



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:**  
**Fulton Independent School**

Feb. 9-12, 2026

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results</b> .....	<b>6</b>
eleot Narrative .....	10
<b>Improvement Priorities</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	13
Improvement Priority 2 .....	14
Potential Leader Actions:.....	15
Your Next Steps .....	15
<b>Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....	22
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning .....	24
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....	26
Student Performance Data.....	30
Schedule .....	63



# Introduction

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

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

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

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

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	2
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	5
<b>Certified Staff</b>	19
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	7
<b>Students</b>	37
<b>Parents</b>	6
<b>Total</b>	79

## Performance Standards Evaluation

Diagnostic Reviews are based primarily on the evaluation of evidence that reflects an institution’s ability to meet the expectations as defined by the essential Diagnostic Review Standards, which are a subset of the Cognia Performance Standards. These standards define the elements of quality that research indicates are present in an

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

## Insights from the Review

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

### Strengths and Continuous Improvement

Fulton Independent School was identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) in the 2024-2025 school year based on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) results. While the middle school grade-level band was cause for CSI identification, the school comprises preschool through grade 12 with one principal. The elementary grade bands (i.e., preschool through grade five) are housed at Carr Elementary, while the 6th-through 12th-grade bands are housed at Fulton Independent School. The school has a rich history dating back to 1884 when it opened as Carr Institute. For the 2025-2026 school year, the school serves 283 students in grades preschool through 12. The school has deep ties to the community, as evidenced by the number of staff who are school alumni, including the school's principal, who graduated from Fulton Independent School in 1989. For this review, the Diagnostic Review Team focused on grades K-12.

The principal began in the 2024-2025 school year. According to the principal's presentation and interviews, both the principal and staff are relatively new to the school. Likewise, the principal's presentation showed that, on average, the teaching staff has less than one year of experience. The principal's presentation and a review of artifacts revealed that the school has focused its efforts on building a positive climate and culture among staff and students. The principal shared that the school has established the non-negotiable of "treating kids with respect" to engender a sense of extended family. In staff interviews, staff consistently indicated a commitment to serving students and staff within the school environment. In short, there is a strong sense of community among the staff and a desire to provide students with varied opportunities. For instance, survey data demonstrated that 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, "At my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)." Staff and parents noted similar sentiments during interviews where they expressed appreciation for their colleagues, the principal and students.

The evidence provided to the team demonstrates a commitment to building culture and climate among students, also. For instance, students complete the "Club and Activities Survey" to indicate which clubs they would like to join. The club rosters provided by the school show many students participating in clubs, which is notable given the school's small population. Interviews with middle and high school students revealed that students felt that the school provided opportunities for them to engage in activities that interested them before, during and after school. Students spoke about basketball and the monthly club days held during the school day. Furthermore, based on the "New Elective Survey August '24" and interviews, students are provided opportunities for enrichment. In middle and high school, students select electives aligned with their interests and complete them in school or online. Students reported that the ability to select advanced courses was a highlight, as it allowed them to explore their academic interests, such as criminology and audio/video production. The "24-25 Dual Credit Offerings" demonstrated that the school provides dual enrollment courses in mathematics, English, social studies, arts and humanities, public speaking and information technology, among others. Additionally, the school has engaged in student recognition through the "Top Banana Award", given monthly to students at the elementary, middle and



high school levels. Also, the principal's presentation revealed that, with the superintendent's support, the district repurposed a building on campus to serve as an alternative school for students who were not meeting code-of-conduct expectations. Data from the Fulton Independent School Report Card for 2022-2023 indicated that 24.8% of discipline referrals resulted in out-of-school suspension. That percentage increased to 53.3% in 2024-2025. According to interviews and the principal's presentation, the purpose of the alternative site is to keep students engaged in learning and maintain their academic achievement while addressing behavioral issues. These findings point to intentional structures designed to build school climate and culture among students.

Stakeholder survey data further supports a commitment to building the school's culture and climate. According to the "Elementary School Student Survey", 80% of elementary students agreed/absolutely agreed, "Adults show they care about us (7)." Furthermore, open communication between the school and families has improved over the last year and is considered positive, according to parent interviews.

The data from the 2024-2025 Kentucky Score Report Card depicts a diverse student population. The school serves a high-needs population, with 83.6% of students identified as economically disadvantaged. Students with disabilities (IEP) comprise 31.6% of the population and English learners (ELs) make up 6.3% of the population. The racial composition of the school includes 34.91% African American, 34.91% White, 10.18% Hispanic or Latino and 17.09% Two or More Races. Although it has a small population, the school has a self-contained classroom of students with moderate and severe disabilities. Through its Family Resource Youth Service Center (FRYSC) program, the school serves the community's economic needs through various events held throughout the school year. For instance, the community's economic needs are addressed through the provision of goods, such as coats, backpacks and food. To meet students' academic and social needs, the school hosts in-school events, including Grow, Reality Store and Truth and Consequences. The school also hosts a Parent Youth Cafe for middle school parents and families.

While the school has focused on building climate and culture, data reviewed by the Diagnostic Review Team substantiate the need for structured instructional improvement efforts. According to the KSA accountability data, which the principal reported in his presentation, Fulton Independent School received an overall score of 48.3 for elementary, 46 for middle school and 75.5 for high school. Stakeholder survey data further supported the student achievement data reviewed by the team. For instance, 56% of students at the middle/high school level agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12)." During interviews, when asked what would make the school a better place to learn, students noted the need for more engaging work beyond only taking notes in class. A highlight in the KSA data found on the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) School Report Card dashboard is a post-secondary rate of 100, and according to the principal's presentation, that gives the school the highest post-secondary rate in the state in postsecondary readiness in the 2024-2025 school year. According to the principal's presentation and interviews, improving postsecondary readiness is closely linked to a focus on dual-credit courses in high school. The principal projects that 70% of all high school students will have college credit by the end of this school year.

The review of the school's 2025-2026 comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) demonstrated that the school is setting goals to improve student learning. The plan's achievement gap target and objectives are related to increasing the number of economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the 2025-2026 KSA in reading and mathematics. The three- to five-year goal builds on the previous goal by stating that the school will increase its reading and mathematics status scores by at least 15% annually in elementary and middle schools and by 10% annually in high school. To attain the achievement gap target and three- to five-year goals, the CSIP includes curriculum and instructional strategies, such as small-group instruction. The CSIP also includes strategies for monitoring progress, such as analyzing data and student work samples. Lastly, the CSIP states a need to strengthen instructional staff's understanding of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) to "ensure grade-level expectations are clear and consistently implemented." Furthermore, the plan established the need for high-quality Tier 1 instruction to ensure "strong foundational literacy and numeracy skills."



The school is in the initial stage of establishing structures and processes to monitor and evaluate instruction. The school has begun continuous improvement efforts in instruction. Specifically, the principal's presentation and staff interviews both referenced the use of Kagan strategies, weekly professional learning community (PLC) meetings, data analysis for response to intervention (RTI) and an instructional walkthrough tool. Although the school identified these strategies for its improvement efforts, implementation is uneven across the school. For example, although Kagan strategies were selected and professional learning on Kagan strategies was provided, their implementation was not observed in elementary or secondary classrooms. PLC implementation began toward the end of fall 2025, but the school lacks an institutionalized structure. Furthermore, expectations for PLC work remain unclear based on the interviews and a review of PLC agendas provided to the team. The instructional walkthrough tool was designed and implemented in January 2026. The principal stated that walkthrough data are shared with individual teachers, but it is unclear how the data are used to inform instruction across the school. Among the strategies adopted by the school, RTI is the most developed, as evidenced by master schedules that include it. RTI is used for remediation in kindergarten through grade eight and for enrichment in grades six through eight. During RTI sessions, students have access to the i-Ready Assessment and Diagnostic Suite for remediation and to online enrichment courses.

Taken together, the evidence collected and reviewed demonstrates that the school has worked to establish a positive climate and culture where students, staff and parents feel welcome and part of the school's community. While the school has selected strategies for continuous instructional improvement, a review of documents and observational and interview data indicates that these strategies are not embedded in the school's structures. As such, further continuous improvement efforts should focus on institutionalizing instructional practices schoolwide and monitoring and providing feedback on those practices to promote student learning.



# Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 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%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.3</b>				

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%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.0</b>			

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%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.4</b>			



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 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%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.8</b>			

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%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.9</b>			



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%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.5</b>			

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%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.4</b>			



## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 24 eleot observations in core content classrooms and many informal observations throughout the school. Overall average ratings ranged from 1.4 out of 4.0 for the Digital Learning Environment to 2.5 for the Well-Managed Learning Environment.

The team observed classrooms where most teachers and students were treated fairly. Interviews indicated that students knew their teachers and administrators cared for them. Survey data revealed 87% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, “At my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2).” Classroom observational data were slightly lower than educator survey data regarding how students are treated. It was evident/very evident in 71% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” Additionally, observational data indicated that it was evident/very evident in 62% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” In documents and evidence, there are at least 14 unique club rosters that demonstrate how the school strives to make connections with many students. Leveraging these strong relationships could create opportunities for teachers to raise current academic expectations.

Team members observed the degree to which instructional staff created an active learning environment for students. While staff asked many questions of students during instruction, a low proportion of active learning was observed. The average rating for the Active Learning Environment was 1.8 out of 4. Additionally, observational data indicated that in 0% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2).” Moreover, observational data also indicated that in 8% of classrooms, “Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning (G3).” Survey data confirms the need to increase student engagement. Specifically, when middle school and high school students were asked the question, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?”, 53% of students selected “listen to teachers talk.” Similarly, when elementary school students were asked, “Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?”, 66% of elementary students selected “listen to teachers talk.” In student interviews, when asked what would make the school a better place to learn, most students said they wanted more hands-on learning activities. The lower proportion of active learning observed in the classrooms aligns with the KSA student performance data. For example, the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring at the Proficient/Distinguished levels in social studies on the KSA declined from 25% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025, and their performance was below the state average of 39%. Likewise, the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring at the Proficient/Distinguished levels in editing and mechanics on the KSA declined from 35% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025, and their performance was below the state average of 49%.

Progress monitoring and feedback were also examined during the classroom observations. The average rating for the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment was 1.9 out of 4. Observational data indicated it was evident/very evident that in 8% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Although, in 25% of classrooms it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)”, in 13% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2).” The elementary and middle/high school survey further supports the classroom observational data. For instance, 70% of elementary students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had many ways to show my teachers what I learned (19)”, while 58% of middle and high school students agreed/absolutely agreed with the same item (19). Finally, while team members observed efforts to create an environment where students feel respected, safe and positive, this is an area for continued improvement. The average overall rating for the Well-Managed Learning



Environment was 2.5 out of 4. Classroom observations reflected those intentions as it was evident/very evident in 62% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” Student and staff interviews also focused on the incentives behind positive student behavior. Team members observed classroom procedures being used in over half of the classrooms, as it was evident/very evident in 58% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” Teacher interviews indicated that this year staff members are beginning to be more consistent compared to last year in their response to behavioral incidents, promoting a decrease in negative student behaviors. Surveys showed that 81% of educators selected the word “safe” in response to the question, “Which four words best describe, in general, your institution’s culture (24)?” Also, 82% of families selected the word “safe” in response to the question, “Which four words best describe, in general, your child’s school (22)?” The 2024-2025 “Quality of Climate and Safety Survey,” administered by KDE, showed that 83% of students agreed/strongly agreed with the statement “All my teachers make me feel welcome in their class (1).”

Collectively, the evidence suggests that the school has established a positive climate and culture. However, the school needs to implement a process to increase instructional capacity by adopting schoolwide instructional practices to improve student learning and monitor progress, adjusting instruction as needed to meet students’ needs. To address this, the school will need to research instructional models for adoption and implementation and monitor instruction to make timely adjustments based on the data.



# 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

Research, implement and monitor a clear schoolwide instructional model that includes expectations and non-negotiables to ensure instruction meets the rigor of the KAS.

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

### Findings:

Evidence from multiple data sources indicated that the school and district leadership team had not collaborated to develop and implement a structured instructional model that includes clear instructional expectations and non-negotiables.

KSA student performance data demonstrated the need for increased instructional focus and accountability across all grade levels in the school, highlighting the need for a schoolwide instructional model that sets high expectations for learners and learner-centered instructional practices. The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 27% in 2023-2024; however, overall performance was below the state average of 50%. Similarly, the percentage of 6th-grade students scoring at the Proficient/Distinguished levels in math on the KSA declined from 22% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024, and their performance was below the state average of 42% in 2023-2024. Classroom observational data indicated the need for a schoolwide instructional model that sets high expectations for the learning environment. For example, it was evident/very evident in 25% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1).” Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” It was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5).”

Interview data indicated concern about the level of instructional rigor for students. Several stakeholders noted a lack of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) for all content areas, including high school mathematics, social studies and science. According to interviews with the principal and instructional staff, the school received a grant and selected Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH) as its K-12 reading curriculum, specifically purchasing Into Reading for K-5 and Into Literature for grades 6-12. Teacher interviews also revealed that teachers had a coach through HMH to provide guidance and coaching on the curriculum. According to interviews and classroom observations, the i-Ready Assessment Suite, which provides individualized activities based on students’ performance on the assessment, has been adopted as the math curriculum for K-8. Interviews with instructional staff also revealed a lack of consistent PLC meetings and reported a need for further direction to help new teachers create more rigorous instruction that meets the learners’ needs throughout the school.

Surveys, interviews and document reviews also provided evidence supporting the need for an instructional model. For instance, 64% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, “At my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).” Seventy-four percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, “At my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12).” Seventy-seven percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed, “The adults have high expectations for learning (10).” Interviews with staff, the principal and students indicate that the school focused on climate and culture in 2024-2025 and was starting to focus on instruction in



2025-2026. The principal and staff identified Kagan strategies as the school's predominant instructional strategy. Kagan strategies are designed to support cooperative learning structures. The "November Professional Development Kagan Strategies" demonstrated that staff received professional learning on Kagan strategies. However, a review of the evidence revealed that the content shared was a high-level overview and did not provide comprehensive examples of implementing multiple Kagan strategies in the classroom. Staff interviews demonstrated understanding of Kagan strategies as an adopted instructional practice. Despite this understanding, during the interview, the principal acknowledged that more professional development was needed across the school to institutionalize implementation in all classrooms. Based on survey results, this is happening infrequently. When asked, "Which four phrases describe what the adults in your school consider to be the most important for students (23)?", 13% of middle and high school students selected "worked with others." Likewise, when asked, "Which four phrases best describe what adults say most of the time to students at school (23)?", 26% of elementary students chose "work with others." Although the recently developed walkthrough tool includes an item on Kagan strategies, the principal interview did not reveal how data on Kagan strategies gathered would be used to further institutionalize the practice.

Synthesizing the student performance data, classroom observations, documents and interviews indicates the lack of a schoolwide instructional model that includes expectations and non-negotiables to ensure instruction meets the level of rigor in the KAS.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Assemble and establish a schoolwide instructional leadership team to collaborate on the development of schoolwide grade-level appropriate instructional model(s).
- Research, select and/or establish an evidence-based instructional model(s) to ensure instruction meets the rigor of the KAS.
- Provide professional learning to instructional staff on the selected instructional model(s) to provide a foundational understanding and schoolwide expectations of the instructional model(s) and examples of the model(s) in practice.
- Implement, monitor and provide a system for feedback to staff on the instructional model to grow their capacity.



## Improvement Priority 2

Refine and implement a systematic process to monitor and adjust instruction using data to address individual student needs during instructional planning.

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

### Findings:

The need for a systematic and consistent approach for monitoring and adjusting instruction based on data is highlighted by several data points gathered from observations, stakeholder interviews and performance metrics. Multiple stakeholders indicated that the summer 2025 professional development focused on implementing the HQIR and the district's various assessment programs. However, several staff members reported being unsure how to use the multiple data sources generated from student performance and how to adjust instruction accordingly. A review of documents and artifacts revealed that the school data spreadsheets exist, but there was no evidence of how the data are used to drive instruction. In addition, classroom observations revealed that it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that "learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)." In addition, surveys revealed 66% of elementary students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Similarly, 46% of middle school and high school students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, "In the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Likewise, 65% of families agreed/absolutely agreed, "In the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)." According to the principal's presentation, all three levels of the school saw an increase in their combined reading and math status scores. However, the elementary and middle schools are designated as Orange, indicating the need to continue monitoring and adjusting instruction.

Multiple stakeholders indicated that PLCs were occurring inconsistently across the school. However, many recognized that a new protocol is being developed and will be implemented across the school. The review of evidence included two PLC agendas that listed topics but did not document opportunities for teachers to engage in conversations about students' instruction. Classroom observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities to meet their needs (A1)." Implementing and monitoring a PLC protocol will ensure that teachers are creating differentiated learning opportunities to meet the needs of all students. It was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." In 17% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident 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)."

Through interviews, stakeholders indicate that professional learning has been provided on Kagan strategies in middle/high school. A review of documents and artifacts revealed a presentation that was used in a faculty meeting to introduce Kagan as an engagement strategy. However, classroom observations revealed few instances of Kagan strategies being implemented. As an example, it was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." Stakeholder interviews indicate that middle and high school teachers are aware and have received one professional development session on Kagan strategies. Student interviews at all levels indicated that they spend significant time on seatwork (e.g., workbook pages, note-taking, listening to teachers). Finally, interviews with district and school administrators revealed that the district invested in sending a group of teachers and leaders to Kagan training and planned for the team to lead future professional learning sessions at the school.

Stakeholder interviews indicated that summative evaluations were conducted annually, but there was a lack of consistent teacher feedback to improve their professional practices. The team reviewed a recently developed



walkthrough tool. During interviews, stakeholders indicate they are aware of the new tool but have not seen it implemented. According to interviews, teachers have received external coaching from Kids First Education and HMH but do not receive consistent coaching from school administrators. Both administrators indicated that improving teacher efficacy is an area for growth.

These findings indicate a strong need to develop and implement a process for consistently monitoring and adjusting instruction. By establishing a systematic approach to monitoring expectations, the school can ensure that instructional initiatives effectively align with rigorous standards and advance student learning.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Implement and monitor the newly established PLC protocol (K-12) to ensure instructional staff analyze student performance data (e.g., formative, student work samples) to identify individual student learning needs and adjust instruction to meet those needs.
- Develop, implement and monitor a data analysis protocol (e.g., individual, grade-level, content, vertical) that synthesizes school-selected data to inform action steps that improve instruction and meet students' needs.
- Use data to provide additional ongoing professional learning coupled with coaching and feedback for teachers to address the instructional needs of diverse learners.

## Your Next Steps

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

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

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

# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

The principal has intentionally focused on culture and climate since becoming principal last year. The culture is described by stakeholders as safe, welcoming and respectful. The principal is aware of the strong history of the school's connection to the community. The principal used continuous improvement methods by gathering stakeholder input and involving them in decisions to begin work toward achieving the vision and promoting the school's core values.

The principal has exhibited a strong passion for the school, staff and students. This resonated during interviews, as many described the principal as invested. The team recognized the principal's level of commitment to increasing post-secondary readiness. The principal has prepared the school and community for improvement by engaging community members, increasing student access to opportunities, including internships, multiple dual credit and advanced course options.

Evidence suggests PLC meetings are inconsistent and rarely use data to inform instruction. The principal and teacher leaders should refine, implement, monitor and evaluate an effective PLC process that is data driven and based on increasing student learning. This process should occur regularly and become integral to the school's continuous improvement. Observational data show a lack of instructional rigor, wherein it was evident/very evident that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)" in 25% of classrooms. The principal should create a system to ensure that KAS are taught at the appropriate level for which the students are assessed on the KSA. The principal should expect teachers to provide students with high-yield instructional strategies and engaging lessons through an instructional



model. School leadership should hold teachers accountable for setting high expectations for all students to make significant achievement gains, while engaging the teachers in an ongoing continuous improvement process.

Evidence from stakeholder interviews, documents and artifacts indicate that the principal has inconsistently implemented walkthroughs to strengthen instruction and improve student learning. The principal acknowledged this to be an area of growth during his presentation and interview. The team found little evidence of a formal process to provide coaching and feedback. Observational and assessment data indicate a lack of instructional rigor in classrooms and high-yield instructional strategies. While a professional development session around Kagan was offered at the middle/high school, observations and stakeholder interviews suggest that it is in the beginning stages and inconsistently implemented and not presented to the elementary staff. School leadership should use the district office and external partners, as needed, to develop systems that promote coaching and feedback of instructional staff.

The principal should capitalize on the process used to make improvements in post-secondary readiness and in high school reading and math to continue the momentum at the elementary and middle levels. The district should take steps to put structures in place so that the elementary building is included in the work the principal and leadership team have prioritized as next steps for the K-12 school.



# Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief biography
<b>Majorie Ceballos</b>	Marjorie Ceballos worked for 17 years in public PK-12 education. She is currently an associate professor of educational leadership in Florida. Her past experiences include serving as a reading and English teacher, instructional coach and school district-level administrator.
<b>James Carrier</b>	James Carrier is a 28-year veteran educator. Since 2021, he has served as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with KDE. James served as a principal, an instructional coach, a library media specialist and a classroom teacher. He was a semi-finalist for the Kentucky Elementary Teacher of the Year in 2009 and a Kentucky finalist for the 2010 Presidential Award for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching.
<b>Lindsey Evans</b>	Lindsey Evans is a 22-year veteran educator. She has been an ERL with KDE since 2024. Lindsey served as literacy coach and multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) coordinator, instructional coach and classroom teacher.
<b>Drew Teel</b>	Drew Teel has 14 years of educational experience. Currently, he serves as a principal in Kentucky. His past experiences include serving as an assistant principal and a special education teacher for students with learning and behavior disorders and moderate to severe disabilities.

# Appendix

## Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

### Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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



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

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
6. Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.	Professional staff members receive few or no resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members rarely receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive some resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members periodically receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members consistently receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. A formal structure ensures that professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	1

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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



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

## Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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



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

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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



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

# Student Performance Data

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

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
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 well 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, compared to 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

- Students who were post-secondary ready increased from 85.7 in 2022-2023 to 100 in 2024-2025.
- Students who were post-secondary in school with high demand increased from 96.4 in 2022-2023 to 103.8 in 2024-2025 and were above the state average for both of those years.

### 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 in the school 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 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 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% in 2024-2025.
- 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% in 2024-2025.

### 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**

<b>Group</b>	<b>On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)</b>	<b>On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)</b>	<b>On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)</b>
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%.
- Fifty percent of 10th-grade White students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 in reading, which was above the all students group state average of 47%.

### 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**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Social Studies (2022-2023)</b>	<b>Social Studies (2023-2024)</b>	<b>Social Studies (2024-2025)</b>
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
3 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Team travels to institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6 p.m. – 8:30 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(s)	School	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	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team Members
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	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, Feb. 12, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m. – 3 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

