



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Hartstern Elementary**

March 2-5, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation2
 - Insights from the Review3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....5**
 - eleot Narrative.....8
- Improvement Priorities10**
 - Improvement Priority 110
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....11
 - Improvement Priority 212
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....13
 - Your Next Steps14
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review15**
- Team Roster17**
- Appendix18**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings18
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....18
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning20
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning.....22
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning.....24
 - Student Performance Data.....27
 - Schedule40

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	2
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	6
Certified Staff	41
Noncertified Staff	14
Students	29
Parents	7
Total	102

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

Surveys and interviews indicate that Hartstern Elementary has established a culture grounded in care, respect and commitment to students and families. Faculty members frequently expressed that they put the heart in Hartstern Elementary, reflecting a shared belief that relationships with students and families are central to the school's mission. Survey data reinforced these perceptions, as 90% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults care about children's well-being (7)." Similarly, 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcome (1)." These results indicate that students, families and educators perceive the school as a supportive and welcoming environment. Faculty members also described collegial relationships and a shared commitment to improving student outcomes.

Stakeholder surveys and interview data indicate that the school prioritizes student safety and well-being. According to survey data, when asked "Which four words best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?", 83% of families selected both "safe" and "respectful." Survey results also showed that 90% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." Similarly, 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we think of everyone's safety when making decisions (3)." Interview data revealed that installing a vestibule before the start of the 2025-2026 school year was the principal's key safety priority.

Stakeholders shared that the school's diversity is one of its best attributes. According to the principal's presentation, the school's student population has shifted significantly in recent years, with Multilingual learners (ML) representing 309 of 573 students, approximately 54% of the student population in 2025-2026. In response to these changing demographics, the school principal and faculty have implemented several initiatives to support MLs and their families, as Hartstern Elementary is now a high-density school.

One initiative to support this diverse population includes using school improvement funds (SIF) to pay for a consultant to lead language instruction for English learners/MLs through collaborative instructional strategies. As presented in the principal's presentation, interview data and confirmed in evidence, the "Honigsfeld Proposal 25-26" is a plan to lead 10 faculty members through pursuing EL endorsements, with anticipated completion in May 2026. The principal also ensured that each grade level has an English language development (ELD) teacher. Additionally, professional learning opportunities have been provided to strengthen instructional practices for MLs, including faculty book studies such as "Curriculum and Instruction for English Learners", also documented in the "Honigsfeld Proposal 25-26." Additionally, the school has implemented outreach efforts to support the diverse school community, including offering free English classes for parents and adopting a "No Family Turned Away" vision to promote family engagement. With this policy, any family that comes to the school will receive assistance with enrollment, even if Hartstern Elementary is not the home school. Staffing adjustments, including the addition of a third bilingual instructional associate, further reflect the school's commitment to supporting the evolving needs of its students and families, as evidenced in the "Hartstern Elementary's Journey to Greatness: Continuous School Improvement" presentation.

The school has established several structures designed to support continuous improvement. In addition, the school aims to improve instructional practices. The comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) outlines



goals to increase student achievement, such as increasing the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading from 26% to 70% and in math from 16% to 66% by 2030. To support these goals, the school has implemented several initiatives to enhance instruction. The school has weekly professional learning community (PLC) meetings where staff members have the opportunity to review student work collaboratively, analyze assessment data and design instruction to meet students' needs. The school also has a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) to identify students' academic needs and provide literacy and math interventions. School leadership also implemented classroom walkthroughs to monitor instructional practices and support professional learning. These efforts indicate the school is committed to continuous improvement; however, interview and observational data show these initiatives are not consistently implemented with fidelity.

Evidence revealed that teachers meet weekly in PLCs to collaborate and review student work. Interview data indicated that teachers are expected to bring student artifacts to PLC meetings for analysis and discussion. Evidence of this expectation was documented in "Hartstern Master Schedules 2025-2026" and confirmed through educator interviews and a PLC observation conducted by the Diagnostic Review Team. These collaborative structures are intended to support instructional planning and the use of student data to inform instruction. While PLC meeting time is embedded in the schedule, the PLC process appears to be in the early stages of development. Although educators meet regularly, evidence suggests that PLC work has inconsistently led to actionable instructional adjustments at the classroom level. Establishing clearer structures, sharing leadership and having a stronger emphasis on analyzing student data and applying findings to instruction will help ensure that PLC collaboration translates into improved instructional practices.

According to the "Hartstern Elementary MTSS Guide Overview" document, part of the school's MTSS includes PLC data analysis used to place students into intervention tiers for English language arts (ELA) literacy skill/all block and Edgenuity-supported mathematics. In addition, school leadership has implemented initial classroom walkthroughs to monitor instruction and improve student outcomes. Walkthrough documentation outlining six instructional look-fors was detailed in the "Hartstern 30-60-90" day plan. These practices are intended to support instructional improvement and strengthen alignment between professional learning and classroom practice; however, the breadth of initiatives detracts from the depth of understanding and adoption, overwhelming teachers and negatively impacting culture.

Despite these efforts, evidence indicates that school improvement initiatives are broad in scope and not consistently translated into coherent classroom-level instructional practices. Interviews and artifact reviews revealed multiple initiatives, including PLC implementation, walkthrough observations, professional learning activities, book studies and support from multiple external and district consultants. While these efforts reflect a strong commitment to improvement, stakeholders expressed uncertainty about communication and how these initiatives align with a clearly defined instructional focus. As a result, improvement efforts may benefit from greater coherence, communication and prioritization.

While Hartstern Elementary has established a safe learning environment and is engaged in multiple improvement efforts, greater coherence, focus and shared ownership of instructional priorities are necessary to ensure that improvement initiatives translate into consistent classroom practices and improved student outcomes. Strengthening clarity around instructional expectations and developing leadership structures that promote shared responsibility, transparent communication and meaningful stakeholder engagement will help the school build on its existing strengths while addressing areas identified for continued growth.

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 24 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.5	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	54%	38%	8%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	4%	29%	58%	8%
A3	2.7	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	46%	42%	13%
A4	1.8	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.	38%	46%	17%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.2				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.8	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	33%	58%	8%	0%
B2	1.9	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	25%	58%	17%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	50%	50%	0%	0%
B4	1.8	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	25%	75%	0%	0%
B5	1.9	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	25%	63%	8%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.8			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.3	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	4%	58%	38%	0%
C2	2.2	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	13%	54%	33%	0%
C3	2.3	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	8%	50%	42%	0%
C4	2.6	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	4%	33%	63%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.4			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.0	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	25%	50%	21%	4%
D2	1.7	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	42%	50%	8%	0%
D3	2.3	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	13%	50%	38%	0%
D4	2.0	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	25%	54%	17%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.5	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	58%	33%	4%	4%
E2	2.0	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	21%	67%	8%	4%
E3	2.1	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	17%	63%	17%	4%
E4	1.3	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	75%	25%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.6	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	4%	33%	58%	4%
F2	2.4	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	8%	50%	38%	4%
F3	2.2	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	17%	54%	25%	4%
F4	2.3	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	8%	63%	25%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.4			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	63%	29%	4%	4%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	92%	4%	4%	0%
G3	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	96%	0%	4%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 24 classroom observations using the eleot observation tool at Hartstern Elementary to gain insight into the learning environments experienced by students. The observations provided evidence regarding classroom climate, student engagement, instructional expectations and the use of digital tools to support learning. Across the school, the team mostly observed respectful interactions and structured learning environments. At the same time, the data revealed opportunities to strengthen instructional rigor, learner ownership of learning and the purposeful integration of technology to support deeper learning experiences.

While the stakeholder survey results, shared earlier in this report, identify a supportive and welcoming culture referenced by families and staff, this relational strength is not being leveraged to create an orderly learning environment in all classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 62% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 63% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with the teacher (C4).” The team encourages the school to align the supportive, welcoming culture of care with more consistent classroom management practices that ensure respectful interactions are the standard in every classroom.

It was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in learning activities (D3).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 25% of classrooms that “learners participate in discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate (D1).” These indicators suggest that in many classrooms, students were not routinely engaged in learning tasks and interacting with teachers and peers during instruction. Student perception data revealed that when asked, “Which four words best describe your school (20)?”, 38% of students selected “boring.” This correlation between classroom observations and student perceptions suggests that the current instructional model is not consistently capturing the interest or active participation of students. Also, it was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that “learners collaborated with peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)”, suggesting that structured opportunities for student collaboration are still developing across classrooms. Further, 51% of students chose “listen to teachers talk” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?”

Observational data also revealed opportunities to strengthen connections between instructional content and authentic learning experiences. It was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2).” According to survey results, 53% of students chose the phrase “complete worksheets” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” Further, it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that learners “demonstrate and/or are able to describe high-quality work (B3)” and “engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require higher-order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” These findings reveal a disconnect between daily classroom activities and the high-quality, rigorous learning experiences necessary to foster student engagement and a deeper understanding of the content.

Additional indicators associated with high expectations and rigorous learning experiences were also observed less frequently across classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)”, and it was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” These findings suggest that while classroom routines and behavioral expectations are generally established, expectations for rigorous academic work are inconsistently evident across classrooms.

The Digital Learning Environment indicators reflected limited use of technology to support inquiry, collaboration or problem-solving. It was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).” It was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that learners use digital tools/technology to “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)” and “communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning (G3).” These findings suggest that while technology may be present in classrooms, its use as a tool for deeper learning experiences remains an emerging practice.

Throughout domains, the elite observations revealed variability in instructional practices across classrooms. While some classrooms demonstrated positive engagement and structured learning environments, opportunities exist to strengthen instructional rigor, student collaboration and meaningful integration of digital learning tools. When considered alongside stakeholder feedback, artifact reviews and student performance data, these findings suggest that establishing clearer expectations for rigorous, learner-centered instruction and strengthening instructional consistency across classrooms can help ensure that all students experience engaging and challenging learning opportunities, ultimately leading to improved learner outcomes.



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

Use a collaborative process involving teachers to define a limited, focused set of schoolwide expectations for effective instruction that promote learner-centered practices. Ensure these expectations clearly define the use of evidence-based instructional strategies and guide teaching practices across the school.

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

Findings:

Hartstern Elementary’s educators are committed to supporting students and improving instructional practices. The principal’s interview and presentation, stakeholder interviews, “Hartstern Elementary’s Journey to Greatness: Continuous School Improvement” and “Hartstern Elementary MTSS Guide Overview” revealed several initiatives intended to strengthen instruction, such as a new PLC data analysis protocol, MTSS (i.e., academic and behavioral), multiple external consultants, book studies and walkthroughs. However, the number and breadth of these efforts have led to a broad-scope focus rather than a concentrated effort on a limited number of high-impact instructional practices. As a result, instructional expectations and learner-centered practices are not clearly defined or consistently implemented across classrooms. Narrowing the instructional focus to a limited set of clearly defined, evidence-based practices may allow educators to deepen implementation and achieve greater consistency in instructional delivery, ultimately strengthening learning experiences and improving student outcomes.

Student performance data from the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) revealed mixed academic outcomes across grade levels and content areas. Some areas reflect modest improvement. For example, the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in mathematics increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025, and the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025. While this represents a slight improvement, broader trends across grades and content areas indicate declining performance in several key areas. For example, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 53% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025, and the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 39% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2024-2025. Similarly, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in mathematics declined from 53% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025, and the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in mathematics declined from 19% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025. Additional declines were observed in science and social studies and are outlined in the appendix of this report. These patterns indicate that while some areas demonstrate slight improvement, overall student achievement trends suggest the need to strengthen instructional practices to support consistent academic growth.

There is misalignment among stakeholder’s perceptions of high expectations. Eighty-eight percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults in the school have high expectations for learning (10)”, yet 74% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12).” While these responses indicate that expectations for learning are present, the lower percentage of educators who believe all learners thrive suggests an opportunity to strengthen instructional practices that support consistent success for every learner.

Survey data also indicates that most educators perceive collaborative structures within the school. Seventy-eight percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we work closely with each other and our



stakeholders to support learners (6)", and 78% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10)." However, perceptions related to instructional alignment and instructional monitoring were lower. Sixty-nine percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)", and 66% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)." These findings suggest that while collaborative structures exist, consistent instructional implementation aligned to high expectations is still developing.

Classroom observational data provided additional insight into the learning environment. Evidence of rigorous academic expectations and learner-centered instruction was limited across classrooms. For example, learners who "strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)" were evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms, and learners "engaging in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)" were evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms. Also, learners who "demonstrate and/or describe high-quality work (B3)" and "engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)" were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms observed. These findings suggest that while classroom environments often reflect supportive relationships between students and teachers, opportunities for rigorous academic engagement and higher-order thinking are inconsistently evident across classrooms.

A review of artifacts provided context regarding instructional systems and supports. Results from the 2025-2026 Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey (IMPACT) indicated that 58% of staff members reported being favorable about "where to find resources for working with students who have unique learning needs (4)." While this suggests that some educators are aware of available support, it also indicates that a substantial number of staff may benefit from additional clarity and guidance in accessing instructional resources designed to support diverse learners. Although student-led conferences are referenced in the "Hartstern 30-60-90" day plan artifact, interviews indicate that conferences are not currently implemented. The absence of consistent structures for student goal-setting processes or the implementation of student-led conferences suggests that opportunities for learner ownership and engagement in monitoring academic progress are still developing or in the early implementation phases.

Hartstern Elementary's educators are committed to supporting students and engaging in improvement efforts; however, instructional expectations and learner-centered practices are not clearly defined or implemented with fidelity across classrooms. Evidence and stakeholder perceptions indicate that numerous initiatives to improve instruction and student outcomes are underway. While these efforts reflect a strong desire to improve the school, the breadth of initiatives has led to an instructional focus that is broad rather than concentrated on a limited set of high-impact instructional practices. As a result, educators face difficulties developing deep implementation and mastery of any single instructional priority. Interview and stakeholder perception data also suggest that the number of concurrent initiatives has contributed to inconsistent communication regarding school priorities and expectations, leaving some stakeholders uncertain about how improvement efforts connect and how decisions are communicated across the school community. These conditions have contributed to staff frustration and impacted the school's overall culture and stability, hindering sustained instructional improvement. Strengthening instructional coherence will require a focused set of schoolwide instructional expectations and leadership structures that promote shared ownership of improvement efforts and clear communication among stakeholders.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Collaboratively identify and define a limited set of high-impact instructional practices to serve as the school's instructional expectations.
- Align professional development, mentoring, coaching and classroom observation cycles to support the consistent implementation of these instructional practices.
- Regularly monitor student learning data, including formative and summative assessments, to determine the effectiveness of instructional practices and inform instructional adjustments.



Improvement Priority 2

Collaboratively research, develop and implement a distributed leadership model that includes a clear process for all stakeholders (i.e., parents, students, staff) to provide input into the school's continuous improvement efforts. The leadership model should promote shared leadership and encourage open, respectful communication among all stakeholders and the school leadership.

Standard 9: Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.

Findings:

As the school establishes a more focused instructional framework, strengthening distributed leadership structures and communication processes is critical to ensuring that stakeholders share ownership of improvement efforts and have clear opportunities to contribute to the school's continuous improvement process.

A review of multiple data sources indicates that the school has educators who are committed to improving their professional practices and supporting student learning. Stakeholder perception data suggests that teachers actively engage in professional learning and believe they possess the knowledge and skills necessary to support learners. For example, 84% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)." Also, 83% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we know and perform our jobs well (13)", while 86% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults know and do their work well (11)." These responses suggest that both educators and families perceive staff members as capable professionals who are committed to supporting students.

Survey data also indicate that school structures are intended to support collaboration and responsiveness to learner needs. Seventy-eight percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)", and 78% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10)." Additionally, 71% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", while 69% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)." Family perception data further supports these findings, as 84% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)." Observational data emphasized a disconnect, as it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that learners "engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that met their needs (A1)." This indicates that while survey responses suggest educators believe instruction is responsive to learners' needs, observational evidence shows that instructional practices designed to meet diverse learner needs are not consistently implemented across classrooms. Establishing stronger collaborative leadership structures may help educators collectively analyze instructional practices, share effective strategies and support more consistent implementation of differentiated instruction. As leadership structures and decision-making processes shape how priorities are communicated and implemented across the school, stakeholder perceptions of communication, trust and professional culture provide additional context for the need to strengthen distributed leadership.

Evidence also demonstrates that the principal has taken steps to build educator capacity and support instructional improvement. For example, documentation from the "JCPS Envision Equity" article on coaching for equity, written by the principal, outlines efforts to use SIF to support teachers in earning an English as a second language (ESL) endorsement. These efforts are intended to strengthen teachers' ability to teach multilingual learners and address the evolving needs of the school's student population. In addition, artifacts and interview data indicate that multiple consultants and district professionals, including resources from English learner services, curriculum implementation teams, SchoolKit, Leader in Me and district reading and mathematics specialists, have provided professional learning opportunities designed to strengthen instructional practices across the school.

While these initiatives demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and school improvement, data from stakeholder interviews indicate that opportunities for shared leadership and collaborative decision-making are still developing. Several stakeholders noted that communication regarding school initiatives is sometimes unclear and



lacks consistent two-way dialogue. Although staff members are informed about new initiatives and improvement efforts, interview data suggest that processes for providing feedback or contributing to decision-making are not always clearly defined. This perception is reflected in survey responses as 13% of educators selected “transparent” while 40% selected “secretive” when asked, “Which four words best describe, in general, your institution’s culture (24)?” These findings are consistent with stakeholder interview data indicating a desire for clearer communication and more opportunities for staff input in school improvement efforts.

Stakeholder interviews also indicated that some educators have been provided opportunities to develop leadership capacity, such as presenting to new teacher cohorts or sharing information during faculty meetings. While these opportunities demonstrate emerging efforts to develop leadership among staff members, stakeholders indicated that leadership opportunities are not yet broadly distributed across the faculty. Several participants expressed a desire for additional structures that allow staff members to contribute ideas, share concerns and participate more actively in school improvement discussions.

Additionally, stakeholder interview data indicated that some educators would benefit from opportunities to share perspectives or raise questions without concern for how their feedback may be received. Several stakeholders indicated a need for clearer communication processes and a school culture that encourages open dialogue when questions or concerns arise. These perceptions suggest that while staff members recognize ongoing improvement efforts, such as the implementation of MTSS structures, PLC collaboration, data collection systems and adjustments to the master schedule, greater stakeholder engagement in shaping these initiatives would strengthen collective ownership of the school’s improvement work.

Survey responses, artifact evidence, classroom observations and stakeholder conversations revealed a consistent pattern. The school demonstrates a committed faculty and leadership team that is actively pursuing improvement initiatives and professional learning opportunities. However, the school lacks a clearly defined distributed leadership model that systematically engages educators, families and other stakeholders in collaborative decision-making and continuous improvement processes. Without clearly articulated structures that promote shared leadership, communication and stakeholder input, opportunities to leverage the collective expertise of the school community will be limited.

Establishing a distributed leadership model that promotes shared decision-making, open communication and meaningful stakeholder engagement will help build trust, strengthen the school’s professional culture and create greater clarity around school improvement efforts. By engaging educators, families and other stakeholders in collaborative leadership structures, the school can strengthen organizational coherence, support consistent implementation of improvement initiatives and create the conditions necessary to improve student outcomes.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish leadership committees that include stakeholder representation in school decision-making.
- Implement regular opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback and input on school initiatives and improvement efforts.
- Provide opportunities for stakeholders to participate in leadership roles that support school improvement.

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.

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

The principal demonstrates a commitment focused on improving the effectiveness of the school for students, staff, families and the community. With a sense of urgency and an intentional focus on improving student outcomes, the principal volunteered for a Two-Day Review in 2024. One of the improvement priorities was, "Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners." Over the past two years, the principal has focused on that support by developing a protocol for PLC meetings that followed the Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) protocol to support collaborative instructional planning practices.

Also, the principal has focused on improving the effectiveness of the school in supporting MLs, families and the community. Several initiatives have been implemented to prioritize improvement efforts for this high population demographic. The school is considered a high-density school with a large percentage of newcomers. The principal has focused on building teachers' capacity to support these students. The principal has worked with the district to provide growth opportunities for teachers to earn an ESL endorsement. The principal has adjusted the master schedule to ensure an ELD teacher supports every grade level, providing the opportunity to co-teach in every classroom. Last year, the principal wanted to offer wrap-around services for families by providing English classes for parents. The principal has also worked towards the school being considered a welcoming center for families, which is supported by the family survey data with 90% of families who agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed" and 93% who agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect."

Evidence and interviews indicated a lack of collaborative efforts to engage stakeholders throughout the continuous improvement cycle. While several initiatives are in place and data are often required in PLCs, there is limited evidence of fully developed systems focused on shared leadership, strategic goal setting, planning, implementing and monitoring for continuous school and classroom improvement. Multiple stakeholders could



speak to the use of data in the PLC process and that the expectation is for classroom data to be collected; however, there was a lack of consistency as to how that data were to be used to support continuous improvement. Evidence included a district engagement report identifying areas for improvement, including gathering teacher feedback on current support and meeting with team leaders to ensure consistency and alignment in communication and school-wide priorities. The principal should use a strategic thinking process that provides multiple opportunities for stakeholder engagement and feedback, ending in actionable next steps.

Evidence and interviews also indicate a lack of structures and practices in place to balance the need to make effective changes while supporting staff's ability to learn and develop new skills. Multiple initiatives focused on professional growth have occurred. Evidence and interviews indicate limited structures or practices in place to support staff's ability to learn and internalize the new skills. There is little evidence of formalized coaching and feedback practices. The principal should establish structures that elevate and utilize teachers' voices, ensuring open, two-way communication and removing barriers that hinder the successful implementation of change efforts.



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
Wendy Oliver	Wendy Oliver has 25 years of experience in education. Currently, she serves as the head of a school in Tennessee. In addition to serving on the leadership committee for National Standards for Quality (NSQ), she is the co-leader for the revision of the National Standards for Online Teaching. Her past experiences include serving as a teacher, coach, administrator and chief learning architect, as well as leading initiatives in online learning for districts, charters and the Tennessee Department of Education.
Teresa Miller-Ruiz	Teresa Miller-Ruiz has over 29 years of experience in education, including 12 years with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL), supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching elementary school and serving as a district curriculum coach. She is a certified facilitator for Jim Shipley and Associates in School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence (SIPPE). The primary focus of her current role is to improve student achievement by building leadership capacity, improving instructional practices within the classroom and creating sustainable systems to ensure future student success.
James Carrier	James Carrier is a 28-year veteran educator. Since 2021, serving as an ERL with KDE. James served as a principal, instructional coach, library media specialist and classroom teacher. James was a semi-finalist for the Kentucky Elementary Teacher of the Year in 2009 and a Kentucky finalist for the 2010 Presidential Award for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching.
Tonya Holt	Tonya Holt is a retired educator who served students in rural, urban and suburban communities over the past 31 years. She began her educational career as a special education teacher. She later transitioned to Kentucky to serve students in multiple school districts. She has served as an instructional coach, elementary and middle assistant principal, preschool associate principal and as an ERL with KDE, supporting CSI schools. Tonya ended her educational career serving the students, staff and community as a principal.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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



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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	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.	2

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	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.	2
27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.	The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices.	The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	2
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	1

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

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	53	46	51	47	24	47
4th-Grade Reading	39	48	29	50	26	50
5th-Grade Reading	27	48	20	46	28	50
3rd-Grade Math	53	43	32	43	23	43
4th-Grade Math	28	42	15	43	17	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	19	41	11	43
4th-Grade Science	22	35	*	34	13	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	21	42	19	39	18	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	19	47	22	47	18	47
5th-Grade On-Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	*	38

Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 53% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA declined from 39% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA declined from 53% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA declined from 19% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA declined from 22% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA declined from 21% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA declined from 22% in 2023-2024 to 18% 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	20	26	26	29	38	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	31	35	40	35	30	35
Percent Score of 100	31	24	23	23	17	22
Percent Score of 140	17	14	12	13	14	13

Plus

- The percentage of EL students receiving 140 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025 and was above the state average of 13%.

Delta

- The percentage of EL students receiving zero points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 38% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students receiving 60-80 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 40% in 2023-2024 to 30% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	53	51	24
Female	59	50	20
Male	47	52	29
White	65	46	28
African American	39	40	17
Hispanic or Latino	55	48	26
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	47	41	18
English Learners plus Monitored	54	47	23
Economically Disadvantaged	54	43	18
Students with Disabilities with IEP	21	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 3rd-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 53% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 59% in 2022-2023 to 20% 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 52% in 2023-2024 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 65% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 40% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 55% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 47% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade ELs plus monitored scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 54% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 54% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	53	32	23
Female	62	26	*
Male	45	39	31
White	57	*	22
African American	52	30	*
Hispanic or Latino	45	33	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	47	*	21
English Learners plus Monitored	54	34	23
Economically Disadvantaged	52	30	21
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 3rd-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 53% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 62% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 45% in 2022-2023 to 31% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 57% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 52% in 2022-2023 to 30% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 45% in 2022-2023 to 33% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 47% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade ELs plus monitored scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 54% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 52% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	39	29	26
Female	37	33	19
Male	40	25	33
White	*	26	*
African American	26	*	27
Hispanic or Latino	50	*	14
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	36	*	10
English Learners plus Monitored	43	*	20
Economically Disadvantaged	34	33	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 33% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 26% in 2022-2023 to 27% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 4th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 39% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 37% in 2022-2023 to 19% 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 50% in 2022-2023 to 14% 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 10% 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade ELs plus monitored scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 43% in 2022-2023 to 20% 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 34% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	28	15	17
Female	23	*	8
Male	32	11	27
White	*	17	*
African American	*	*	18
Hispanic or Latino	35	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	25	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	31	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	25	15	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 4th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 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	*	13
Female	*	*	*
Male	21	*	18
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	27	*	11
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	6
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	8
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 4th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	27	20	28
Female	28	25	29
Male	27	16	26
White	*	*	29
African American	15	17	*
Hispanic or Latino	29	27	48
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	28
English Learners plus Monitored	*	16	30
Economically Disadvantaged	26	16	24
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 5th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 48% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade ELs plus monitored scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 30% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 24% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 26% in 2022-2023 to 24% 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	*	19	11
Female	*	*	16
Male	*	24	5
White	*	*	10
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	33	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	22	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	17	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 5th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 5% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 9% 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	21	19	18
Female	*	17	14
Male	18	20	*
White	*	15	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	18	33	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	13	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	27	*
Economically Disadvantaged	23	16	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 33% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 5th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 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	19	22	18
Female	21	25	22
Male	18	20	13
White	18	*	19
African American	*	20	*
Hispanic or Latino	18	37	28
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	13	14
English Learners plus Monitored	*	22	18
Economically Disadvantaged	19	19	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all students in 5th-grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 37% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade ELs plus monitored scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 16% 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	*	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Schedule

Monday, March 2, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
2 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #1 Cont.	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, March 3, 2026

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

Wednesday, March 3, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:40 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, March 5, 2026

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