



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Indian Trail Elementary

Jan. 20-23, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	5
eleot Narrative	8
Improvement Priorities	10
Improvement Priority 1	10
Potential Leader Actions:.....	11
Improvement Priority 2	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	13
Your Next Steps	13
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	14
Team Roster	16
Appendix	17
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	17
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	17
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	19
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	21
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	23
Student Performance Data.....	27
Schedule	40

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	3
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	6
Certified Staff	39
Noncertified Staff	3
Students	37
Parents	3
Total	94

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:

Students, families and staff consistently reported that Indian Trail Elementary has made intentional efforts to establish a safe, caring and welcoming learning environment. A recurring strength identified across interviews, observations and survey results is the school's strong culture of care, safety and belonging with the multilingual learners (MLs), which serves as a foundation for teaching and learning for students from diverse backgrounds. Stakeholders frequently described the school as family, warm, welcoming and collaborative, noting that adults are deeply invested in students and one another. Families expressed confidence that students' well-being is a priority for the administration, staff and teachers. Students overwhelmingly say the school is safe, rules make them feel safer, teachers help them and a good education is provided for them. Students also noted that even when they are new, teachers help them feel comfortable and supported. Some students also reported that they spend time working in the i-Ready Assessment Suite and that teachers place them in groups, set goals with them and use notebooks to help them track their progress.

Stakeholder survey data aligned with interview data, as 93% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)", and 97% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we think of everyone's safety when making decisions (3)." In addition, 88% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)", and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcome (1)."

The principal was appointed in July 2026. The principal's overview presentation outlined the entry plan and early improvement strategy following their appointment as the school's principal. The school serves approximately 623 students, more than half of whom are MLs. Indian Trail Elementary is a comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) school based on Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data published in November 2025. The principal's overview presentation was a candid assessment of the school's current context, including high staff turnover, persistent vacancies, inconsistent instructional practices and fragmented systems supporting behavior, multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) and school culture.

Stakeholders shared that students appear happier and more connected to school than last year, with increased positive interactions between students and the principal. Families described the school as supportive and hands-on, particularly for students with special needs. Families also emphasized the depth of care that extends beyond academics, reinforcing the perception that Indian Trail Elementary is a community focused on trust and relationships. Classroom observations aligned with these perceptions, revealing well-managed learning environments where students are compliant, respectful and ready to learn. While instructional rigor and engagement remain growth areas, the predictable, orderly climate has created a stable platform for deeper learning. Efforts are also being made to strengthen a collegial professional culture. Teachers reported feeling increasingly more comfortable sharing ideas and proposing solutions, signaling progress toward collaborative improvement. Protected professional learning community (PLC) time is in place, and departmentalization has been received well by most staff, allowing teachers to focus on their strengths.

Observational and interview data indicate an intentional effort to strengthen the PLC process, including a focus on improving its structure and providing teachers with protected collaborative planning time. Interview data indicated



that the school has PLC meetings and embedded professional learning opportunities. The school also receives external support from Solution Tree to refine PLC practices; however, the absence of systematic data collection and evaluation of PLC effectiveness has limited the school's ability to translate collaboration into instructional quality. Teachers reported that student data are inconsistently reviewed and rarely used to inform instructional adjustments. In addition, inconsistent communication of expectations and limited monitoring of instructional implementation have reduced the overall impact of PLC work, resulting in a lack of school improvement processes that produce sustained gains in student achievement.

In conclusion, while growth opportunities remain, pockets of promise are evident in the school, including dedicated time for PLCs and dependable data sources, such as Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and the i-Ready Assessment Suite. Also, the school has implemented the Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation and Success (CHAMPS) process, and interviews show increased staff confidence in the principal's ability to move the school forward.



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 25 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.8	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	56%	12%	24%	8%
A2	2.2	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	12%	52%	36%	0%
A3	2.6	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	12%	24%	56%	8%
A4	1.9	Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions, and dispositions.	32%	44%	24%	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.	40%	44%	16%	0%
B2	2.2	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	16%	52%	32%	0%
B3	1.6	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	52%	36%	12%	0%
B4	1.9	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	34%	64%	12%	0%
B5	2.0	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	20%	56%	24%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.4	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	12%	40%	44%	4%
C2	2.2	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	20%	48%	28%	4%
C3	2.2	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	8%	48%	36%	8%
C4	2.9	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	8%	20%	48%	24%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			



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.	28%	44%	24%	4%
D2	1.7	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	48%	36%	16%	0%
D3	2.3	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	8%	56%	36%	0%
D4	1.8	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	44%	18%	16%	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	1.6	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	52%	40%	8%	0%
E2	2.0	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	16%	64%	20%	0%
E3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	20%	64%	16%	0%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	72%	16%	8%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.8			



F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.9	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	4%	20%	60%	16%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	8%	24%	48%	20%
F3	2.1	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	36%	28%	24%	12%
F4	2.2	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	8%	60%	32%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	80%	16%	4%	0%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	88%	12%	0%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	96%	4%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.1			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 25 classroom observations in core content classrooms using the eleot tool. The team also conducted informal observations in non-core content classrooms and common areas. The team observed respectful interactions between students and teachers in most classrooms, hallways and common areas. Students were eager to welcome team members in the hallway, often thanking them for being there. This observational data was supported by survey data, as 88% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” It was evident/very evident in 76% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” The team observed a supportive learning environment in most classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 72% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a

congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” The team encourages the school to leverage the respectful and supportive qualities in most classrooms to implement the instructional recommendations outlined in this report.

The team identified areas for instructional improvement. For example, it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” Students were often observed engaging in tasks or answering questions at a low level of knowledge. While students were usually compliant with completing these tasks, active learning engagement is an area of growth for the school, as it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” Designing and delivering more rigorous instruction to support student learning will increase student engagement.

Observations revealed that instruction was most often teacher directed. The team observed most students completing the same tasks. Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 32% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)” and evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning (G3).” These indicators support the need for professional learning and coaching to help teachers deliver instruction that not only meets students’ individual learning needs but also supports a collaborative learning environment where students learn with and from their peers and the teacher.

The team observed a few instances where students took responsibility for their learning. It was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that “learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5).” It was also evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own learning or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” This suggests the need for a systematic process to improve progress tracking, so learners can take greater responsibility and be more self-directed in their learning. Furthermore, learners who “receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)” were evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” When teachers provide students with feedback to support and improve their learning, students are better able to produce and describe high-quality work. The team encourages the school to provide coaching that supports teachers during curriculum implementation. Specifically, this coaching should offer guidance on planning intentional opportunities for student feedback and using rubrics to help learners understand and achieve high-quality work.

While it was evident/very evident in 64% of classrooms that “students are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)”, it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that “learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3).” Students who feel the classroom environment is unfair may disengage or spend time off task. Off-task behaviors may, at least in part, be due to a lack of purposeful use of class time. It was evident/very evident in 32% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).” The team encourages the school to grow and leverage a clear, consistent approach to maximize class time and transitions between activities and classes.



Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement Priority 1

Establish a systemic continuous improvement framework where leaders purposely engage teachers and instructional staff to set goals, use structured data analysis and routinely monitor progress to guide instruction, ensuring success for all students.

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

Findings:

Student performance data from the 2024-2025 KSA showed that the percentage of students who scored Proficient/Distinguished was below the state average across all grade levels and subjects. In addition, the percentage of students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA declined in all grade levels in reading from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. Although stakeholder survey data revealed that 85% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", stakeholders could not describe a consistent, formal and documented continuous improvement process during interviews. Stakeholders shared that some data are reviewed (e.g., MAP, i-Ready Assessment Suite), but they were unable to identify how data are intentionally used to adjust Tier 1 instruction.

Documents and artifacts corroborate these findings by revealing structural gaps in leadership systems. Administrative team meeting agendas lacked consistent expectations, documented outcomes or follow-up actions and did not include attendance records, which limited accountability. The team found little evidence of a systematic walkthrough schedule or feedback tool. The principal shared that he was updating the walkthrough tool. PLC artifacts reflected compliance-oriented practices, such as copying curriculum language into planning documents, rather than engaging in deep instructional discussions or collaborative analysis of student work. Importantly, the team found little evidence of a documented monitoring plan for the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP), further indicating a lack of routine progress monitoring.

Additionally, many stakeholders stated during interviews that they truly loved being a part of the school community and felt that student learning was at the core. While these perceptions reflect positive intent and a willingness to improve, the team was unable to corroborate them with student performance data or classroom observations. Classroom observational data reinforced the absence of a systematic, continuous-improvement framework. While observational data showed that many classrooms were orderly and compliant, most classrooms lacked instructional rigor and meaningful student engagement. For example, it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." When instruction was delivered in small groups, students were more engaged and teachers provided more opportunities for feedback than during whole-group instruction. Also, it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)." The delivery of curriculum was often perfunctory rather than responsive to learners' needs. These findings suggest that while stakeholders perceive effort and commitment, those efforts are not organized within a structured improvement system capable of producing measurable academic gains.

Data collection and use were inconsistent. Evidence and stakeholder interviews revealed that interventionists rely on MAP data, while classroom teachers inconsistently collect or use formative data. Independent practice and weak routines reduce opportunities for formative assessment and instructional refinement. There was minimal evidence of a shared, school-wide expectation for how data should be analyzed or applied to adjust instruction.



The disconnect between data collection and classroom execution prevents teachers from making the real-time adjustments necessary to address individual learning needs.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Create a cyclical formalized process for analyzing student data (i.e., MAP, i-Ready Assessment Suite, common formative assessments, benchmarks) to measure instructional outcomes during PLCs.
- Implement a data protocol to strengthen the process that supports leaders and teachers in adjusting instruction and improving student outcomes.
- Monitor the implementation through regular classroom walkthroughs and make the appropriate adjustments.
- Use walkthrough and student performance data to provide differentiated professional development that strengthens teaching practices.

Improvement Priority 2

Establish a cyclical process to provide teachers with frequent feedback, enabling real-time instructional adjustments that improve teachers' effectiveness and deepen student outcomes.

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

Findings:

The Diagnostic Review Team observed that strategies were rarely implemented in ways that effectively aligned with students' diverse needs. While isolated feedback practices and coaching support exist, they function inconsistently and are not aligned within a coherent process that advances instructional effectiveness or deepens student learning.

Student performance data reinforces the need for a stronger instructional feedback cycle. Over multiple years, student achievement data show limited improvement, with most areas stagnating or declining, as noted in Improvement Priority 1. These trends suggest that instructional adjustments are not occurring with sufficient frequency or precision to impact learner outcomes. The lack of sustained academic gains indicates that feedback mechanisms are not systematically informing changes to Tier 1 instruction or improving instructional effectiveness over time.

Stakeholder interview data revealed a need for frequent classroom walkthroughs with consistent, meaningful feedback. Stakeholders reported that feedback is inconsistently provided and typically positive, without actionable steps to improve instructional practices. While survey data showed teachers participated in training, they were not provided consistent, meaningful feedback to guide their professional growth. For example, although 87% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)”, during interviews, many teachers expressed a desire for more frequent, constructive and actionable feedback to improve their instructional capacity.

While stakeholders appreciate the focus on improving student behavior and the introduction of CHAMPS, several noted the need for additional training to ensure consistent and effective implementation. Perceptions of school culture were mixed; some stakeholders described the school as a family, while others reported divisions among personnel that undermine coherence in feedback and instructional support. Stakeholders also identified clear needs related to school-wide communication of expectations, professional learning on the high-quality instructional resource (HQIR), consistent coaching for all teachers and a formalized, shared system for data use beyond isolated MAP or i-Ready Assessment Suite analyses.

Classroom observational data provided direct evidence of the absence of a cyclical instructional monitoring process. Observations consistently showed classrooms that were orderly and compliant, yet student engagement and instructional rigor varied across classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 32% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)”, and evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1).” While many teachers used the adopted HQIR and followed a whole-group and small-group instructional structure, the use of student data to inform grouping and instructional decisions was inconsistent. Interventionists relied on MAP or checkpoint assessments, while classroom teachers used various data sources without shared expectations or alignment. The team found a lack of a systematic approach to providing feedback or guiding instructional adjustments, limiting the school's ability to monitor and refine instruction in real time.

A review of documents and artifacts further confirms the lack of an established feedback cycle. There was limited evidence of a teacher observation schedule that documents teacher instructional progress and produces growth opportunities, or an analysis protocol to guide frequent instructional monitoring. Although 10 teachers receive coaching through an external provider (i.e., Better Lesson), participation is limited and not embedded within a



school-wide system. Newer teachers participate in “NACHO Average Teacher” professional learning, and some teachers have mentors; however, these supports operate independently rather than as part of a unified feedback and monitoring structure.

Stakeholder interview data further highlighted gaps in feedback and monitoring practices. Teachers consistently reported a desire for more critical feedback to support instructional adjustments. Interviews revealed that walkthroughs occur sporadically and often result in limited or no follow-up feedback. Some teachers reported receiving an email notification after a walkthrough, with little specific guidance or coaching conversation. Feedback is commonly associated with formal evaluation observations rather than ongoing instructional monitoring. Although administrators referenced a past walkthrough tool, there is no evidence of its current, consistent implementation. Instructional staff noted inconsistencies in observations, PLC implementation and curriculum use, as well as limited team cohesion among administrators, which further weakens the feedback loop necessary for instructional improvement.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Regularly meet with the administrative team to establish collective commitments around school-wide instructional expectations.
- Communicate the updated instructional framework/expectations to all stakeholders.
- Develop, communicate and implement a classroom walkthrough protocol and process to monitor the instructional framework that provides timely feedback and coaching to teachers.
- Closely monitor the walkthrough process to gauge the effectiveness of teachers meeting the individual, diverse academic needs of all students.

Your Next Steps

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

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

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



Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

Since being appointed in July 2025, the principal at Indian Trail Elementary has committed to improving the school culture through teacher voice and student recognition. Stakeholder interviews suggest an appreciation for the principal's willingness to engage with staff, families and students. Furthermore, interviews and observations demonstrate positive interactions between students and teachers, as well as among staff. Stakeholders report feeling a sense of welcome, safety and belonging.

The principal's primary focus has been building trust, establishing relationships and creating behavioral and cultural changes. Stakeholder interviews and a review of documents showed the principal has not embraced a system of continuous improvement to address the academic needs of the school. Agenda evidence includes an item labeled "Focus Area: Academic and Student Progress", however, most agendas do not include a review of student academic data. The adopted school motto is "We are here for teaching and learning." This motto is stated in the morning announcement and is visibly posted in the building. The principal needs support to engage stakeholders in developing, communicating and implementing this motto in daily school routines. Administrative meetings have decreased from once a week to once a month. The principal needs support in building his guiding coalition through and with the administrative team to define a clear vision and actionable plan for urgent action toward improvement.

There is an established schedule whereby PLCs meet twice weekly in grade-level teams. Teachers spend time collaboratively completing HQIR unit and lesson internalization documents and participating in embedded professional development. Teachers reported, and a review of PLC agendas confirms that student data are reviewed inconsistently and not routinely used to inform instructional adjustments. While MAP data are used to place students into intervention groups, there is inconsistent analysis of data, including classroom assessment

data, to support adjustments to Tier 1 classroom instruction. The principal will need support in establishing a protocol for consistent collection and analysis of multiple data sources and in monitoring its use to adjust classroom instruction.

The principal states he has an updated walkthrough tool; however, this has not been shared with others who may conduct instructional walkthroughs. The principal has conducted a few focused walkthroughs; however, stakeholder interviews indicate that walkthroughs occur inconsistently and rarely result in feedback shared with classroom teachers. A review of evidence, including artifacts and interviews, demonstrated a need for consistent monitoring, feedback and coaching to ensure instruction that meets the rigor of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS). To better prepare for improvement, the principal needs support in developing systems that clearly communicate non-negotiable instructional expectations and establishing a monitoring system to ensure accountability and oversight across all areas of the instructional system (e.g., intellectual preparation, instructional delivery, data analysis).

The principal shared that in his first 30 days he sought clarity around existing systems, which were primarily operational (e.g., behavior referrals, technology, climate, culture). Observations reveal that systems for daily operations (e.g., CHAMPS, morning announcements, transitions) are well established.

Stakeholder interviews reveal a disconnect across role groups regarding priorities and expectations for school improvement and the cohesion of systems. Interviews, observations and a review of artifacts reveal the need for the development of aligned strategic systems. The principal will need support in developing interconnected systems to support strategic alignment of the goals, strategies or activities within a revised CSIP / turnaround plan.

Observational data and a review of the evidence and stakeholder interviews suggest a need for support and interventions for instructional staff in the intentional planning and delivery of instruction at the level of rigor required by the KAS and the selected HQIR.

For the turnaround of a CSI school to be successful, the principal should be the definitive instructional leader. The principal will need support for developing intentional structures to create coherence across all instructional systems (e.g., intellectual preparation, implementation and monitoring of instruction, data analysis through PLCs, professional learning).

Team Roster

The Diagnostic 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
Nelson L. Render	Nelson L. Render has dedicated more than 28 years to educational leadership, consistently advancing students' learning outcomes. He has held several leadership positions in public education, including director of bands and assistant principal, in DeKalb County Schools. His career also includes service as an assistant principal and implementation specialist for 9-12 college and career readiness in Atlanta Public Schools, as a principal in Clayton County Schools, as chief of secondary schools and as an associate superintendent of high schools in the Madison Metropolitan School District in Wisconsin. He currently is the executive officer in the Bibb County School District, where he supports, serves and supervises 13 principals.
Jennifer Wilt	Jennifer Wilt has 31 years of experience as an educator in public schools. She has served as a high school associate principal, middle school principal, instructional coach and high school teacher. She is currently an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), where she supports schools with aligning curriculum, instruction and assessment with state standards and coaches leaders in continuous improvement processes related to the development and refinement of systems.
Nick Pannell	Nick Pannell has more than 22 years of experience in public education. He has served as a high school teacher, assistant principal and principal. He currently serves as an ERL Liaison with KDE in the Office of Continuous Improvement and Support, where he empowers and equips educators to build sustainable systems for continuous improvement focused on student learning.
Jimmy D. Shaw, Jr.	Jimmy D. Shaw, Jr., has devoted more than two decades to public education, serving in leadership roles focused on improving student outcomes and strengthening school systems. His career includes service as a classroom teacher, school administrator and district-level leader. Jimmy recently served as superintendent of Florence City Schools in Florence, Alabama for the past nine years, where he provided strategic leadership for academic improvement, organizational coherence and community engagement across the district. In addition to his work in education, he is an active community leader and pastor, bringing a values-driven and systems-oriented approach to leadership and continuous improvement.
Terry Fludd	Terry Fludd's career spans over 20 years in education. She has worked as a secondary mathematics teacher, assistant principal, principal, curriculum support specialist, Enterprise learning coach, regional support coach for the South Carolina State Department of Education and a district-level administrator. Terry has served as an adjunct professor in South Carolina and North Carolina. Currently, she is the director of school improvement and innovation, district-wide professional development and secondary math content coordinator for Orangeburg County Schools. Terry is the chief executive officer (CEO) and founder of Notable Consulting and Instructional Services, LLC. She has been certified by the National School Reform Faculty as a trained critical friends group coach and trained as a project-based learning coach through Buck Institute for Education to implement project-based learning with a focus on science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) and science, technology, engineering, art and mathematics (STEAM) curricula.

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.	1
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	1

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
21. Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices.	Instructional activities are primarily designed around curriculum objectives with little or no focus on learner needs and interests. Professional staff members rarely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their individual potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on needs and interests typical of most students. Professional staff members infrequently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Most learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members routinely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members consistently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	2
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.	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
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.	2

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

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

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	22	46	18	47	15	47
4th-Grade Reading	27	48	33	50	21	50
5th-Grade Reading	33	48	18	46	16	50
3rd-Grade Math	31	43	19	43	18	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	19	43	21	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	14	41	8	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	14	34	12	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	22	42	14	39	9	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	28	47	14	47	8	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	13	39	17	39	13	38

Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by two percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by seven percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by six percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 17 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined by 13 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined by six percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies declined by 13 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- According to the 2024-2025 KSA, students scored lower (i.e., gap of 23 percentage points or more Proficient/Distinguished) in all content areas compared to the state average.
- In 2024-2025, 8% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math compared to the state average of 43%.
- In 2024-2025, 9% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies compared to the state average of 47%.
- In 2024-2025, 8% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics compared to the state average of 38%.

Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	33	26	38	29	39	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	35	35	35	35	37	35
Percent Score of 100	23	24	19	23	15	22
Percent Score of 140	9	14	9	13	9	13

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of EL students receiving 0 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment increased from 33% in 2022-2023 to 39% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased by eight percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	22	18	15
Female	26	*	16
Male	18	18	14
White	*	17	*
African American	29	18	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	12
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	20	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	21	9
Economically Disadvantaged	23	18	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 10 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by four percentage points in reading on the KSA from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by nine percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	31	19	18
Female	21	20	13
Male	40	18	22
White	54	17	*
African American	25	15	11
Hispanic or Latino	*	26	24
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	35	28	*
English Learners plus Monitored	35	29	19
Economically Disadvantaged	29	20	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined by eight percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined by 18 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined by 14 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined by 15 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	27	33	21
Female	*	37	27
Male	33	29	14
White	40	64	23
African American	*	34	14
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	23
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	13
English Learners plus Monitored	*	18	18
Economically Disadvantaged	*	33	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 10 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 19 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 17 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 20 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 16 percentage points in reading on the KSA from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	19	21
Female	*	14	20
Male	*	24	21
White	*	*	23
African American	*	21	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	21
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	15
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	18
Economically Disadvantaged	*	20	18
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by six percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by three percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by two percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

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

Plus

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

Delta

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	33	18	16
Female	33	20	23
Male	32	16	11
White	*	23	*
African American	28	24	19
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	15
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	7
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	13
Economically Disadvantaged	31	15	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 10 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 21 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by nine percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 16 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	14	8
Female	*	*	6
Male	*	18	11
White	*	38	*
African American	*	*	9
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	7
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	*	*	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by seven percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	22	14	9
Female	22	8	9
Male	*	21	9
White	*	31	*
African American	21	14	7
Hispanic or Latino	18	*	7
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	5
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	8
Economically Disadvantaged	24	12	8
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by 13 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by 12 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by 14 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by 16 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	28	14	8
Female	25	15	11
Male	32	13	5
White	*	15	*
African American	21	16	9
Hispanic or Latino	36	*	5
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	14	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	13	4
Economically Disadvantaged	27	11	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by 14 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by 27 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by 12 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by 18 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 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	13	17	13
Female	*	15	17
Male	14	19	9
White	*	*	*
African American	14	22	20
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	5
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	13	6
Economically Disadvantaged	12	15	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased by two percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased by five percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Schedule

Tuesday, January 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
2:30 p.m.– 3:30 p.m.	Initial Team Meeting/ Introductions/ Review of Schedule	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m.– 6 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6:30 p.m.– 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, January 21, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:50 a.m.– 5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m.– 5:45 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6:15 p.m.– 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, January 22, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:50 a.m.– 5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m.– 6 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6:30 p.m.– 9:15 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Friday, January 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members