



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Johnson Traditional Middle**

Feb. 17-20, 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.....	26
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	1
Building-Level Administrators	5
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	4
Certified Staff	19
Noncertified Staff	16
Students	17
Parents	2
Total	64

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:

Documents, artifacts, interviews and survey data revealed strengths related to the school's culture and climate. Survey results indicate that educators perceive strengths in maintaining a respectful and welcoming environment. Educator survey results revealed that 85% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)." Additionally, 94% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." Finally, 79% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we keep our learners' well-being as a priority in everything we do (11)." Interview data also revealed that the staff perceives the school as supportive with a strong sense of collegiality. These responses indicate that educators perceive the school as an inclusive, respectful and caring environment. Additionally, interviews and observations showed the implementation of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) is having a positive impact on the school culture, as evidenced by the consistent representation of Respectful, Organized, Accountable, Resilient (ROAR) and Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation and Success (CHAMPS) expectations. Interviews and artifacts also revealed the implementation of a reward system for positive behavior, as evidenced by the "ROAR Schoolwide Incentive Plan" and the digital PBIS Rewards system, Navigate 360. Collectively, these practices and perceptions suggest that the school has established foundational systems that foster a positive, orderly learning environment.

The 2024-2025 Two-Day Review report suggested a focus on strengthening instructional quality through high expectations and building consistent systems for using assessment data to improve student learning outcomes. The team noted evidence of initial practices to support professional development through the implementation of professional learning communities (PLCs), Embedded Professional Days (EPDs) and districtwide GOLD days. The team reviewed school leadership's classroom walkthrough schedules and the instruments used to monitor instructional practices and provide teachers with feedback. However, student performance data and classroom observations revealed that instructional practices are inconsistently aligned to high expectations or learner-centered strategies across classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)" and "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Additionally, when asked, "Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?", 65% of students selected "do the same work as everyone else" and 57% chose "listen to teacher talk." Student performance data indicated growth in select areas, including increases in 7th-grade reading proficiency and gains in both 7th- and 8th-grade math proficiency; however, results are still below state averages.

Educator survey data also revealed strong perceptions of professional growth and use of data to guide instruction, as 85% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)" and 88% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I used a variety of information for decision-making that affected my area of responsibility (21)"; however, interviews and a review of artifacts suggested that while PLC meetings are in place, their work has focused more on pacing and planning than on deep analysis of student performance data to drive instructional decisions. The team suggests leveraging the current professional learning and observational structures to strengthen differentiated instruction,



increase data-driven instruction and ensure the consistent implementation of high-quality instructional practices across classrooms.

The team also noted opportunities to improve the continuous improvement process. Interview data revealed that students, parents and staff have limited involvement in developing and monitoring the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP). Stakeholder survey results also revealed varying perceptions regarding school improvement efforts, as 53% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that adults “try new things to improve the school (6)” and 60% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults are committed to trying new things to improve (6).” Educator survey results reflected similar perceptions, as 64% agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10)” and 67% agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners’ needs (5).” These findings indicate that while structures for collecting and reviewing student data are in place, the continuous improvement process lacks consistent, systemic stakeholder engagement and consistent action. The team recommends strengthening formal processes for stakeholder (e.g., students, parents, staff) participation in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the CSIP to ensure transparency, shared accountability and sustained focus on improving student outcomes.



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 19 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	1.4	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	68%	21%	11%	0%
A2	2.3	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	74%	26%	0%
A3	2.4	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	5%	53%	42%	0%
A4	1.4	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.	63%	37%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.9				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.5	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	47%	53%	0%	0%
B2	1.7	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	42%	47%	11%	0%
B3	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	63%	32%	5%	0%
B4	1.6	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	53%	37%	5%	5%
B5	1.5	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	47%	53%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.6			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	1.7	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	42%	47%	11%	0%
C2	1.6	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	53%	37%	11%	0%
C3	1.9	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	37%	37%	21%	5%
C4	1.9	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	26%	53%	21%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.8			



D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.7	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	53%	26%	21%	0%
D2	1.5	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	58%	37%	5%	0%
D3	1.9	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	16%	79%	5%	0%
D4	1.4	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	68%	26%	5%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.6				

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.4	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	58%	42%	0%	0%
E2	1.7	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	37%	53%	11%	0%
E3	1.7	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	37%	53%	11%	0%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	63%	32%	5%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.6				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.2	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	21%	42%	37%	0%
F2	1.9	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	37%	37%	26%	0%
F3	1.7	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	47%	37%	16%	0%
F4	1.8	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	37%	47%	16%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

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.	79%	21%	0%	0%
G2	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	79%	21%	0%	0%
G3	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	84%	16%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The team conducted 19 observations in core content classrooms. An analysis of observational data and the 2024-2025 Two-Day Review revealed both areas for improvement and ongoing challenges. The team observed slight improvements in the High Expectations Learning Environment. During the 2024-2025 Two-Day Review, it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)”; however, the percentage increased to 5% during the current Diagnostic Review. It was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms during the Two-Day Review that “learners engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)”

and that increased to 10% in the current Diagnostic Review. Although gains were noted, rigorous expectations and high-quality work are inconsistently implemented across classrooms.

The team also noted continuing challenges. Overall, the data reflected limited evidence of differentiation, student ownership and deep understanding of content. It was evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” and “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3).” It was also evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teachers (B1)” and “learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” These findings indicate the need for consistent differentiated instructional practices and structures that ensure learning experiences are responsive to individual student needs across classrooms.

Additionally, rigor, student engagement and academic feedback were observed at low levels. It was evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms that learners “are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)” and “understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” It was also evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that learners “engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” and “receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2).” These results indicate a need to strengthen differentiation, engagement, formative feedback and structures that promote learner agency.

The team also identified challenges. While some positive practices were observed, consistency remains limited. It was evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1).” It was also evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that learners “transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)” and “use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).” It was evident/very evident in 26% of classrooms that learners “are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)” and “demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” The findings indicate the need for more consistent classroom routines, engagement strategies and collaborative learning structures across classrooms.

Overall, the observational data reflected incremental progress in isolated areas; however, implementation of high expectations, student ownership of learning, differentiated instruction and consistent classroom structures is not systemic. Continued focus on strengthening instructional rigor, formative assessment practices and coherent classroom routines will be critical to ensure that these practices become consistently evident across all classrooms.



Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement Priority 1

Consistently engage students, parents and staff in a systematic, continuous improvement process that includes data analysis, prioritizing areas of focus, implementation of action steps and progress monitoring to improve student outcomes.

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

Findings:

Overall, student performance data, stakeholder feedback, observations, interviews and a review of documents indicate a need to strengthen the school's systematic continuous improvement processes to ensure alignment among instructional practices, interventions and student learning needs.

Student performance on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) reflected inconsistent trends across grades and content areas over the three-year period. Sixth-grade reading scores increased from 24% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2023-2024 but then declined to 18% in 2024-2025. Seventh-grade reading scores declined from 27% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2023-2024 and then increased to 30% in 2024-2025. Eighth-grade reading scores decreased from 22% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024 and increased slightly to 18% in 2024-2025. Across all grades, reading performance did not demonstrate sustained year-to-year growth.

In mathematics, scores in the 6th-grade increased from 12% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024 but then declined to 6% in 2024-2025. Seventh-grade mathematics scores decreased from 15% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024 and then increased to 20% in 2024-2025. Eighth-grade mathematics scores declined from 16% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024 and increased to 17% in 2024-2025. Despite gains, mathematics performance remained below state expectations across all grade levels.

In other content areas, 8th-grade social studies scores declined from 18% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024. Eighth-grade editing and mechanics scores decreased from 39% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2023-2024 before increasing to 28% in 2024-2025. Eighth-grade on-demand writing scores remained at 20% Proficient/Distinguished in both 2022-2023 and 2023-2024. These patterns indicate that instructional adjustments and interventions have not consistently resulted in sustained growth across content areas.

Survey data reflected similar inconsistencies in how students' needs drive instructional decisions and improvement efforts. Surveys showed that 67% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)" and 64% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)." Additionally, 82% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I used a variety of resources to meet learners' needs and interests (19)." Student and family responses aligned with these findings, as 54% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had support when I needed it (18)" and 60% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child received support based on their needs (21)." Furthermore, 64% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we follow a process to determine the support that



learners need (10).” These data suggest that while supports are in place, the processes for analyzing needs, prioritizing focus areas and monitoring impact are not consistently experienced or understood by stakeholders.

Classroom observational data reinforced these findings by revealing limited evidence of progress monitoring and student ownership of learning. It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own learning or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” and in 5% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” It was also evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that learners “receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)” and “demonstrate and/or verbalize understandings of the lesson/content (E3).” Without consistent monitoring and feedback systems, it is difficult to ensure that instructional adjustments are informed by real-time data and aligned to identified student needs.

Interview data revealed concerns regarding a shared understanding of school goals and action steps to improve student achievement. While students and educators referenced programs such as Lexia, Imagine Math and the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments, many could not clearly explain how these tools aligned with KSA expectations or how results informed instructional decisions. Additionally, the ROAR intervention block is embedded in the schedule; however, specific goals and progress monitoring connected to KSA outcomes were not evident. When a consistent cycle of analyzing data, implementing targeted actions and monitoring progress is not fully implemented, instructional efforts may remain fragmented and less likely to produce sustained improvement.

Documents and artifacts provided evidence of structures intended to support ongoing improvement, including the “Instructional Systems Monitoring Tool/MTSS Academic Plan.” However, interviews revealed limited evidence of a systematic process for communicating, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of these plans across stakeholders. Strengthening processes to ensure consistent data analysis, prioritizing focus areas, implementing action steps and monitoring results collaboratively will support greater coherence and shared accountability in improving student outcomes.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Provide professional learning for administrators and staff on systems thinking and the implementation of coherent schoolwide continuous improvement processes to ensure consistent understanding and application of improvement practices.
- Establish structured processes to engage students, families, certified and classified staff and administrators in analyzing data, identifying needs and collaboratively prioritizing focus areas and action steps.
- Develop and implement a clearly defined continuous improvement cycle that includes short- and long-term goals, measurable implementation indicators and ongoing monitoring of progress to evaluate effectiveness and guide adjustments.

Improvement Priority 2

Identify and implement common instructional practices and strategies that promote rigor, critical thinking, student engagement and differentiated grade-level learning opportunities to support student growth and mastery.

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

Findings:

Evidence gathered from student performance data, surveys, interviews, observations and artifacts indicated variances in instructional practices and limited consistency in learner-centered instruction across classrooms. Student subgroup performance on the KSA reflected persistent achievement gaps and inconsistent progress across grades and content areas, suggesting a lack of implementation of instructional practices that support growth for all learners.

Survey results further highlighted concerns about student engagement, differentiation and learner-centered instruction. Survey responses revealed that 53% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that adults “try new things to improve the school (6)”, while 42% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “lessons were changed to meet their needs (13).” Additionally, 48% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “lessons made me want to learn new things (12)”, and 56% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that they “had many ways to show my teacher what I learned (19).” Family survey responses aligned with these findings, as 60% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)”, 61% agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child used a variety of resources to learn about things that interest them (18)” and 61% agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child engaged in lessons that improved their desire to learn new things (14).” Collectively, these responses suggest inconsistent experiences with differentiated instruction and limited opportunities for student-centered learning.

Interview data further revealed inconsistent understandings of instructional expectations and curriculum implementation. Observations revealed variations in how instructional practices and intervention periods were implemented across classrooms and grade levels. Interviews indicated that teachers primarily relied on informal collaboration with colleagues rather than a systemic approach to ensuring common instructional expectations. Without clearly defined, consistently communicated and frequently monitored instructional practices, implementation varies across classrooms, limiting opportunities for equitable access to rigorous, grade-level learning experiences.

Observational data reinforced these findings by identifying limited evidence of engagement, differentiation and rigor. It was evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)” and in 11% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms that “learners engage in coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” These findings indicate that learner-centered practices and rigorous instructional strategies were not consistently observed across classrooms. It was also evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)”, suggesting that instructional time is not consistently maximized to support meaningful engagement and learning.

A review of documents and artifacts, including the “2024-2025 Two-Day Report,” identified recommendations focused on strengthening high expectations and instructional practices. Suggested leader actions included identifying and clearly communicating the visible characteristics of high expectations in classrooms and training staff on instructional practices that promote active engagement, differentiation and increased rigor. However, data from observations, interviews and document review indicated inconsistent implementation, suggesting a need to establish and monitor common instructional practices that ensure rigor, critical thinking, student engagement and differentiated learning opportunities are consistently implemented across classrooms to support student growth and mastery.



Potential Leader Actions:

- Review and revise the current PLC protocol to ensure that a systematic, evidence-based process uses student data to drive instructional planning, reflection and decision-making.
- Implement a common evidence-based instructional framework (e.g., gradual release, workshop model) to support rigorous instruction, student engagement and differentiation based on individual learner needs.
- Establish and implement a consistent walkthrough process using a defined walkthrough tool to evaluate the implementation of rigorous instruction, differentiated learning and the designated curriculum. Use walkthrough data to provide targeted feedback and coaching to teachers, strengthening instructional practices and improving student achievement.
- Develop and deliver targeted professional learning aligned with walkthrough findings and student performance data to build teacher capacity to implement rigorous, differentiated and learner-centered instructional strategies.

Your Next Steps

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

The principal at Johnson Traditional Middle has been in the top leadership position for almost three years. In that time, she has attempted to focus on a combination of schoolwide behavioral and academic expectations. The principal has mostly been successful communicating this focus as evidenced by participation in the Kentucky Department of Education's (KDE's) former Two-Day Review process, the inclusion of regular time for PLC, Student Intervention Team (SIT) and department meetings, the provision of a ROAR intervention period in the master schedule, use of the Character Strong curriculum in advisory, an expectation of the CHAMPS behavioral framework use in classrooms, the development of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for academics and student behavior and an attempted focus on academic and non-academic data use. While the team noted regular data collection methods, systematic schoolwide data use was not immediately evident. Additionally, the team noted inconsistencies in CHAMPS implementation during their classroom visits.

The principal has also attempted to work on a culture of two-way communication. Teacher and parent interviews and surveys confirmed this, as well as artifacts such as the Johnson Voice external newsletter, the Jaguar Journal internal electronic communication, staff and student handbooks, faculty meeting agendas and minutes, Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meeting agendas and minutes, school-based decision-making (SBDM) council meeting agendas and minutes and event flyers for various school community events.

While the school's participation in the Two-Day Review process demonstrated an attempt at proactive instructional leadership, the extent to which the leadership team's improvement planning was based on the Two-Day Review report's improvement priorities was not immediately evident. While some stakeholders noted additional coaching cycles alongside walkthroughs for teacher feedback, this was not consistently mentioned by all. Most stakeholders articulated receiving feedback after walkthroughs, but it was not immediately evident that

all walkthroughs resulted in coaching cycles for actionable feedback. The principal should consider a more intensive focus on the previously identified improvement priorities, as well as on a continuous improvement process, including a plan to expand the current coaching cycles to yield actionable feedback to address low teacher expectations and classroom rigor.

Finally, the team noted one of the principal's greatest strengths was her positive vision for the school as the premier traditional middle school in the district, which multiple stakeholders were able to repeat. Stakeholder surveys and interviews confirmed the principal's commitment to the school and her desire for continuous improvement but also noted inconsistencies in the communication of expectations. The principal displays passion for the school community but could benefit from a focus on formalized schoolwide systems.



Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Tonya Addison	Tonya Addison has served as a teacher, assistant principal and principal in secondary schools for over 20 years. She has also served as the district coordinator of attendance and MTSS to increase student achievement and provide support for attendance, behavior and social-emotional learning through the implementation of MTSS. She currently serves as the director of teacher quality. In this role, she supports schools by strengthening teachers' collective and individual instructional capacity to improve student achievement.
Tom Stewart	Tom Stewart has 30 years of experience in Kentucky public education. He has taught at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Additionally, he has four years of experience in school district administration, serving as instructional supervisor, district assessment coordinator, teacher quality and professional learning coordinator and personnel director. He has also served as an assistant professor of teacher education and an associate professor of educational administration, research and leadership. Tom is currently an Educational Recovery Director (ERD) for the KDE.
Adam Coleman	Adam Coleman has filled multiple roles in education, including a middle school teacher, an instructional coach for four years, an elementary assistant principal for one year and is currently serving as the K-12 principal. He previously served as a school lead for trauma-informed care and created MTSS processes for the district to improve student outcomes.
Lorri Stivers	Lorri Stivers has 30 years of experience in education. Currently, she serves as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) for KDE. Her past experiences include being a high school English, psychology and journalism teacher, an instructional coach, a middle school assistant principal and a 13-year middle school principal.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices 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.	1
27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.	The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices.	The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	1
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 learner performance with stakeholders.	1

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Reading	24	48	28	49	18	52
7th-Grade Reading	27	45	23	47	30	48
8th-Grade Reading	22	44	17	41	18	42
6th-Grade Math	12	38	13	42	6	41
7th-Grade Math	15	37	14	39	20	43
8th-Grade Math	16	36	13	37	17	40
7th-Grade Science	*	23	*	22	7	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	18	35	17	35	*	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	39	49	22	47	28	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	20	45	20	49	*	49

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading increased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading increased from 23% from 2023-2024 to 30% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math increased from 12% from 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on KSA in math increased from 14% from 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math increased from 13% from 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in editing/mechanics increased from 22% from 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- Data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in science on KSA were below the state average in 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.
- Data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- Data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on KSA were below the state average in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.

Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	*	68	*	66	*	60
Percent Score of 60-80	*	24	*	23	*	26
Percent Score of 100	*	7	*	8	*	10
Percent Score of 140	*	2	*	3	*	3

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	24	28	18
Female	28	32	25
Male	25	24	12
White	41	46	*
African American	17	18	13
Hispanic or Latino	22	31	36
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	25	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	44	27
Economically disadvantaged	20	23	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 28% in 2022-2023 to 32% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 41% in 2022-2023 to 46% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 31% in 2023-2024 to 36% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 28% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 32% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 6th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 6th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 44% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 23% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	12	13	6
Female	11	*	5
Male	12	16	7
White	22	18	*
African American	7	*	4
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	7	13	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 7% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 6% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 7% in 2022-2023 to 4% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 5% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	27	23	30
Female	22	25	35
Male	30	22	25
White	41	31	*
African American	16	19	23
Hispanic or Latino	*	17	*
Asian	42	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	18	38	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	21	18	27
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 23% in 2023-2024 to 30% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 35% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade two or more races students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 38% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 30% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 41% in 2022-2023 to 31% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	15	14	20
Female	13	17	15
Male	17	12	24
White	27	21	37
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	20	9	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	18	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	12	19
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 24% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 21% in 2023-2024 to 37% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on math decreased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on math decreased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	7
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	10
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	22	17	18
Female	23	13	24
Male	21	21	*
White	39	21	22
African American	13	13	16
Hispanic or Latino	25	42	22
Asian	*	40	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	15
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	18	16	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 24% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 42% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 39% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed that the percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 42% in 2023-2024 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024, then decreased again to 15% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	16	13	17
Female	15	11	16
Male	17	15	18
White	32	21	27
African American	10	*	15
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	17
Asian	*	30	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	15	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 21% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 10% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on math decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 32% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	18	17	*
Female	18	13	14
Male	17	20	*
White	36	26	*
African American	10	9	13
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	14	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	17	
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 10% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2023-2024.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	39	22	28
Female	41	23	28
Male	38	22	29
White	66	31	30
African American	29	18	26
Hispanic or Latino	33	25	17
Asian	*	40	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	50	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	34	20	25
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 23% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 39% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 41% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 38% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 66% in 2022-2023 to 31% in 2023-2024.



- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 29% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 33% in 2022-2023 to 25% in 2023-2024, then to 17% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 34% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade On-Demand Writing

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	20	20	*
Female	25	20	*
Male	15	21	*
White	39	*	*
African American	14	17	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	18	20	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing remained at 15% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing remained at 20% in 2022-2023 and in 2024-2025.
- KSA data revealed the percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024.

Schedule

Tuesday, Feb. 17, 2026

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

Wednesday, Feb. 18, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3:30 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 19, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3:30 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Friday, Feb. 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m. – 12:00 a.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

