



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Greenwood Elementary**

Jan. 20-23, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	5
eleot Narrative	8
Improvement Priorities	11
Improvement Priority 1	11
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Improvement Priority 2	13
Potential Leader Actions:.....	14
Your Next Steps	15
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	16
Team Roster	18
Appendix	19
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	21
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	23
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	25
Student Performance Data.....	29
Schedule	41

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	2
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	4
Certified Staff	32
Noncertified Staff	7
Students	27
Parents	4
Total	77

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:

Greenwood Elementary exhibited a strong culture of care, safety and belonging that is consistently experienced by students, families and educators. Survey data showed high levels of trust across stakeholder groups. For example, 86% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)" and 83% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Family and educator responses mirrored these perceptions. Ninety-six percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make students feel welcomed (1)" and 89% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "we make learners, families and staff feel welcomed (1)." Interview data frequently included descriptors such as safe, welcoming and family when talking about the school. These aligned perceptions indicate that the school has established a relational foundation that supports emotional safety and trust.

Building on this foundation, classroom observations affirmed a positive learning climate. Across classrooms, routines were clear, behavioral expectations were evident and interactions between students and adults were respectful. Learners transitioned smoothly, followed established procedures and demonstrated comfort when seeking assistance from teachers. Observational data indicated strong performance associated with the learning environment and relationships, suggesting that students experience predictable, supportive learning opportunities. These conditions contribute to stability and readiness to engage and provide a strong platform for academic growth.

Alongside these strengths, the school has developed coherent systems to support learners academically and behaviorally. The mathematics and reading multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) plans outline universal screening, diagnostic assessment and progress-monitoring cycles across grades, clearly defining when and how assessments are administered and how data inform placement within tiers. The behavioral framework articulates Tier 1 expectations and routines, with defined protocols for Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports. The literacy instructional decision tree provides a pathway from assessment results to instructional response. Collectively, these artifacts demonstrate thoughtful design and reflect an organizational commitment to meeting diverse learner needs.

Despite these strengths, evidence indicates that systems are inconsistently translated into coherent Tier 1 classroom instruction. For example, a review of team documentation revealed that common formative analysis often remains at the surface level, with statements indicating that some students had trouble without identifying misconceptions, articulating instructional responses and determining how instruction should shift for diverse learners. Similarly, while progress monitoring data are used effectively to determine intervention placement, they are less frequently used to redesign core instruction. This pattern indicates that unit internalization and instructional design remain emerging practices.

Professional learning community (PLC) artifacts reinforce this finding. Agendas frequently prioritize logistics, calendars and assessment administration rather than sustained inquiry into standards, lesson progression and instructional design. The four guiding PLC questions are not consistently evident, and limited time is devoted to unpacking what students must know and be able to do or how instruction will shift for those who have mastered content and those who have not. As a result, collaborative time does not consistently function as a driver of



instructional coherence, differentiation across classrooms or as a reliable structure for shared instructional decision-making guided by clear purpose and defined instructional expectations.

Student survey data and classroom observations align with these instructional patterns. While climate-related student survey items reached strong agreement, instructional responsiveness reflected lower levels of agreement. For example, 86% of students agreed that “the adults make them feel welcomed (1)”, while 65% agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” This contrast suggests that while students report a strong sense of belonging, their experiences with instructional feedback and adjustments are more variable. Classroom observations revealed limited evidence of clearly communicated learning targets, opportunities for learners to monitor progress or differentiated pathways to mastery. In multiple classrooms, lessons emphasized task completion rather than conceptual understanding. Student performance data, detailed in the appendix of this report, reflect the instructional variability observed during the review. Proficiency rates in reading and mathematics across grade levels remain below the state average, indicating that students do not yet experience consistently coherent, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction. While pockets of growth are evident, outcomes suggest uneven access to grade-level learning. Performance patterns further indicate disparities in outcomes for English learner (EL) students and students with disabilities, underscoring the need for coherent instructional practices that ensure equitable access to rigorous learning for all students.

Leadership interviews and artifacts reveal a parallel opportunity for growth. While the school benefits from strong relational leadership and a clear sense of care for students and staff, instructional direction and improvement planning remain largely centralized. Stakeholders described uncertainty about how priorities are established and how decisions are made. Some educators noted that while input is requested, improvement strategies and professional learning are often developed by a small group. A review of team documentation, including the “Fall PLC Meeting Agenda”, “Winter PLC Agenda” and the “comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP)” suggests that instructional dialogue is still developing in depth and focus, particularly when adjustments are needed for students with complex learning needs, including students receiving special education services. Within this documentation, analysis frequently remains descriptive rather than diagnostic, with limited articulation of misconceptions, instructional responses or shifts for diverse learners. Student survey results also indicate variability in clarity around instructional expectations and feedback. For example, 76% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me think in new ways (15)”, reflecting inconsistent experiences with instructional engagement and feedback. Together, these patterns suggest that while relational trust is strong, structures and practices that support sustained, evidence-based instructional discourse and shared accountability are still emerging. The principal acknowledged that an instructional vision exists but has not been fully articulated or internalized by the broader staff.

These findings mirror the school’s own recognition, reflected in its CSIP, of the need to strengthen instructional coherence and collective ownership of improvement efforts. When triangulated, survey results, eleot observations, interviews, artifacts and performance trends reveal a consistent pattern. Greenwood Elementary has established a strong culture and robust support systems that create stability and trust; however, instructional experiences vary across classrooms and leadership structures do not yet consistently engage educators in shaping shared priorities or instructional direction. The school is well-positioned for its next phase of growth by leveraging its relational strength to deepen collaborative leadership and by establishing coherent processes that support teachers in internalizing curriculum, aligning instruction and responding to learner needs so that every student experiences engaging, rigorous and equitable 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 to the extent to which students are engaged in activities and demonstrate knowledge, attitudes and dispositions that are conducive to effective learning. Classroom observations are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes.

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 18 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.8	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	33%	50%	17%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	39%	56%	6%
A3	3.1	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	6%	83%	11%
A4	1.7	Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions, and dispositions.	50%	33%	17%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.3				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.9	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	28%	56%	17%	0%
B2	2.2	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	6%	67%	28%	0%
B3	1.7	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	39%	56%	6%	0%
B4	1.9	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	17%	72%	11%	0%
B5	2.2	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	6%	72%	22%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.8	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	6%	17%	72%	6%
C2	2.4	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	11%	39%	44%	6%
C3	2.8	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	22%	72%	6%
C4	2.9	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	22%	67%	11%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.7			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.3	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	11%	44%	44%	0%
D2	2.1	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	28%	39%	33%	0%
D3	2.5	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	6%	44%	44%	6%
D4	2.2	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	22%	39%	39%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.3			

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.	22%	72%	6%	0%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	22%	39%	28%	11%
E3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	22%	56%	22%	0%
E4	1.5	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	61%	28%	11%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.0	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	11%	78%	11%
F2	3.0	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	11%	78%	11%
F3	2.8	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	6%	22%	61%	11%
F4	2.5	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	17%	17%	67%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.8			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	89%	6%	6%	0%
G2	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
G3	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	94%	6%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.1			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 18 classroom observations at Greenwood Elementary using the eleot. These data provided meaningful insight into instructional practices and the learning environments experienced by students. Across classrooms, the team observed orderly learning spaces grounded in respectful interactions and established routines. Students generally understood behavioral expectations and educators demonstrated care and consistency in their interactions. These conditions provided a stable foundation for learning. At the same time, the data revealed consistent opportunities to strengthen instructional coherence, rigor, student ownership of learning and the use of formative practices to guide instruction.

Classroom culture and management reflected mostly consistent implementation across many classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 89% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)”, and in 89% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” Additional classroom management indicators were observed with less consistency, as it was evident/very evident in 72% of classrooms that “learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)”, and in 67% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).”

Observational data related to relationships further reinforced that relationships were positive in most classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 78% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1)”, that “learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)” and that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” Stakeholder survey data aligned with these findings. Eighty-six percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make us feel welcomed (1)”, and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” Family responses further corroborated this point as 96% agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make us feel welcomed (1)”, and 99% agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” Together, these data confirmed that the school is building a strong relational and organizational base upon which to build instructional improvement.

While the Well-Managed Learning Environment reflected consistent implementation in several areas, instructional practice varied across settings. In some classrooms, students were actively engaged and supported in meaningful learning. In other classrooms, instruction remained largely teacher-directed with limited opportunities for students to think deeply, collaborate or take ownership of their learning. In 11% 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 (B4).” Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 28% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)”, and in 17% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1).” These patterns suggested that instructional tasks were often designed for completion rather than conceptual understanding.

Opportunities for relevance and student-centered learning were also inconsistent. It was evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” However, it was evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)”, and in 39% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish tasks (D4).” Survey data showed 75% of students agreed that “lessons made me want to learn new things (12)”, and 76% of students agreed that “lessons made me think in new ways (15).” Together, these data indicated that many lessons did not consistently invite students into meaningful discourse, collaboration or problem-solving. This instructional variability was most visible in how lessons responded to individual learner needs. It was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy, respect or appreciation for differences (A4).” These data suggested that while fairness and consistency were common, fewer classrooms intentionally designed instruction to meet varied learner needs or elevate student voice.

Observational data showed that progress monitoring and feedback practices were not consistently embedded. It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” It was evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)”, and in 11% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” While it was evident/very evident in 39% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)”, these data indicated that formative assessment and feedback cycles were not consistently guiding instruction. Survey data mirrored these findings, as 65% of students agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).”

The Digital Learning Environment reflected similar patterns. It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).” In 0% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)”, or “use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” These data suggested that technology, when present, was typically passive rather than a vehicle for inquiry, collaboration or higher-order thinking.

Across domains, the team observed variability in instructional quality. Effective practices existed within the building but were not yet shared, modeled or implemented as collective expectations. As a result, students experienced different levels of rigor, engagement and clarity depending on the classroom. Greenwood Elementary demonstrated relational foundations and well-managed learning environments. Students experienced respectful interactions and predictable routines that supported a positive climate; however, eleot and survey data revealed that instructional practices lacked consistency in rigor, differentiation and student ownership.

These findings suggest a need for schoolwide clarity around high-quality instruction and the establishment of shared expectations for lesson design and delivery, rigor and student engagement to ensure that every learner experiences coherent, rigorous instruction across classrooms.

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

Establish a system of distributive leadership for collaborative decision-making by utilizing teams, establishing guiding principles and determining academic priorities that provide purpose and direction for continuous improvement.

Standard 3: Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.

Findings:

A review of multiple data sources indicates that Greenwood Elementary benefits from strong relationships, high trust among staff and a culture described by stakeholders as "family." Survey results affirm this foundation, as 86% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Family and educator responses mirror these perceptions, as 96% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make students feel welcomed (1)", and 89% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "we make learners, families and staff feel welcomed (1)." As further evidence of this culture, 84% of educators chose "collaborative" when asked, "Which four words do you think best describe, in general, the interactions you experience with your colleagues (26)?" In the Fall 2025 Teach Upbeat Survey, 85% of educators agreed that administrators actively seek teacher input when making important decisions and 100% agreed that there are opportunities for teachers to take on leadership roles and to shape school culture. Together, these data demonstrate a climate well-positioned to support shared leadership and collective responsibility.

Despite this strong relational base, evidence indicates that decision-making and instructional leadership remain concentrated among a small group of individuals. Stakeholder interviews revealed that instructional direction is primarily driven by the principal, with teams often waiting for guidance rather than shaping priorities collaboratively. Several educators described the improvement planning and instructional focus as "top down", noting that while input is requested, final decisions and direction are largely centralized. This structure limits the development of leadership capacity across the faculty and constrains opportunities for educators to meaningfully influence academic priorities.

The principal overview presentation corroborates this pattern. Leadership acknowledged that engaging stakeholders in vision setting and instructional direction is a growth area. While an instructional leadership team and school-based decision-making structures exist, communication of purpose and priorities has been inconsistent. The principal noted that the instructional vision is clear to leadership and interventionists but has not been fully articulated or internalized by the broader staff. As a result, many educators lack a shared understanding of how their daily work connects to schoolwide priorities.

The principal further expressed a desire for all staff members to share the same sense of urgency and consistency in executing best practices. Leadership noted that while expectations are clear within the administrative and instructional leadership teams, they are not yet experienced with the same clarity or immediacy across the faculty. This gap reinforces the need for a leadership model that distributes ownership of priorities and empowers teams to lead implementation rather than wait for direction.

Interview data further illuminate this gap. Educators described uncertainty regarding how decisions are made and how improvement priorities are determined. Some noted that teams meet regularly but are not consistently empowered to lead problem-solving or instructional improvement. In this context, interview data indicate that while staff are asked to submit documentation for the CSIP, they are not consistently engaged in shaping the priorities or actions within the plan. This pattern reinforces perceptions that participation is largely procedural rather than generative. Stakeholder interviews revealed perceptions that teams are not yet prepared to lead PLCs independently and that leadership remains concentrated among administrators. Together, these data suggest that structures exist but are not yet functioning as vehicles for distributive leadership.

Artifacts and PLC agendas reflect a similar pattern. While teams convene routinely and address planning and logistics, evidence of collective ownership of instructional priorities is limited. Agendas emphasize tasks and timelines rather than shared inquiry, collective decision-making or alignment to schoolwide goals. Without a clear framework for collaborative leadership, teams function primarily as implementers rather than co-creators of the school's improvement work.

The eliot observations reinforce this finding. Classrooms reflected positive relationships and orderly environments, yet instructional practices varied across settings. This variability aligns with the absence of shared instructional priorities developed and owned by staff. Without collective leadership structures that promote coherence, instructional direction depends on individual interpretation rather than on shared commitments shaped by the faculty.

When triangulated, survey data, interviews, artifacts, observations and leadership reflections reveal a consistent pattern. Greenwood Elementary has the culture and trust necessary for shared leadership but lacks a coherent system that engages educators in establishing priorities, guiding principles and instructional direction. To meet Cognia Performance Standard 3, leaders must move beyond consultation toward authentic collaboration that builds capacity across the faculty. Establishing distributive leadership will enable Greenwood Elementary to leverage its collective expertise, strengthen ownership of improvement efforts and ensure that academic priorities are understood, supported and enacted by all stakeholders.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish an inclusive leadership structure that incorporates diverse voices, roles and experiences, as well as shifts from a top-down to a distributed leadership approach with shared responsibility and empowerment.
- Create organizational conditions that support distributive leadership, including clearly defined team roles, decision-making protocols and structures that move teams from implementation to shared leadership and ownership.
- Engage educators in the co-development of institutional priorities and guiding principles that articulate shared commitments for teaching, learning and continuous improvement.
- Foster a culture of collective learning by modeling inquiry, reflection and professional growth within leadership teams and PLCs.
- Embed continuous improvement processes that focus teams on analyzing evidence, determining priorities and monitoring progress toward shared goals.

Improvement Priority 2

Establish coherence and clarity among curriculum, instructional resources, assessments, data collection and interventions by designing and executing a system to internalize, implement and monitor the recognized, evidence-based curriculum. Ensure that the system includes support for teachers in delivering the curriculum as a key element of strengthening Tier I instruction, providing grade-level learning experiences for all learners.

Standard 12: Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy, inclusion and effectiveness.

Findings:

A review of multiple data sources indicated that the school lacks a coherent system to ensure that curriculum and instruction are aligned for relevance, inclusion and effectiveness. While professional staff demonstrate a strong commitment to students and a collaborative culture, interview and observational data indicate that instructional resources are implemented with varying depth and clarity. Student performance trends, eleot observations, interviews and artifacts collectively indicate that teachers are working diligently to meet pacing expectations, yet often without a shared understanding of how standards, lessons and assessments connect across a unit. As a result, students do not consistently experience grade-level instruction aligned to the intent of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS), limiting the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.

Student performance data reflect this instructional variability. During the 2022-2023 school year, 32% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, increasing to 39% in 2024-2025. In contrast, the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 31% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025. In 2024-2025, 20% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, remaining below the state average. In mathematics, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished increased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 36% in 2024-2025, while the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 27% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025. In 2024-2025, 10% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in mathematics, declining from 16% in 2023-2024. Overall performance remains below the state average in all tested grades and content areas. English learner (EL) Progress data further underscore this pattern. During the 2024-2025 school year, 18% of ELs earned 140 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment, surpassing the state average. Also, 37% of ELs received 0 points for progress in 2023-2024. Because ACCESS measures English language acquisition rather than academic content knowledge, these data suggest that some English Learners may experience barriers to fully accessing grade-level instruction delivered in English, reinforcing the importance of coherent, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction supported by appropriate language scaffolds.

The observational data mirror these trends. In multiple classrooms, the Diagnostic Review Team noted limited evidence of instruction that clearly communicated clear learning targets or engaged students in higher-order thinking. Instructional tasks frequently emphasized completion rather than conceptual understanding, and alignment between tasks and intended standards varied. Teacher interviews provide context for these patterns. Educators described differing approaches to planning and lesson design, with several unable to articulate a shared process for internalizing units. Stakeholder interviews revealed a shared perception that instructional planning is increasingly driven by curriculum coverage and pacing expectations rather than by deeply unpacking standards to design instruction. Educators perceived the work as being more compliance oriented than conceptually grounded. Together, these data indicate the absence of a common framework for understanding the arc of learning within units.

Stakeholder perception data confirm that Greenwood Elementary has established a strong relational foundation that can support instructional growth. Eighty-six percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make us feel welcomed (1)”, and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” Family responses were even more positive, with 96% who agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make students feel welcomed (1)”, and 99% who agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat students with respect (2).” Educator



responses mirrored these perceptions, with 89% who agreed/absolutely agreed that “we make learners, families and staff feel welcomed (1)”, and 94% who agreed/absolutely agreed that “we treat learners, families and staff with respect (2).” While these data reflect a positive school climate, fewer indicators address academic clarity, suggesting that the strength of relationships has not yet translated into consistent instructional alignment.

PLC artifacts reflect collaboration but limited instructional coherence. Agendas show that teams engage in unit mapping, accommodations and assessment calendars, demonstrating a commitment to working together. However, documentation emphasizes logistics rather than deep analysis of standards, lesson progression and instructional design. Professional staff described PLCs as supportive yet inconsistently focused on data and instructional practice. This pattern aligns with stakeholder interviews and elite observational data, reinforcing that professional staff members often plan in isolation rather than through a shared instructional framework.

The principal presentation corroborates these findings. While the school has established strong systems for attendance, behavior and MTSS, leadership identified PLCs, walkthroughs and coaching as growth areas and prioritized professional learning focused on teacher clarity, engagement strategies and unit and lesson internalization. When triangulated, student performance data, ACCESS results, survey responses, elite observations, interviews and artifacts reveal a consistent pattern. Greenwood Elementary has the culture, collaboration and leadership commitment to improve, yet lacks a coherent system to support professional staff members in internalizing curriculum and implementing instruction aligned to the intent of the KAS. To meet Cognia Performance Standard 12, the school must establish structures that ensure teachers understand the arc of learning within units, align lessons and assessments to standards and design instruction that provides equitable access to grade-level content. By embedding unit internalization into PLCs and aligning professional learning, walkthrough and feedback processes to instructional clarity, the school can strengthen Tier 1 instruction and ensure that all learners experience relevant, inclusive and effective instruction.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish a schoolwide unit internalization process that defines how professional staff members analyze standards, identify the arc of learning within each unit and align lessons, tasks and assessments prior to instruction.
- Redesign PLCs to focus on unit internalization and instructional coherence by embedding structured protocols that require teams to unpack standards, analyze lesson progression, identify high-leverage engagement strategies and determine scaffolds for students who cannot access grade-level content.
- Create a coherent, systematic process within PLCs using formative and summative data to determine when students require scaffolds, extensions or interventions in Tier 1 instruction and monitor by reviewing artifacts, lesson plans, student performance and walkthrough data to evaluate implementation impact and to adjust supports.
- Provide targeted professional learning to ensure all professional staff members understand the intent, structure and instructional design of the recognized curriculum and can implement lessons aligned to grade-level standards.
- Establish expectations for “one school” instructional coherence by defining non-negotiable instructional practices that ensure all learners experience equitable access to grade-level content regardless of their teacher and monitor implementation through walkthroughs and actionable feedback to ensure instructional clarity, lesson progression and standards-based practices in Tier 1 instruction.

Your Next Steps

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

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

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



Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

The principal has led Greenwood Elementary for three years. The administrative team consists of the assistant principal, counselor and Family Resource Youth Services Center (FRYSC) coordinator. An Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) has been established, consisting of the principal, assistant principal, academic instructional coach, school psychologist, counselor and teacher leaders.

During the review process, the principal was open and self-reflective, indicating she views this process as an opportunity for growth. The principal's presentation and interview demonstrated that she strongly believes in the potential to improve student achievement and overall school effectiveness. Additionally, stakeholders and evidence indicated that the school has a positive climate, with recent improvements in attendance, intervention and behavior data. Many interviewees identified frequent family engagement opportunities, the implementation of a house system and a positive behavioral approach as key factors contributing to these improvements. Surveys and interviews overwhelmingly indicated that the principal is well liked by the faculty, staff and parents and is considered very approachable and supportive.

The principal has taken steps to build a sense of shared commitment among staff. One example is the establishment of an ILT this year. According to her interview and evidence, the team was tasked to revise the vision statement to build shared clarity and collective ownership around what equitable instruction means in practice at Greenwood Elementary. While a new vision statement was developed, staff interviews and evidence also indicated that it was completed with limited stakeholder engagement and minimal communication occurring through the staff bulletin. To strengthen mutual commitment and accountability, the principal should implement communication structures (e.g., regular ILT updates to staff, structured feedback loops and transparent communication platforms) that ensure all stakeholder groups have meaningful opportunities to participate in future



decision-making processes. These structures should support collaborative identification of areas of focus, the development of school priorities and the establishment of guiding principles.

As the instructional leader, the principal should expand efforts to continuously support teachers and improve professional practice. Although some evidence of curricular and instructional resource analysis was noted, there was limited evidence of a deliberate focus on selecting and implementing evidence-based instructional practices. Classroom observations and interviews indicated that the mandated curriculum is often delivered through pre-published slides, with little evidence of deeper instructional planning. Additionally, evidence from PLCs indicated that teacher teams rarely engage in consistent, collaborative unit or lesson internalization that would deepen their understanding of instructional resources and strengthen both instructional practice and student achievement.



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
Nikkita Warfield	Nikkita Warfield has 25 years of experience in education. She serves as chief schools officer/special advisor for Purpose Built Schools Atlanta. Her professional experience includes teacher, instructional coach, assistant principal, principal, director and district-level executive leader. Nikkita has led and evaluated school improvement efforts across elementary, middle and high school settings and is recognized for her expertise in instructional leadership, turnaround and leadership development.
Kevin Gay	Kevin Gay currently serves as an Education Recovery Leader (ERL) for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). This position provides direct support to turnaround schools across the state. Kevin is a certified trainer for Jim Shipley Systems and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL). He has been an educator for over 27 years, serving as a middle school teacher, elementary principal and high school principal. Kevin has served on Diagnostic Review teams and audit teams for the past 12 years as a team member, lead and associate-lead.
Amy Atkins	Amy Atkins has more than 25 years of experience in elementary education and currently serves as the Title I coordinator for Boone County Schools. She spent 13 years as a classroom teacher in Indiana, Ohio and Kentucky before becoming an elementary instructional coach in Boone County. She later transitioned to Learning Support Services as the coordinator of Title I/interventions, where she has worked closely with schools to close learning gaps and support continuous improvement.
Paula Johnson	Paula Johnson currently serves as a Continuous Improvement Coach for the KDE and previously served as an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS). Her current position provides schools and districts with ongoing, embedded support for implementing sustainable systems as they strive to close achievement gaps and improve student growth and achievement through continuous improvement. Paula has been an educator for 27 years, serving as an elementary teacher, reading interventionist, curriculum coach, assistant principal, principal and district-level director of equity and academics. Paula has served on Diagnostic Review and audit teams for over 10 years.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders seldom use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders sometimes use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use analyzed current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use a formal, systematic process for analyzing current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	1
27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.	The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices.	The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	2
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	1
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	2
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving	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
				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	32	46	31	47	39	47
4th-Grade Reading	36	48	31	50	18	50
5th-Grade Reading	21	48	22	46	20	50
3rd-Grade Math	20	43	21	43	36	43
4th-Grade Math	27	42	17	43	14	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	16	41	10	43
4th-Grade Science	22	35	17	34	11	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	14	42	24	39	13	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	22	47	13	47	14	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	12	39	6	39	*	38

Plus

- Third-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by 16 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in all grade levels and subject areas with reported data was below the state average in 2024-2025.

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	30	26	26	29	37	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	45	35	43	35	29	35
Percent Score of 100	15	24	20	23	16	22
Percent Score of 140	10	14	11	13	18	13

Plus

- Eighteen percent of ELs made 140 points for progress on the ACCESS test, which is higher than the state average in 2024-2025.

Delta

- Thirty-seven percent of ELs did not advance to the next level on the ACCESS test in 2024-2025, which is higher than the state average.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	32	31	39
Female	31	36	38
Male	33	*	41
White	42	33	36
African American	19	*	41
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	25	33
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	20

Plus

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

Delta

- Twenty percent of 3rd-grade students with disabilities scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	20	21	36
Female	25	25	24
Male	*	*	46
White	25	26	39
African American	*	*	32
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	42
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	36
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	36
Economically Disadvantaged	17	*	30
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased 16 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentages were not low enough to qualify as a delta.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	36	31	18
Female	33	41	25
Male	39	23	*
White	41	41	31
African American	24	*	*
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	28	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	20	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 13 percentage points from 2023–2024 to 2024–2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	27	17	14
Female	*	16	18
Male	34	*	*
White	36	19	23
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	*	8
Students with Disabilities with IEP	13	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 13 percentage points from 2022–2023 to 2024–2025.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	22	17	11
Female	*	14	18
Male	25	20	*
White	38	24	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	*	10	8
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science decreased by 11 percentage points from 2022–2023 to 2024–2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	21	22	20
Female	26	23	15
Male	*	21	25
White	28	28	27
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	17	18
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- Twenty percent of all 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading in 2024-2025.
- Eighteen percent of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading 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	*	16	10
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	16	11
White	*	25	14
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

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

Delta

- Ten percent of all 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math 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	14	24	13
Female	15	20	8
Male	*	*	18
White	*	30	22
African American	*	*	8
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	15	20	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- Thirteen percent of all 5th-grade students scored Proficient/ Distinguished in social studies, representing an 11-percentage point decrease in one academic year from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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	22	13	14
Female	30	15	18
Male	10	*	11
White	25	18	16
African American	17	*	8
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	*	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- Fourteen percent of all 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics in 2024-2025.
- Ten percent of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics in 2024-2025.

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	12	6	*
Female	*	13	*
Male	13	*	*
White	11	8	*
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	12	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2023-2024.

Schedule

Tuesday, January 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.	Initial Team Meeting/ Introductions/ Review of Schedule	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:45 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, January 21, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:45 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:15 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, January 22, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:45 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Friday, January 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m. – 1:45 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

