerings are a blend of district and building-level offerings. The team noted through a review of documents, artifacts and interview data that building-level professional learning offerings have limited alignment with the established instructional focus.

Multiple data points, including stakeholder survey, interview and observational data, reflected the lack of efficacy regarding school improvement activities. Survey data revealed that 59% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that in the last 30 days, they "provided opportunities for learners that align to their needs (18)", and 56% agreed/absolutely agreed that they "base their improvement on learners' needs (5)." Though the principal's presentation and the "OAS 25-26 ISMT as of 12/15" indicated a name and claim protocol, stakeholder interview data suggested that teachers did not always have an opportunity to pick their own students. Observational data found it evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Additionally, student surveys revealed that 37% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the last 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)", and 48% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that adults in the school "try new things to improve our school (6)."



The Diagnostic Review Team was unable to find evidence of consistent practice in monitoring classroom instruction. The “OAS 25-26 ISMT as of 12/15” identified a strategic activity related to high-quality instruction as school leaders supporting systems to build capacity and sustainability of the implementation of HQIRs and best practices in literacy and math, including regular classroom observations, coaching and feedback cycles and HQIR professional learning. However, stakeholder interview data indicated that classroom observations are inconsistent. The “OAS Updated Walkthrough Tool as of 9/19 (Responses)” reflected observational feedback dated Oct. 17, 2025. Stakeholder interview data reflected that feedback received from observations seldom resulted in actionable steps. The principal explained that the instructional coach is responsible for coaching Tier 1 teachers, while members of the administrative team coach Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers. While the “OAS Coaching Cycle” outlines a coaching protocol, the Diagnostic Review Team was unable to find evidence, or multiple data sources, that indicated coaching activities were being conducted consistently and effectively.

Taken together, the achievement data, document review, classroom observations and stakeholder feedback underscore the urgent need for a coherent and systemic instructional improvement approach. While foundational structures such as PLCs, professional learning opportunities and coaching protocols are in place, the Diagnostic Review Team found inconsistent implementation, limited alignment to instructional priorities and an absence of a reliable feedback loop to inform instructional practices. The lack of sustained monitoring of instruction, limited actionable coaching and few instances of differentiated professional learning has contributed to stagnant or declining student performance in reading and mathematics. Implementing a comprehensive system for monitoring instruction, strengthening high-yield coaching practices and establishing a continuous, data-informed feedback cycle is essential to building educator capacity, improving instructional efficacy and ensuring that professional practices consistently respond to learner needs. This improvement priority is critical to reversing current achievement trends and creating the conditions necessary for meaningful, sustained gains in student achievement.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Conduct frequent and regular classroom observations to collect data on instructional strategies and curriculum-alignment.
- Monitor the implementation of core instructional materials and ensure consistency of implementation throughout the school.
- Plan individual and collective professional development sessions to improve the use of core, high-yield instructional material.
- Provide ongoing individual and collective instructional coaching cycles (e.g., lesson studies, modeling, debriefing, feedback loops) and professional development to support implementation of the curriculum with integrity and fidelity.
- Provide action steps for instruction based on reviewed data from stakeholder meetings/PLCs.

Improvement Priority 2

Implement a curriculum-aligned instructional process that delivers rigorous Tier 1 instruction and consistently meets the needs of all students.

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

Findings:

The Diagnostic Review Team was unable to find the consistent practice of high academic expectations and high-yield, effective instruction as evidenced by KSA data, classroom observations, stakeholder interviews and stakeholder surveys. As noted, student achievement, according to 2024-2025 KSA data, indicated the school performed below the state average in math, reading, science, social studies, editing and mechanics and on-demand writing, and performed at or below achievement levels compared to the 2022-2023 KSA results. Challenges faced by the school include teacher vacancies in core subjects, uncertified and novice faculty members and changes in curriculum.

Observational data indicated it was evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to demonstrate high quality work (B3).” Stakeholder surveys indicated that 52% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I had lessons that will prepare me for my future (11).” Similarly, 69% of teachers agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I provided opportunities to help learners acquire skills needed for their future (15).” The “OAS 25-26 ISMT as of 12/15” outlined instructional practices that were not fully implemented or progress monitored with fidelity. Stakeholder interviews highlighted inconsistent practices regarding observations, feedback and data analysis. Other stakeholders indicated receiving feedback that was often positive but lacking improvement action steps. Stakeholder survey data indicated that 68% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22).” Similarly, 41% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I provided an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).”

Though the “OAS Instructional Focus” identified academic discourse as a characteristic of every classroom, observational data found it was evident/very evident in 32% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1).” It was evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Stakeholder survey data confirmed observational data, indicating that 52% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I had many ways to show my teachers what I learned (19).” Additionally, 63% of students selected “listen to teachers talk” when asked, “Which four words best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” According to stakeholder perception survey data, 59% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “we uphold high expectations for learning (12).”

The Diagnostic Review Team was unable to find evidence of a clear communication system within the school processes, including for instructional delivery. Stakeholder interview data suggested that feedback opportunities were created by the school but were seldom reflected in decisions. While teachers were able to share that instructional non-negotiables include keeping the classroom instructional framework current, adherence to pacing and curriculum, warmup activities and writing every day, stakeholders were unable to identify the alignment between professional learning offerings and delivering effective Tier 1 instruction. Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their progress is monitored (E1).”

Collectively, the evidence from student achievement data, classroom observations, document reviews and stakeholder feedback highlights a persistent lack of consistent, rigorous Tier 1 instructional practices aligned to the adopted curriculum. Despite the presence of non-negotiables and identified characteristics such as academic discourse, implementation across classrooms remains inconsistent and insufficient to meet the diverse needs of all learners. Low percentages of observed high-quality student work, limited student ownership of learning and



inconsistent learning opportunities indicate that instructional delivery generally is missing high expectations or effective instructional design. Moreover, challenges related to staffing, curriculum transitions and novice educators have further impacted instructional coherence and effectiveness. The absence of a clearly communicated, curriculum-aligned instructional process has hindered teachers' ability to deliver high-quality Tier 1 instruction to improve professional capacity and achieve sustained gains in student achievement.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Define and communicate the roles of stakeholders to ensure delivery of effective and rigorous Tier 1 instruction.
- Communicate and schedule dedicated time to plan and prepare for instructional needs.
- Identify and facilitate effective instructional strategies to increase student engagement.
- Monitor and use curriculum-embedded assessments to measure the efficacy of instruction.

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.

Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention (MRI) Schools

Teams reviewing MRI-designated schools must consider the following additional elements:

- A review of how the school and district have managed and expended the relevant school improvement funds previously awarded with a specific focus on the impact of the funding decisions;
- A review of the progress made towards accomplishing any improvement priorities recommended by prior Diagnostic Review reports and/or Two-Day Reviews;
- A review of prior year turnaround plans and related documentation;
- A review of existing improvement efforts and initiatives and data documenting the results of the initiative;
- A comprehensive resource allocation review;
- A review of stakeholder involvement in the improvement process; and
- A review of district support on the implementation of the school's turnaround plan.

Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South underwent its last Diagnostic Review in January 2023. This additional review considers the specific steps and strategies enacted by the school since its prior review. The current principal has led the school since accepting the role as instructional leader in July 2022.

The principal expressed commitment to the students, parents and community at Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South; however, these actions have not manifested in tangible improvement or outcomes. Disappointment was evident from interviews and surveys concerning a need to include all stakeholders in the improvement and decision-making process at the school. Staff expressed frustration with communication from the principal and how their voice was used, or more frequently not used, when making school decisions.

The prior Diagnostic Review of the school yielded two improvement priorities. Improvement Priority 1 was based on Cognia Standard 7 and instructed the school to develop, implement and monitor a data-driven continuous improvement process that focuses on implementing high-yield instructional strategies, monitoring instruction and providing coaching and feedback to teachers to improve professional practices and increase student achievement. Improvement Priority 2 was based on Cognia Standard 22 and directed the school to develop, implement and monitor a process for identifying and addressing learners' individual academic needs. The principal identified improving PLCs, developing and implementing a coaching and feedback system and developing a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) as the focus in response to the review report. The evidence shows work towards the development and implementation of these systems. However, the evidence also indicates that little progress has been made towards adopting these systems.

The improvement focus for the 2025-2026 school year was changed, although it was not clear why the focus changed or if the change came as a result of attainment of the previous areas of focus. The focus for the 2025-2026 school year shifted to improving Tier 1 instruction and the implementation of the curriculum, becoming data literate to improve decision-making and improving the culture and climate of the building. A review of evidence, staff interviews and survey data indicates that there has been little progress towards these new initiatives. There is evidence of internalization of the HQIR in PLCs and there is evidence from the turnaround plan and the turnaround team agendas that data is being collected, analyzed and considered when making decisions; however, there is no evidence that supports the effective and systematic use of this data. Likewise, survey data and interviews indicate that the climate and culture of the school is still an area of growth. This is highlighted by current vacancies in core subjects and the yearly turnover of staff.



The school has received a total of \$572,812 in school improvement funds (SIF) over the past three years. In the 2023-2024 school year as a part of Cohort 4, the school received \$367,922, in SIF funding. The school's focus for the year was to provide training in the effective use of differentiation and increase teacher's application of "Understanding by Design" (UbD) strategies. Funds were used to create positions for additional support in math, reading and behavior. Funds were used for rental space for administrative and staff retreats. Funds were also used for attending National Science Teaching Association Conference (March 2024), International Society for Technology in Education (June 2024), Association for Middle Level Education Leadership Conference and the Kagan Conference (Summer 2024). Additionally, funds were used to hire a retired administrator as 6th-grade assistant principal and an educational consultant for PLCs and coaching and feedback. Instructional materials were also purchased, including EL supplemental texts for differentiation, Chromebooks and Pocketalk personal translators. Evidence shows little coherent structure to the PLC system in place with inconsistent meeting documentation, and interviews revealed confusion amongst teachers about the PLC system.

In the school year 2024-2025, as a part of Cohort 5, the school received \$204,890 in SIF funding. As a part of the school's efforts to continue to increase the development and implementation of a systems approach to continuous improvement, funds were used to continue to provide consultants for PLCs and intervention in math, reading and behavior. Materials and professional development were funded to enhance the EL Education reading curriculum, and teacher stipends were provided for PLC and social and emotional learning (SEL) work and planning. In addition, two classified staff members were hired to help with interventions. The latest grant balance is \$18,626, most of which will be expended by the end of the year on staffing.

The district's support for Frederick Law Olmstead Academy South in addition to approval of the SIF funds and amendment requests within each year of allocation includes the following items: the funding formula used to provide OAS's budget (also the same one used for all middle schools); additional "equity funding" that must be used solely on personnel; an additional minimum of eight-thousand-dollar stipend for certified staff and administrators assigned to certain school zones as an incentive to attract and retain staff; and an additional number of paid days for certified staff to attend training at the beginning of the school year. Principals of comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) schools are given early access to the transfer list from the district's Human Resources (HR) Department. The principal is also allowed to submit staff names to HR for non-renewal based on their lack of effectiveness in the turnaround work. Additionally, the district does provide additional monitoring requirements for specific programs and turnaround initiatives. It was also found in interviews that CSI schools do not receive any priority for substitutes; as a result, there are days there are unfilled vacancies in multiple classrooms. This leads to specialists, co-teachers and interventionists filling in for classroom teachers and is a barrier to providing small group or individualized instruction to students and for staff to attend PLCs. In addition, the district has provided an Executive Administrator (EA) to support MRI and CSI principals in improvement efforts and support the work of the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) Educational Recovery (ER) staff within the school.

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 to the Commissioner of Education:

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

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school, Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South.

The principal at Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South became principal in July 2022. The school received a Diagnostic Review in January 2023, which resulted in an Improvement Priority to "Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven continuous improvement process that focuses on high-yield instructional strategies, monitors instruction and provides coaching and feedback to teachers to improve professional practices and increase student achievement." The principal has been unsuccessful in developing methods for continuous improvement that ensure high-quality instruction is taking place in all classrooms. Stakeholder surveys and interviews consistently revealed frustration regarding a lack of authentic instructional feedback and coaching or modeling of effective instructional strategies for all teachers. This was especially true for new and struggling teachers.

During the principal's tenure in the CSI school, student performance has not improved. The most recent 2024-2025 KSA results showed that academic achievement has either declined or remained flat in all assessed areas and grades since 2022-2023. The principal is acutely aware of the lack of academic growth but has not been able to implement comprehensive changes that lead to instructional effectiveness and academic improvement.

The principal has been unable to instill the mutual commitment and accountability needed for school improvement. Since assuming this leadership role, the school has experienced issues of staff retention and difficulty recruiting teachers to fill vacancies. Currently there are multiple core content classrooms being filled with long-term substitutes or teachers without certification in the core content area that they are teaching.

The team was made aware that efforts to address and increase the effectiveness of PLCs were started at the beginning of last year. Additionally, the school's turnaround team was formed in the 2024-2025 school year and worked to deconstruct the improvement priorities the school received from the January 2023 Diagnostic Review.



These efforts have not created a coherent system. PLC work is inconsistent across the building and is not resulting in improvement in instruction, student engagement or academic achievement.

The principal has not been able to develop an effective and consistent communication protocol to keep staff involved and informed on decisions, initiatives or changes being implemented within the school and within the leadership team. Stakeholder interviews revealed inconsistencies in how information is shared across the building. The school has a living calendar with live links to resources and agendas, yet administrative decisions and initiatives are often made in isolation with little stakeholder input. Additionally, stakeholder interviews expressed dissatisfaction in receiving information after decisions or changes were made. Another concern expressed was that often previously agreed upon decisions or plans are reversed without explanation or stakeholder input. This has negatively impacted the culture and collaboration within the leadership team and trust and confidence in the principal's leadership ability to effectively lead turnaround efforts in this school.

Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Stephen Hammock	Stephen Hammock's most recent appointment is the principal of Newton High School in Covington, Georgia. During his 13-year career in education spanning K-12, Stephen has served as a general education teacher, special education teacher, bus driver, athletics coach, assistant athletics director, assistant principal, principal and district school improvement specialist. In the aforementioned roles, he supervised attendance and engagement, climate and culture, special education, mathematics, social studies and teacher recruitment and retention.
Chris Mueller	Chris Mueller has over 38 years of experience as a teacher, administrator and Educational Recovery Leader (ERL). Chris has taught at the middle, high school and collegiate levels. While serving as an ERL, Chris worked with administrative teams and school leadership teams to facilitate turnaround efforts in Kentucky's central region. Additionally, he has been an associate lead in multiple Diagnostic Reviews. He has also led monitoring reviews in CSI schools for the KDE. He is a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) for the Lead-KY initiative. This 12-unit program provides school and district administrators with research-based strategies in strategic thinking, instructional leadership, elements of standards-aligned instructional systems, effective coaching for high-quality teaching and driving and sustaining change. Also, Chris has experience as an adjunct instructor in political science for Campbellsville University and as a university supervisor for the University of the Cumberlands.
Joe Matthews	Joe Matthews has over 27 years of experience as a teacher and administrator, having taught in middle and high schools and served as an assistant principal and principal at the high school level. He is currently an ERL with the Kentucky Department of Education.
Yamilette Williams	Yamilette Williams has served in various positions in education throughout her 27-year career. She has been a department chair, district training analyst, director of instructional technology in two urban districts, state school improvement partner, a project implementation manager and chief of curriculum, instruction and assessment. Presently, she serves as the owner and operator of Synergy Solutions Partners, LLC, where she directly supports educational technology companies with program implementation and school districts with leadership professional development and coaching for principals in their first three years.
Mary Guinn	Mary Guinn has over 35 years of experience in education, serving as a superintendent, deputy superintendent, chief academic officer and principal. Also, she has served as head of school for a Louisiana charter school, providing instructional leadership and operational oversight in a choice-based education environment. She currently works as an independent consultant, partnering with district and school leaders, teachers and special education staff to strengthen instructional systems and improve student outcomes.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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



Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	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.	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.	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.	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.	1

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
				learner performance with stakeholders.	

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Reading	22	48	18	49	16	52
7th-Grade Reading	19	45	16	47	14	48
8th-Grade Reading	21	44	17	41	21	42
6th-Grade Math	11	38	9	42	7	41
7th-Grade Math	17	37	15	39	8	43
8th-Grade Math	*	36	11	37	17	40
7th-Grade Science	*	23	*	22	6	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	11	35	12	35	11	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	24	49	18	47	23	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	45	14	49	12	49

Plus

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

Delta

- Sixth-grade KSA reading scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished have declined each year from 22% in 2022-2023, to 18% in 2023-2024 and to 16% in 2024-2025.
- Seventh-grade KSA reading scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished have declined each year from 19% in 2022-2023, to 16% in 2023-2024 and to 14% in 2024-2025.

- Eighth-grade KSA reading scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished has not increased with 21% in 2022-2023 and 21% in 2024-2025.
- Sixth-grade KSA math scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished have declined each year from 11% in 2022-2023, to 9% in 2023-2024 and to 7% in 2024-2025.
- Seventh-grade KSA math scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished have declined each year from 17% in 2022-2023, 15% in 2023-2024 and 8% in 2024-2025.
- Eighth-grade KSA math scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was 17% in 2024-2025.
- Seventh-grade KSA science scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was 6% in 2024-2025.
- Eighth-grade KSA social studies scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished has remained stagnant each year from 11% in 2022-2023, 12% in 2023-2024 and 11% in 2024-2025.
- Eighth-grade KSA editing and mechanics writing scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was 24% in 2022-2023, 18% in 2023-2024 and 23% in 2024-2025.
- Eighth-grade KSA on-demand writing scores reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 14% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.

Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	65	68	62	66	66	60
Percent Score of 60- 80	27	24	26	23	25	26
Percent Score of 100	6	7	12	8	7	10
Percent Score of 140	1	2	1	3	2	3

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of EL students who received 0 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment was 65% in 2022-2023, 62% in 2023-2024 and 66% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received between 60-80 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment declined each year, with 27% in 2022-2023, 26% in 2023-2024 and 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment declined from 12% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was below the state average each year.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	22	18	16
Female	22	18	15
Male	*	*	*
White	30	32	28
African American	15	*	9
Hispanic or Latino	26	*	8
Asian	46	*	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	30	*	*
English Learners	*	*	4
English Learners plus Monitored	22	*	14
Economically Disadvantaged	22	15	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined from 22% in 2022-2023, to 18% in 2023-2024 and to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined from 15% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined from 26% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA was 4% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade EL plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 22% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 22% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	11	9	7
Female	11	9	7
Male	*	*	*
White	18	*	11
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	25
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	30	15	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	9	*	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA declined from 11% in 2022-2023, to 9% in 2023-2024 and to 7% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA declined from 9% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	19	16	14
Female	19	16	14
Male	*	*	*
White	24	28	19
African American	15	10	*
Hispanic or Latino	13	23	18
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	36
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	3	7	*
Economically Disadvantaged	20	16	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 19% in 2022-2023, to 16% in 2023-2024 and to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 28% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 23% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 20% in 2022-2023, to 16% in 2023-2024 and to 12% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	17	15	8
Female	17	15	8
Male	*	*	*
White	24	*	*
African American	14	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	19	21	*
Asian	17	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	14
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	19	14	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA declined from 17% in 2022-2023, to 15% in 2023-2024 and to 8% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	6
Female	*	*	6
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	21
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

- The percentage of all students in grade 7 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA was 6% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	21	17	21
Female	21	17	21
Male	*	*	*
White	28	34	29
African American	16	8	17
Hispanic or Latino	26	16	22
Asian	*	20	18
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	6
Economically Disadvantaged	22	18	22
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA reveals no improvement from 21% in 2022-2023, to 17% in 2023-2024, and to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA revealed little improvement from 28% in 2022-2023, to 34% in 2023-2024 and to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA shows little improvement from 16% in 2022-2023, to 8% in 2023-2024, and to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 26% in 2022-2023, to 16% in 2023-2024 and to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 20% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA revealed no improvement from 22% in 2022-2023, to 18% in 2023-2024 and to 22% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Math

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

Plus

- The percentage of all students in the 8th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA shows an increase from 11% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA shows an increase from 12% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.

Delta

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Social Studies

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	11	12	11
Female	11	12	11
Male	*	*	*
White	14	16	10
African American	5	11	5
Hispanic or Latino	*	5	19
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	12	13	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 5% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all students in grade 8 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA remained stagnant, with 11% in 2022-2023, and 12% in 2023-2024 and 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA declined, with 14% in 2022-2023, 16% in 2023-2024 and 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA remained stagnant, with 5% in 2022-2023, 11% in 2023-2024 and 5% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA declined, with 12% in 2022-2023, 13% in 2023-2024 and 9% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	24	18	23
Female	24	18	23
Male	*	*	*
White	30	26	43
African American	20	15	17
Hispanic or Latino	*	16	21
Asian	*	30	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	5
Economically Disadvantaged	23	19	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 30% in 2022-2023 to 43% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 8th-grade scoring Proficient/ Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA remained stagnant, with 24% in 2022-2023, 18% in 2023-2024 and 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA declined, with 20% in 2022-2023, 15% in 2023-2024 and 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA declined, with 23% in 2022-2023, 19% in 2023-2024 and 20% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade On-Demand Writing

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	*	14	12
Female	*	14	12
Male	*	*	*
White	*	26	38
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	30	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	14	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data for 8th-grade on-demand writing reveal that the percentage of White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished increased from 26% in 2023-2024 to 38% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- KSA data for 8th-grade on-demand writing reveal that the percentage of female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data for 8th-grade on-demand writing reveal that the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025.



Schedule

Monday, January 12, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3:30 p.m.- 5 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:45 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m.- 4:20 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:20 p.m.- 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, January 14, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m.- 4:20 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:20 p.m.- 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, January 15, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.- 2:20 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

