



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Fulton Independent

Feb. 9-12, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation2
 - Insights from the Review3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....4**
 - eleot Narrative8
- Improvement Priorities9**
 - Improvement Priority 19
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....10
 - Your Next Steps11
- District Capacity in Diagnostic Review12**
- Team Roster14**
- Appendix15**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings15
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....15
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning17
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning21
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning23
 - Student Performance Data.....26
 - Schedule59

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 |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Board Members | 5 |
| District-Level Administrators | 8 |
| Building-Level Administrators | 1 |
| Total | 14 |

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 become a better institution. The Diagnostic Review Team applies a four-level rubric to determine the degree to which the institution demonstrates effective practices that reflect the expectations of each standard. The rubric scale is designed to indicate the current performance of the institution. The Diagnostic Review Team’s findings and the rubric for each standard are in this report’s appendix.

Insights from the Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the processes, programs and practices within the institution to arrive at the findings of the team. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

Strengths and Continuous Improvement

Stakeholder interviews, surveys and informal observational data indicate a strong commitment to supporting the whole child. District leaders recognize the diverse needs of the student population and are committed to meeting their non-academic needs in collaboration with community stakeholders. The superintendent's overview presentation identified the district's students as its strength. In addition, the presentation indicated that students' needs are central to the administrative team's decision-making, which was confirmed by educator survey data. Eighty-four percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)." The district takes pride in its ability to support the basic needs of students and families by providing food, clothing, school supplies, medical services and beds to students in need.

Evidence and interviews indicate that the district had experienced significant changes in most district and school leadership positions since the superintendent assumed that role on Aug. 2, 2024. Most stakeholders viewed this as a positive step toward improving learning conditions in the district. Interviews revealed that district staff work well together. Stakeholder interviews indicated that the superintendent is viewed positively by the school district and its leadership team.

A review of documents, artifacts, stakeholder interviews and survey data indicate a need for district leadership to engage in systematic continuous improvement through decision making and monitoring of district initiatives. Interviews indicate an awareness of the comprehensive district improvement plan (CDIP); however, most stakeholders reported that the CDIP is a compliance document and it is not driving continuous improvement. Seventy-one percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10)." The team was unable to confirm that the district has processes in place to monitor and adjust the plan to ensure goals are met. Minimal evidence was found to indicate that district or school leaders consistently use data to inform instructional decisions, monitor progress or evaluate the effectiveness of teaching and learning strategies. District leadership recognizes the need to develop specific processes and procedures aligned with academic priorities. Interview data indicate a need for more formalized district-level processes for reviewing and analyzing data to support progress monitoring and instructional decision-making. Some board members expressed interest in reviewing benchmark assessment data to determine whether the district is making progress toward its academic goals.

Stakeholder interview data indicate a lack of non-negotiables across the district, impacting consistency in classroom instruction. Additionally, the superintendent revealed in his interview that instructional non-negotiables have not been established, and various stakeholders confirmed this finding in their interviews. Although the district has invested significant time and resources in securing evidence-based instructional materials, interviews revealed that many staff members are not using them. Further review of documents and artifacts indicates that teachers may use external sources for instructional materials, such as "Teachers Pay Teachers" and "ChatGPT." Interviews revealed that, in some instances, teachers have challenged the implementation of the new curriculum and continued to use prior materials without consequences. Currently, there is little evidence of formalized expectations for instructional walkthroughs and coaching to increase teacher effectiveness and build leader capacity. Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)." Also, in 13% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)."



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 24 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 | 2.0 | Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs. | 17% | 67% | 17% | 0% |
| A2 | 2.4 | Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support. | 13% | 33% | 54% | 0% |
| A3 | 2.7 | Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner. | 4% | 25% | 67% | 4% |
| A4 | 1.9 | 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. | 29% | 50% | 21% | 0% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | | 2.3 | | | | |

| B. High Expectations Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Indicators | Average | Description | Not Observed | Somewhat Evident | Evident | Very Evident |
| B1 | 2.2 | Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher. | 4% | 71% | 25% | 0% |
| B2 | 2.0 | Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable. | 17% | 71% | 13% | 0% |
| B3 | 2.0 | Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work. | 13% | 75% | 13% | 0% |
| B4 | 2.0 | Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing). | 13% | 71% | 17% | 0% |
| B5 | 1.9 | Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning. | 25% | 58% | 17% | 0% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | | | 2.0 | | | |

| C. Supportive Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Indicators | Average | Description | Not Observed | Somewhat Evident | Evident | Very Evident |
| C1 | 2.3 | Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful. | 8% | 50% | 42% | 0% |
| C2 | 2.4 | Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback). | 13% | 33% | 54% | 0% |
| C3 | 2.4 | Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks. | 13% | 33% | 54% | 0% |
| C4 | 2.5 | Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher. | 13% | 25% | 58% | 4% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | | | 2.4 | | | |

| D. Active Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|--------------|------------------|---------|--------------|
| Indicators | Average | Description | Not Observed | Somewhat Evident | Evident | Very Evident |
| D1 | 1.9 | Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate. | 21% | 67% | 13% | 0% |
| D2 | 1.8 | Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences. | 25% | 75% | 0% | 0% |
| D3 | 2,1 | Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities. | 8% | 71% | 21% | 0% |
| D4 | 1.6 | Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments. | 50% | 42% | 8% | 0% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | | | 1.8 | | | |

| E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--------------|------------------|---------|--------------|
| Indicators | Average | Description | Not Observed | Somewhat Evident | Evident | Very Evident |
| E1 | 1.8 | Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored. | 33% | 58% | 8% | 0% |
| E2 | 2.0 | Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work. | 13% | 75% | 13% | 0% |
| E3 | 2.1 | Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content. | 13% | 63% | 25% | 0% |
| E4 | 1.7 | Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed. | 42% | 46% | 13% | 0% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | | | 1.9 | | | |



| F. Well-Managed Learning Environment | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|--------------|------------------|---------|--------------|
| Indicators | Average | Description | Not Observed | Somewhat Evident | Evident | Very Evident |
| F1 | 2.7 | Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other. | 0% | 38% | 58% | 4% |
| F2 | 2.6 | Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others. | 4% | 38% | 54% | 4% |
| F3 | 2.4 | Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another. | 21% | 25% | 50% | 4% |
| F4 | 2.4 | Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions. | 13% | 42% | 42% | 4% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | | | 2.5 | | | |

| 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. | 67% | 21% | 13% | 0% |
| G2 | 1.4 | Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning. | 75% | 8% | 17% | 0% |
| G3 | 1.3 | Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning. | 83% | 8% | 8% | 0% |
| Overall rating on a 4-point scale: | | | 2.5 | | | |



eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team at Fulton Independent School observed 24 elementary, middle and high school core content classrooms. The overall average ratings for each of the seven learning environments ranged from 1.4 to 2.5 out of 4.0. The Well-Managed Learning Environment earned an overall rating of 2.5 and the Digital Learning Environment was rated 1.4.

In over half of the classrooms, students were treated fairly by teachers and had positive teacher-student interactions. For example, it was evident/very evident in 71% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” In 62% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” Learners who “speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)” were evident/very evident in 62% of classrooms. These data indicate room for improvement in fostering a climate in which positive interactions between teachers and students provide a foundation for academic growth.

Instructional time was not maximized in most classrooms. Instances of students using “class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)” were evident/very evident in 46% of classrooms. The team found that students were not actively engaged in learning in many classrooms, as it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1).” The Diagnostic Review Team observed very few classrooms in which students participated in group work. Also, the Diagnostic Review Team found that it was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” These findings identify an opportunity for the school to improve student engagement. Another area for improvement emerged in the Active Learning Environment. For example, in 0% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2).” These data indicate an opportunity to motivate students by connecting learning to real-world experiences.

The team observed a minimal number of students who monitored their own learning, thereby creating ownership of their academic progress. It was also evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” When students monitor their own learning, it can improve student engagement.

The team observed limited student collaboration and instructional differentiation. In 17% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that students were engaging in “differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Additionally, instances of students who “collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)” were evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms.

Few students used digital tools for learning. The Digital Learning Environment scored an overall rating of 1.4. In 13% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).” Students using meaningful digital tools can also enhance student engagement.

Survey data revealed that 71% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6).” Additionally, 77% of families agreed/strongly agreed that adults “are committed to trying new things to improve the school (6).” At the elementary school, 69% of students agreed/strongly agreed that “the adults try new things to make our school better (6)”, and 62% of middle and high school students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults try new things to make our school better (6).”



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 district-wide, data-driven continuous improvement process that ensures the alignment, use and monitoring of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) and effective instructional practices.

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

Findings:

The percentage of students in elementary, middle and high school who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) was below the state average in all reported areas in 2024-2025.

Evidence indicated the CDIP contains one goal and two objectives to close the achievement gap. The goal was to increase the number of economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished by five percentage points in both reading and math on the KSA by May 2026. The district established three- to five-year goals to increase its reading and mathematics scores by at least 15% annually at the elementary and middle schools and by 10% annually at the high school by 2027-2028. Multiple stakeholders (e.g., board members, district leadership, school leadership) indicated awareness of the district's strategic efforts to improve student performance on state assessments. Also, interview data showed that stakeholders reported the superintendent had made it a clear goal to increase student performance in reading, mathematics and science. This goal was acknowledged by various board members during interviews and seen as a strategic effort to increase declining district enrollment.

Interviews with district leadership identified high annual turnover among professional staff as a significant challenge. District leaders reported that the tenure of current instructional staff averages less than a year. In addition, a review of the "Local Educator Assignment Data (LEAD) Report" showed that five emergency-certified teachers (26%) were among the 19 instructional staff members in the district. Interviews with board members echoed this concern and cited salary competition with other districts and the area's higher cost of living as contributing factors. Stakeholders indicated that the district is working with school leaders to retain professional staff by providing enhanced support and training to improve their job performance. Additionally, interview data showed that the district was working to hire alumni and residents and train and support them to ensure stability in the professional staff. These efforts were viewed as positive; however, ongoing staff turnover created challenges for instructional quality in the schools. Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing (B4)."

Interview data indicate the district adopted HQIRs in reading and math. The district was awarded the Kentucky Comprehensive Literacy (KyCL) grant in Dec. 2024 and the Kentucky Numeracy Counts grant in March 2025, which provided funding and training for implementing the HQIRs. Interviews showed that Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH) "Into Reading/Into Literature version 2" was available prior to the 2025 school year; however, professional learning was not provided. The district received the KyCL grant to implement HMH "Into Reading/Into Literature version 3" and to fund professional learning for the new curriculum. Stakeholders disclosed that by Feb. 2026 professional learning had been provided to K-12 English teachers, including special education (SPED) teachers. Additionally, interviews indicated that, due to limited experience, teachers were following the book and had not fully internalized the curriculum's various components.



Interviews revealed the district used the numeracy grant to purchase the i-Ready Assessment Suite to serve as the curriculum and benchmark assessment for grades K-8. Interview data also showed that the district is currently selecting a high school HQIR in math, with the goal of adopting it for use in 2026-2027, and district leadership is working with middle school math instructors to purchase and implement a new curriculum.

Interviews showed that Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) was used for benchmark assessments in kindergarten through grade 12 reading and kindergarten through grade five math. A review of the “2025-2026 Carr MAP English language arts (ELA) data spreadsheet” provided grades one through five fall and winter MAP percentile scores and growth for each student in those grades at Carr Elementary. The school provided the team with 6th-, 7th- and 8th-grade data from 2025-2026 that included 2025 KSA ELA cut scores, MAP ELA Rasch UnIT (IT) scores for beginning- and mid-year assessments and 2025 KSA math cut scores. Additionally, the i-Ready Assessment Suite beginning- and mid-year scores for math in grades six through eight were provided. However, the “High School Data 25-26” document provided as evidence was blank. Various district-level stakeholders indicated that these data were not shared or discussed in formal meetings. Additionally, interviews with district leadership team members indicated that school-level leaders rarely use data to inform instruction.

Interviews indicated that district leadership is working to establish a professional learning community (PLC) framework using data for all grades. A few interviews indicated that, at the elementary level, PLCs are held, but teachers do not know which data to discuss. Additionally, the team reviewed the “PLC Agenda” and confirmed that a PLC was held; however, there was no evidence of student performance data reviews. The team identified little effort to implement the district-initiated PLCs at the high school.

Interviews with district and school leadership indicated that districtwide common instructional expectations had not been established. The district adopted HQIRs and interview data indicated that implementation had begun; however, stakeholders noted that the implementation of HQIRs was inconsistent and not aligned across all classrooms. A survey titled “Let’s Grow Together” was reviewed and showed that a variety of curricula were used by teachers (e.g., Houghton Mifflin Harcourt [HMH], Heggerty, Go Math, i-Ready Assessment Suite, All Things Math for Algebra 1 and Geometry). The team noted that the lack of common district-wide instructional expectations had led teachers to use a variety of materials to teach social studies, including “Teachers Pay Teachers” and “ChatGPT.” Additionally, some teachers indicated they lacked a curriculum map to follow, while others stated they had one.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Develop and implement a consistent data-driven process for district decision-making for continuous improvement.
- Develop and implement district-wide evidence-based instructional expectations for teaching and learning aligned with the HQIRs.
- Develop a clear implementation plan to increase teacher effectiveness in Tier 1 instruction through curriculum-based professional learning and teacher support, based on identified needs from district and school-based walkthrough data and student performance analysis.
- Create an ongoing process for district and school leadership to analyze, discuss and share data with stakeholders (e.g., students, parents, teachers, school-level administrators, district leaders, board members).



Your Next Steps

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

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

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



District Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the district has the capacity to lead the CSI turnaround for Fulton Independent School.

The district administration has demonstrated its ability to lead and support the district in improving teaching and learning. This was evident through the artifact review, the district's overview presentation, observational data, informal observations and stakeholder interviews. The superintendent assumed responsibility for leading the district in July of 2024. He was selected by the local board of education to restore stability, public trust and focus on student learning and academic achievement. The board publicly stated that the new superintendent was the best candidate to lead the district forward.

District leadership has endeavored to establish and sustain institutional structures and processes that support both learners and staff in a rapidly changing environment. The district leadership recognizes the need for providing whole-child support, safety and operations while remaining flexible and responsive to evolving needs.



Non-academic support is embedded through outsourced counseling services, an afterschool program and community partnerships with the Family Resource and Youth Services Center (FRYSC).

District leaders have leveraged multiple grant opportunities to secure funding for HQIRs aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS). The district has selected an HQIR for reading and ELA instruction for kindergarten through grade 12, and another for math instruction for kindergarten through grade 8. The district has also adopted MAP as a screener assessment for reading in kindergarten through grade 12 and math for high school.

District leadership has created learning environments beyond the traditional classroom setting. Through work-based learning experiences and career pathways that connect instruction to future goals, students are challenged to develop problem-solving skills and real-world applications. Students have access to dual credit courses, industry certifications and career-focused programming through Four Rivers Academy, a vocational school and multiple college partners. This partnership allows students to pursue pathways in business marketing, industrial maintenance, automotive technology, welding and health sciences, providing authentic opportunities to apply academic knowledge in real-world contexts.

The district leader has assumed numerous roles that demonstrate his passion for students and the community. These assumed roles have resulted in unclear roles and responsibilities for both district and building-level leaders. Additionally, this has diluted the district leader's ability to focus on serving as the district's instructional leader. The district leader must create conditions to build the capacity of the district and building-level leadership in order to delegate duties and responsibilities to increase the instructional effectiveness of all leaders across the district. District leadership must establish clear expectations for consistent delivery and monitoring of effective classroom instruction at all levels across the district.



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 |
|--------------------------|--|
| William Gordon | William Gordon (Bill) has over 40 years of experience as a teacher, principal, area superintendent, chief operations officer and lecturer in K-20 public education in Florida. He is currently serving as associate lecturer in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Central Florida (UCF). In this position, he teaches face-to-face and online courses in educational law, educational finance, systems and organizational leadership, politics and governance and educational leadership to master's and doctoral degree-seeking students. He is a member of the 3rd Education Class of Leadership Florida, which is the state's most respected non-partisan convener of leaders on critical issues facing Florida's future. |
| 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 served as an associate lead on multiple Diagnostic Reviews. Also, he has led monitoring reviews in CSI schools for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). He is a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) for the Lead-KY initiative. Chris has experience as an adjunct instructor in political science for Campbellsville University and as a university supervisor for the University of the Cumberlands. |
| Jennifer Luttrell | Jennifer Luttrell has 23 years of experience in public education in Kentucky. Jennifer began her teaching career in special education before moving into district and school-level leadership. Jennifer served at the district level for 12 years as the director of special education and early childhood and the director of elementary instruction and federal programs. For the past five years, Jennifer has served as a principal. |
| Kevin Connors | Kevin Connors currently serves as an ERL for the KDE through the Office of Continuous Improvement and Support. He has over 18 years of experience as an educator. Kevin began his career as a middle school math teacher, where he served for seven years. From there, Kevin moved into the position of middle school assistant principal and served for two years before becoming a middle school principal for five years. |



Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

| Standard number and statement | Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement. | Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness. | Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard. | Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners. | Team rating |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|
| 7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs. | Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders. | 1 |
| 8. The governing authority demonstrates a commitment to learners by collaborating with leaders to uphold the institution's priorities and to drive continuous improvement. | The governing authority's decisions demonstrate minimal commitment to learners and rarely support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders seldom collaborate on the institution's improvement. | The governing authority's decisions demonstrate some commitment to learners and sometimes support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to focus the institution's improvement. | The governing authority's policies and decisions demonstrate a commitment to learners and support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to collaboratively further the institution's improvement. | The governing authority's policies and decisions are regularly reviewed to ensure an uncompromised commitment to learners and the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to consistently and intentionally collaborate to further the institution's improvement. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| 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 |
| 10. Leaders demonstrate expertise in recruiting, supervising, and evaluating professional staff members to optimize learning. | Leaders hire qualified professional staff members without consideration of contribution to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders rarely use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders seldom supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance. | Leaders hire qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders sometimes use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance. | Leaders identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders routinely use data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders regularly implement practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning. | Leaders intentionally and consistently identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders consistently use analyzed data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders implement and monitor documented practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning. | 2 |

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

| Standard number and statement | Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement. | Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness. | Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard. | Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners. | Team rating |
|--|---|---|--|--|-------------|
| 15. Learners' needs drive the equitable allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources. | Professional staff members rarely analyze learners' needs and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources. Resources are rarely allocated in alignment with documented learners' needs or to ensure equity for learning. | Professional staff members sometimes analyze learners' needs, current, and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are sometimes based on current or updated data. | Professional staff members routinely analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are routinely based on current data and at predetermined points in time. | Professional staff members engage in a systematic process to analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are consistently based on current data at any point in time. | 2 |

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

| Standard number and statement | Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement. | Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness. | Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard. | Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners. | Team rating |
|---|---|--|---|---|-------------|
| 26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning. | Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders seldom use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices. | Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders sometimes use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices. | Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use analyzed current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices. | Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use a formal, systematic process for analyzing current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices. | 1 |
| 27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions. | The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices. | The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success. | The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success. | The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success. | 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. | 2 |

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

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

| Content Area & Grade | %P/D School (2022-2023) | %P/D State (2022-2023) | %P/D School (2023-2024) | %P/D State (2023-2024) | %P/D School (2024-2025) | %P/D State (2024-2025) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 3rd-Grade Reading | 54 | 46 | 21 | 47 | * | 47 |
| 4th-Grade Reading | 20 | 48 | 27 | 50 | * | 50 |
| 5th-Grade Reading | 22 | 48 | * | 46 | 38 | 50 |
| 3rd-Grade Math | 39 | 43 | 16 | 43 | * | 43 |
| 4th-Grade Math | 15 | 42 | 13 | 43 | * | 44 |
| 5th-Grade Math | 22 | 41 | * | 41 | 16 | 43 |
| 4th-Grade Science | * | 35 | * | 34 | * | 37 |
| 5th-Grade Social Studies | * | 42 | * | 39 | 22 | 38 |
| 5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics | 33 | 47 | 22 | 47 | 28 | 47 |
| 5th-Grade On Demand Writing | 22 | 39 | * | 39 | 16 | 38 |
| 6th-Grade Reading | 17 | 48 | 42 | 49 | * | 52 |
| 7th-Grade Reading | * | 45 | 20 | 47 | 43 | 48 |
| 8th-Grade Reading | 25 | 44 | 12 | 41 | 21 | 42 |
| 6th-Grade Math | 22 | 38 | 21 | 42 | * | 41 |

| 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) |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 7th-Grade Math | * | 37 | * | 39 | 40 | 43 |
| 8th-Grade Math | 33 | 36 | * | 37 | * | 40 |
| 7th-Grade Science | * | 23 | * | 22 | * | 29 |
| 8th-Grade Social Studies | 25 | 35 | * | 35 | 21 | 39 |
| 8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics | 35 | 49 | * | 47 | 16 | 49 |
| 8th-Grade On Demand Writing | * | 45 | * | 49 | * | 49 |
| 10th-Grade Reading | 33 | 46 | 39 | 46 | 36 | 47 |
| 10th-Grade Math | * | 34 | * | 36 | 40 | 41 |
| 11th-Grade Science | * | 11 | * | 6 | * | 22 |
| 11th-Grade Social Studies | 18 | 38 | 36 | 38 | 23 | 38 |
| 11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics | 18 | 45 | 50 | 45 | * | 41 |
| 11th-Grade On Demand Writing | * | 42 | * | 43 | * | 45 |

Plus

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

Delta

- While the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was above the state average in reading in 2022-2023, scores declined from 54% to 21% Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024, which was below the state average of 47%.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 27% in 2023-2024 but was below the state average of 50%.

- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 38% in 2024-2025 but was below the state average of 50%.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 39% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024 and was below the state average of 43% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 15% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024 and was below the state average of 44% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 22% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 43%.
- Twenty-two percent of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies in 2024-2025, compared to the state average of 38% in 2024-2025
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics declined from 33% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 47%.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing declined from 22% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 38%.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 42% in 2023-2024; however, overall performance was below the state average of 52% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 43% in 2024-2025; however, overall performance was below the state average of 48%.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 42%.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 22% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024 and was below the state average of 41% in 2024-2025.
- Forty percent of 7th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math in 2024-2025, compared to the state average of 43%.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies declined from 25% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 39%.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics declined from 35% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025 and was below the state average of 49%.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 33% in 2022-2023 to 36% in 2024-2025; however, overall performance remains below the state average of 47%.
- Forty percent of 10th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math in 2024-2025, compared to the state average of 41%.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025 but was below the state average of 38%.

Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

| Group | School (2022-2023) | State (2022-2023) | School (2023-2024) | State (2023-2024) | School (2024-2025) | State (2024-2025) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Percent Score of 0 | * | 26 | * | 29 | * | 30 |
| Percent Score of 60- 80 | * | 35 | * | 35 | * | 35 |
| Percent Score of 100 | * | 24 | * | 23 | * | 22 |
| Percent Score of 140 | * | 14 | * | 13 | * | 13 |

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 | * | 68 | * | 66 | * | 60 |
| Percent Score of 60- 80 | * | 24 | * | 23 | * | 26 |
| Percent Score of 100 | * | 7 | * | 8 | * | 10 |
| Percent Score of 140 | * | 2 | * | 3 | * | 3 |



High School English Learner (EL) Progress

| Group | School (2022-2023) | State (2022-2023) | School (2023-2024) | State (2023-2024) | School (2024-2025) | State (2024-2025) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Percent Score of 0 | * | 64 | * | 62 | * | 59 |
| Percent Score of 60-80 | * | 26 | * | 26 | * | 27 |
| Percent Score of 100 | * | 8 | * | 9 | * | 11 |
| Percent Score of 140 | * | 2 | * | 3 | * | 3 |

Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmarks on the ACT

| Content Area | School (2022-2023) | State (2022-2023) | School (2023-2024) | State (2023-2024) | School (2024-2025) | State (2024-2025) |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| English | 12 | 47 | 38 | 44 | 15 | 44 |
| Reading | 18 | 44 | 31 | 42 | 15 | 41 |
| Math | 24 | 33 | 15 | 30 | 0 | 30 |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of students meeting the English benchmark on the ACT increased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025; however, overall performance was below the state average of 44%.
- The percentage of students meeting the reading benchmark on the ACT decreased from 18% to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting the math benchmark on the ACT decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 0% in 2024-2025.

Graduation Rate

| Year | School Four-Year | State Four-Year | School Five-Year | State Five-Year |
|-----------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 2022-2023 | 100 | 91.4 | 100 | 92.5 |
| 2023-2024 | 100 | 92.3 | 100 | 93.4 |
| 2024-2025 | 87.5 | 93.5 | 100 | 94.2 |

Plus

- One hundred percent of students graduating in both the four-year and five-year cohort was above the state average in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.
- One hundred percent of students graduating in the five-year cohort in 2024-2025 was above the state average of 94.2%.

Delta

- The percentage of students graduating in the four-year cohort was 87.5% and was below the 94.2% state average in 2024-2025.



Post-Secondary Readiness

| Year | School | State | School w/ High Demand | State w/ High Demand |
|-----------|--------|-------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 2022-2023 | 85.7 | 79.1 | 96.4 | 83.5 |
| 2023-2024 | 61.1 | 81 | 68.1 | 86 |
| 2024-2025 | 100 | 83 | 103.8 | 88.8 |

Plus

- One hundred percent of students were post-secondary ready in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students who were post-secondary with high demand was above the state average for 2022-2023 and 2024-2025.

Delta

- Students who were post-secondary ready decreased from 85.7% in 2022-2023 to 61.1% in 2023-2024.
- Students who were post-secondary ready with high demand decreased from 96.4 in 2022-2023 to 68.1 in 2023-2024.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 3rd-Grade Reading

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| All Students | 54 | 21 | * |
| Female | 55 | * | * |
| Male | 53 | * | * |
| White | 55 | * | * |
| African American | 50 | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 17 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 52% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 3rd-Grade Math

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 39 | 16 | * |
| Female | 27 | * | * |
| Male | 47 | 20 | * |
| White | 36 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 17 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 47% in 2022-23 to 20% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 43% in 2022-23 to 17% in 2023-2024.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 4th-Grade Reading

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| All Students | 20 | 27 | * |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | 32 | * |
| White | * | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 27% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 19% in 2022-2023.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 4th-Grade Math

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 15 | 13 | * |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | 21 | * |
| White | * | 31 | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 14 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- While the percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math increased slightly from 13% in 2022-23 to 14% in 2023-2024, the score was below the state average of 43% in 2023-2024.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 4th-Grade Science

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Reading

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| All Students | 22 | * | 38 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | 25 | * | 38 |
| White | * | * | 36 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 38 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- While the percentage of 5th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 38% in 2024-2025, scores were below the state average of 50% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Math

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 22 | * | 16 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | 33 | * | 24 |
| White | * | * | 29 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 17 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 33% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Social Studies

| Group | Social Studies (2022-2023) | Social Studies (2023-2024) | Social Studies (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| All Students | * | * | 22 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | 24 |
| White | * | * | 36 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 21 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- Twenty-four percent of 5th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in social studies.
- Thirty-six percent of 5th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in social studies.
- Twenty-one percent of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in social studies.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

| Group | Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023) | Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024) | Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025) |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| All Students | 33 | 22 | 28 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | 38 |
| White | * | * | 43 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 23 | 22 | 28 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- Thirty-eight percent of 5th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in editing and mechanics, which was below the all students group state average of 47%.
- Forty-three percent of 5th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in editing and mechanics, which was below the all students group state average of 47%.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2024-2025, which is below the all students state average of 47%.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade On-Demand Writing

| Group | On-Demand Writing (2022-2023) | On-Demand Writing (2023-2024) | On-Demand Writing (2024-2025) |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students | 22 | * | 16 |
| Female | * | * | 27 |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | * | * | 29 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 23 | * | 14 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- Twenty-seven percent of 5th-grade female students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in on-demand writing and their performance was below the all students group state average of 38%.
- Twenty-nine percent of 5th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished on KSA in 2024-2025 in on-demand writing and their performance was below the all students group state average of 38%.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025 and their performance was below the all students group state average of 38%.

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

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| All Students | 17 | 42 | * |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | 50 | * |
| White | * | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 20 | 39 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- Fifty percent of 6th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished on KSA in 2023-2024 in reading.

Delta

- While the percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 39% in 2023-2024, their performance was below the all students group state average of 49%.



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

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 22 | 21 | * |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | 25 | * |
| White | * | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 17 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 17% 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 | * | 20 | 43 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | 43 |
| White | * | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | 14 | 47 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 47% in 2024-2025 but was below the all students group state average of 48%.



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

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | * | * | 40 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | 46 |
| White | * | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 44 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- Forty-six percent of 7th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in math and their performance was above the all students group state average of 43%.
- Forty-four percent of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in math, which was above the all students group state average of 43%.

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in the all students group in math in 2024-2025 was 40%.



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

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

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

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| All Students | 25 | 12 | 21 |
| Female | * | * | 18 |
| Male | 25 | * | * |
| White | 42 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 20 | 14 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024.



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

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 33 | * | * |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | 38 | * | * |
| White | 42 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 30 | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- Thirty-eight percent of 8th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in math, which was above the all students group state average of 36%.

Delta

- Thirty percent of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in math, which was below the all students group state average of 36%.

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 | 25 | * | 21 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | 25 | * | * |
| White | 42 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 20 | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- Forty-two percent of 8th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in social studies, which was above the all students group state average of 35%.

Delta

- Twenty-five percent of 8th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in social studies, which was below the all students group state average of 35%.
- Twenty percent of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in social studies, which was below the all students group state average of 35%.



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 | 35 | * | 16 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | 40 | * | * |
| White | 45 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 32 | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- Forty percent of 8th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in editing and mechanics, which was below the all students group state average of 49%.
- Forty-five percent of 8th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in editing and mechanics, which was below the all students group state average of 49%.
- Thirty-two percent of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in editing and mechanics, which was below the all students group state average of 49%.

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 | * | * | * |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | * | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

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

| Group | Reading (2022-2023) | Reading (2023-2024) | Reading (2024-2025) |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| All Students | 33 | 39 | 36 |
| Female | * | 60 | 50 |
| Male | * | * | 27 |
| White | * | * | 50 |
| African American | * | 40 | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | 38 | 25 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- Although the percentage of 10th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 60% in 2023-2024 to 50% in 2024-2025 their performance was above the all students group average of 46%.

Delta

- The percentage of 10th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 60% in 2023-2024 to 50% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 38% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.



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

| Group | Math (2022-2023) | Math (2023-2024) | Math (2024-2025) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | * | * | 40 |
| Female | * | * | 50 |
| Male | * | * | 33 |
| White | * | * | 50 |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | 30 |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- Fifty percent of 10th-grade female students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in math, which was above the all-student group state average of 41%.

Delta

- Thirty-three percent of 10th-grade male students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in math.
- Thirty percent of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in math.



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

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

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

| Group | Social Studies (2022-2023) | Social Studies (2023-2024) | Social Studies (2024-2025) |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| All Students | 18 | 36 | 23 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | 20 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- Twenty percent of 11th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in social studies.
- Twenty-three percent of 11th-grade students in the all students group scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies in 2024-2025.

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

| Group | Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023) | Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024) | Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025) |
|---|--|--|--|
| All Students | 18 | 50 | 15 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | 30 | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | * | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

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

Delta

- Thirty percent of 11th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 in editing and mechanics.
- Fifteen percent of 11th-grade students in the all students group scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics in 2024-2025.

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

| Group | On-Demand Writing (2022-2023) | On-Demand Writing (2023-2024) | On-Demand Writing (2024-2025) |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students | * | 43 | 15 |
| Female | * | * | * |
| Male | * | * | * |
| White | * | * | * |
| African American | * | * | * |
| Hispanic or Latino | * | * | * |
| Asian | * | * | * |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | * | * | * |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | * | * | * |
| Two or More Races | * | * | * |
| English Learners | * | * | * |
| English Learners plus Monitored | * | * | * |
| Economically Disadvantaged | * | 45 | * |
| Students with Disabilities with IEP | * | * | * |

Plus

- Forty-five percent of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024 in on-demand writing, which was above the all students group state average of 43%.

Delta

- The percentage of all 11th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 15% in 2024-2025.

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 9, 2026

| Time | Event | Where | Who |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2 p.m. - 6:30 p.m. | Team Work Session #1 | Hotel Conference Room | Diagnostic Review Team Members |

Tuesday, Feb. 10, 2026

| Time | Event | Where | Who |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 7:30 a.m. | Team arrives at institution | School Office | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 7:40 a.m. - 4 p.m. | Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 4 p.m. - 5 p.m. | Team returns to hotel | | |
| 5 p.m. - 8 p.m. | Team Work Session #2 | Hotel Conference Room | Diagnostic Review Team Members |

Wednesday, Feb. 11, 2026

| Time | Event | Where | Who |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 7:30 a.m. | Team arrives at institution(s) | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 7:45 a.m. - 4 p.m. | Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |
| 4 p.m. - 5 p.m. | Team returns to hotel | | |
| 5 p.m. - 8 p.m. | Team Work Session #3 | Hotel Conference Room | Diagnostic Review Team Members |

Thursday, Feb. 11, 2026

| Time | Event | Where | Who |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|
| 8 a.m. - 2 p.m. | Final Team Work Session | School | Diagnostic Review Team Members |

