



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

Results for: Kerrick Elementary

Jan. 12-15, 2026

# Table of Contents

**Introduction.....2**

    Performance Standards Evaluation .....2

    Insights from the Review .....3

**Effective Learning Environments Observational Tool (eleot) Results.....5**

    eleot Narrative .....8

**Improvement Priorities .....10**

    Improvement Priority 1 .....10

    Improvement Priority 2 .....12

        Potential Leader Actions:.....13

    Your Next Steps .....13

**Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention (MRI) Schools .....14**

**Team Roster .....18**

**Appendix .....19**

    Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....19

        Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....19

        Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....21

        Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning.....23

        Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....25

    Student Performance Data.....29

    Schedule .....41

# Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	2
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	6
Certified Staff	26
Noncertified Staff	8
Students	15
Parents	8
Total	66

## 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 team's findings. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned with research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

### **Strengths and Continuous Improvement:**

Kerrick Elementary fosters a positive, nurturing and welcoming climate, which is one of its most significant strengths. The Diagnostic Review Team observed that staff consistently responded to students' academic and social-emotional needs while creating an environment where all stakeholders feel valued and supported. Staff intentionally build relationships with students, maintain high visibility across the campus, refer to students by name and engage respectfully with students and colleagues. The team found that the school promoted strong family engagement and community involvement, reinforcing its inclusive culture.

Stakeholder survey data affirmed respectful interactions and a welcoming climate. For example, 91% of families and 72% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcome (1)." Similarly, 91% of families and 73% of students agreed/absolutely agreed "The adults treat us with respect (2)." One hundred percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)" and 94% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcome (1)."

When describing the school, stakeholders most often choose relational words. For example, when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?", 88% of educators chose "welcoming", 67% selected "warm" and 64% picked "respectful." Similarly, when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?", 78% of families selected "welcoming", 48% chose "warm", 91% picked "respectful" and 86% selected "safe." Also, when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?", 43% of students chose "warm" and 67% selected "safe." Informal observations and teacher, staff and parent interviews further support that the school's culture is grounded in trust, care and mutual respect.

Kerrick Elementary is undergoing a purposeful transformation, driven by strong leadership, dedicated educators and a shared commitment to improving outcomes for all learners. Interview data consistently highlighted the principal's visible, empathetic and instructionally focused leadership as a foundational strength. Staff described a collaborative environment where educator voice is valued and decision-making is shared through professional learning communities, turnaround teams and other leadership structures. Collaboration is systemic and embedded in daily practice, with teachers reporting meaningful participation across professional learning community (PLC) meetings, Command Central Team, School Transformation and Turnaround Team (STaT), positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) and Hype and Help teams. Survey feedback confirms this strength, with 85% of educators identifying "collaborative" as one of the four words that best describe their interactions with colleagues. Decision-making is transparent, with staff input actively sought before implementing changes to schedules, instructional priorities and behavior systems. PLCs guide instructional planning by using data analysis and problem-solving while directly supporting instructional adjustments and student growth. This shared ownership has strengthened professional relationships, fostered trust and reinforced a collective commitment to continuous improvement.

The Diagnostic Review Team reviewed the "Kerrick Elementary CSI 24–25 CSIP Completed Plan," which outlines a five-year strategy to increase student achievement in reading, writing, mathematics, science and social



studies as measured by the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA), while also addressing school climate and safety. Interviews revealed that the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) was developed collaboratively by the Command Central Team (i.e., principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, academic instructional coach) along with assistance from the Educational Recovery (ER) staff members and teachers. The plan identifies implementing a PBIS system as a key strategy to clearly define behavioral expectations and establish consistent group norms across classrooms, supported by teacher-created classroom management practices. While stakeholder interviews and observations indicate focused attention on this priority, findings reveal a need for greater consistency and coherence in PBIS implementation.

Stakeholder feedback consistently identifies the school as welcoming and family-oriented; however, observations and interviews indicate that behavioral systems and processes need targeted refinement to ensure consistency, equity and effectiveness. Discipline consistency is a critical foundational need for the school to improve student learning. While a flow chart exists to guide staff in distinguishing between teacher-managed and office-managed behaviors, implementation varies across classrooms and grade levels. Despite professional learning opportunities and communications from leadership, teachers report uncertainty about escalation procedures, which often leaves disciplinary responsibilities to the CARE team and results in inconsistent follow-through. Tier 3 behavior documentation is also inconsistent, limiting leadership's ability to monitor trends, implement interventions systematically and make data-informed decisions. When discipline data are accurately and consistently recorded, school leaders can ensure timely responses and equitable outcomes for all students.

Team observations and stakeholder interviews further revealed that while tiered behavioral supports are in place, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions lack clarity and consistent application. Staff noted challenges related to escalation protocols, unclear expectations for responses to significant behaviors and uneven implementation across classrooms. Teachers reported that although initial training was provided in July, ongoing professional learning is needed to ensure confidence and fidelity in implementing behavior management systems. Additionally, staff identified a need for continued professional learning in trauma-informed practices, implicit bias and equity to ensure behavioral interventions are culturally responsive and effective for all students.

By refining discipline systems, ensuring consistent implementation of the teacher-managed (i.e., versus office-managed) behavior flow chart, strengthening tiered behavioral supports, providing recurring professional learning in behavior management, trauma-informed practices and equity, the school can establish a cohesive, predictable and equitable behavioral framework. These actions will enhance consistency across classrooms, strengthen leadership capacity, support collective efficacy and ensure a safe, structured and supportive environment that promotes both academic achievement and social-emotional growth for all students.

# Effective Learning Environments Observational Tool (eleot) Results

Cognia's Effective Learning Environments Observational Tool® (eleot®) is a learner-centric classroom observational 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 23 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	2.2	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	14%	59%	18%	9%
A2	2.8	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	5%	14%	77%	5%
A3	3.1	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	18%	50%	32%
A4	2.3	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.	27%	23%	45%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.6				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.2	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	14%	55%	27%	5%
B2	2.5	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	14%	36%	41%	9%
B3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	27%	45%	27%	0%
B4	2.2	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	14%	50%	36%	0%
B5	2.4	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	5%	55%	36%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.3			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.5	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	18%	32%	36%	14%
C2	2.7	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	9%	27%	50%	14%
C3	3.0	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	18%	64%	18%
C4	3.0	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	14%	68%	18%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.8			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.2	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	14%	50%	36%	0%
D2	2.2	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	27%	36%	27%	9%
D3	2.5	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	5%	50%	36%	9%
D4	2.0	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	41%	32%	18%	9%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.2			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	2.3	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	14%	45%	41%	0%
E2	2.4	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	14%	41%	36%	9%
E3	2.2	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	14%	59%	23%	5%
E4	1.9	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	32%	45%	23%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.2			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.2	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	5%	73%	23%
F2	3.1	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	14%	59%	27%
F3	2.9	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	5%	36%	27%	32%
F4	2.5	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	0%	59%	27%	14%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.9			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.8	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	45%	32%	18%	5%
G2	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	73%	18%	5%	5%
G3	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	77%	14%	5%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.5			

## eleot Narrative

Several strengths emerged from the observational data. The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 23 formal observations in core content classes and several informal observations in common areas across the school. The school had a previous Diagnostic Review in January 2023. Overall, 27 of the 28 indicators across all seven learning environments increased from the previous review.

The overall average ratings on a 4-point scale ranged from a low of 1.5 in the Digital Learning Environment to a high of 2.9 in the Well-Managed Learning Environment. The team observed mostly positive interactions between adults and students in classrooms and common areas. The team noted that in most classrooms, students

displayed respectful behaviors aligned with the PBIS systems and expectations, which were reinforced by teachers.

A strength emerged in the classroom observational data related to student discourse. The team observed students having discussions about their learning and teachers demonstrating strategies that support student discussions. Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 82% of classrooms that “learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 96% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).”

While most indicators improved since the 2023 Diagnostic Review, the team identified areas for continued growth, such as the need for high expectations and differentiated instruction. For example, it was evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” In 50% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2),” and in 36% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2).” Stakeholder survey data revealed 62% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” Conversely, 81% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they “deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8).”

While the team observed posted learning targets and strategies aligned to high-quality instructional resources (HQIR), few students were completing high-level assignments aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS), as it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Also, it was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” These findings suggest that although there are occasional examples of effective strategies for identifying learning targets aligned with the KAS and HQIRs, opportunities continue to exist for engaging students in learning activities at the level of rigor aligned with the KAS and implementing more consistent practices to support students’ understanding of criteria for success and progress toward mastery of standards.

# 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

Sustain and further develop established continuous improvement initiatives while strategically narrowing the scope of work to the most urgent and high-impact priorities.

### **Standard 7:**

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

### **Findings:**

Classroom observational data indicated the school engaged in intentional turnaround work, guided by a clearly articulated vision of "The Road to Operation 95 and Beyond" that includes literacy, culture and continuous improvement identified as primary drivers. The principal's presentation emphasized high expectations, equitable access, coaching and feedback and a safe, orderly and supportive learning environment as foundational to achieving the goal of having 95% of students performing at or above grade level. Observational data both affirm areas of alignment with these priorities and identify instructional practices that remain inconsistently implemented.

Student performance data indicated that the school needs to consistently implement a data-informed process to address students' academic needs. The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in 2024-2025 was below the state averages in all content areas for grades 3-5. Classroom observations further indicated the need for high academic expectations. Observational data indicated that it was evident/very evident that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)" in 32% of classrooms. Observations also revealed inconsistencies in classrooms across the same grade levels, leading to inequitable learning experiences for students.

Survey data showed differences among stakeholder groups regarding innovation at school. For example, 75% of students agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults try new things to make our school better (6)." To the contrary, 93% of families agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults are committed to trying new things to improve (6)" and 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)."

Interview data showed stakeholders are actively involved in decision-making and encouraged to test improvement ideas through short-cycle planning processes, commonly referred to as teacher-led Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycles. A review of artifacts and evidence further corroborated that stakeholders participate in decision-making and are encouraged to test improvement ideas.

The principal implemented the recommendations outlined in the January 2023 Diagnostic Review. Artifacts and interviews revealed a CSIP for success called "The Kerrick Vision Board" that anchors the school's work in the four pillars of turnaround leadership, talent development, instruction and culture. These systems reflect the expectation that school leaders develop and sustain coherent frameworks that guide continuous improvement. Multiple PDSAs, a roles and responsibilities chart, heat maps of progress towards current improvement priorities, principal data presentations and 45-day monitoring plans all demonstrate continuous improvement initiatives, confirming that these expectations exist and are being implemented.

The Diagnostic Review Team identified several emerging continuous improvement initiatives; however, it is essential to narrow and prioritize these efforts to ensure the work progresses effectively.



**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Strengthen the current monitoring system to ensure a consistent, collaborative data analysis process that promotes equitable learning experiences and reduces instructional inconsistencies across grade levels.
- Provide continuous leadership, supporting implementation with active guidance while using targeted monitoring to ensure improvement efforts genuinely strengthen learning conditions for all stakeholders.
- Ensure that schoolwide expectations are clearly understood and can be articulated and applied by all staff and students.
- Sustain the current positive trajectory while tightening the focus to ensure that all improvement efforts are coherent, manageable and aligned with the school's long-term goals.

## Improvement Priority 2

Strengthen the quality of Tier 1 instruction by maintaining a focus on the implementation of consistent, rigorous instructional practices for all learners, while ensuring that evidence-based instructional strategies are applied with fidelity across classrooms.

### Standard 21

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

#### Findings:

The school's instructional and behavioral practices are grounded in "The Kerrick Way" framework, including the PAWS (i.e., display a positive attitude, accept responsibility, work hard, and show respect) discipline expectations. This framework guides teaching, learning and student engagement. Teachers intentionally use "PAWS Lesson Plans" to explicitly teach, model, practice and provide feedback on behavioral expectations that support the dispositions students need to engage meaningfully in instruction. By ensuring students understand what is expected of them behaviorally, PAWS lessons create the conditions necessary for students to fully access instruction and master the learning targets for each lesson. These learning targets are deconstructed, revisited throughout instruction and aligned to the KAS, emphasizing rigor, clarity and attainability. Lessons are designed to promote student discourse, synthesis and reflection, allowing learners to articulate and demonstrate mastery of content. Standards-based instruction is supported through high-quality resources such as Expeditionary Learning (EL) Education for Reading and Illustrative Mathematics (IM) and is differentiated to meet the needs of English learners, students with disabilities and students performing at varying levels. Family and educator survey data reflect positive perceptions of expectations and learning conditions. Eighty-nine percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that adults at the school "have high expectations for learning (10)." Similarly, 84% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)" and 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)." When considered alongside classroom observational and student survey data, these findings highlight differences between adult perceptions and students' instructional experiences.

Stakeholder interviews and artifact reviews also highlight opportunities to strengthen instructional consistency. Interviews revealed a need for a clearer understanding of non-negotiables in planning and delivery of instruction, while reviews of high-frequency walkthrough data, Tier 1 professional development plans and coaching trackers indicated limited opportunities for modeling, evaluating professional learning implementation and follow-up. Certified staff members expressed a need for additional training in HQIR, particularly in Expeditionary Learning for Reading in English language arts (ELA) to ensure instruction meets both grade-level standards and students' diverse needs.

Student performance data underscore the importance of these improvements. On the 2024-2025 KSA, 17% of 3rd-grade students, 28% of 4th-grade students and 12% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, compared to state averages of 47% to 50% across these grade levels. English learner (EL) student performance data indicate that the school serves a high proportion of EL students who face significant language acquisition challenges, as evidenced by the percentage of students receiving zero points on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment exceeding state averages for each of the past three years. These results highlight the need for instruction that consistently supports mastery of grade-level standards for all learners.

Opportunities for engagement in meaningful, authentic learning vary across classrooms. While students participate in science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics (STEAM) and library experiences that support the "Journey to Success" initiative and the development of the five "Success Skills" (i.e., self-management, communication, collaboration, critical thinking and resilience), classroom observations indicate that these experiences are not connected to learning targets or standards. For example, instances of "Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)" and "Learners collaborate with their peers to



accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)” were evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms. Assessment data revealed that a significant percentage of students had not reached Proficient in reading. These findings highlight the need to strengthen connections between authentic learning experiences and rigorous, standards-aligned instruction to ensure all students engage in meaningful, student-centered learning.

The evidence presents a clear picture of the school’s instructional strengths and areas for growth. The school has established strong structures and a shared vision to support teaching and learning, and families and staff generally perceive that high expectations and supportive environments are present. However, variability in classroom implementation, student engagement and differentiated instruction indicate that students are not consistently experiencing rigorous, learner-centered instruction that promotes mastery of grade-level standards and development of essential “Success Skills”.

The Diagnostic Review Team found that strengthening instruction characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices is a priority. Focused attention is needed to ensure that students understand and can articulate learning targets and engage in discourse and synthesis while accessing instruction that is differentiated to meet their diverse academic needs. By systematically using classroom observations, PLC-based reflection, student performance data and survey feedback to guide instructional decisions, the school can more consistently provide rigorous, engaging and equitable learning experiences across all classrooms.

#### **Potential Leader Actions:**

- Collaboratively sustain momentum around instructional strategies by monitoring their impact on both academic engagement and student behavior.
- Increase fidelity and uniformity of PBIS implementation by using data to identify inconsistencies, tighten monitoring practices and providing timely staff support and follow-up training.
- Ensure consistent use of rigorous, evidence-based instructional practices across classrooms and support learner ownership through structured goal-setting and progress-monitoring routines.
- Use the established continuous improvement process to strengthen consistency of rigorous instruction across all grade levels by setting clear expectations and monitoring implementation to ensure equitable learning experiences for all students.
- Focus on relationship-centered and instructionally driven behavior supports to ensure improved classroom practices lead to positive, measurable changes in student conduct and overall learning climate.

## **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.

# Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention (MRI) Schools

703 KAR 5:280(9) requires that Diagnostic Reviews for MRI-designated schools will include “Other information deemed necessary by the commissioner, or his designee, to assess the functionality of the district to support school improvement”. Teams reviewing MRI-designated schools must consider the following additional elements:

- A review of how the school and district have managed and expended the relevant school improvement funds previously awarded with a specific focus on the impact of the funding decisions;
- A review of the progress made towards accomplishing any improvement priorities recommended by prior Diagnostic Review reports and/or Two-Day Reviews;
- A review of prior year turnaround plans and related documentation;
- A review of existing improvement efforts and initiatives and data documenting the results of the initiative;
- A comprehensive resource allocation review;
- A review of stakeholder involvement in the improvement process; and
- A review of district support on the implementation of the school’s turnaround plan.

Kerrick Elementary underwent a Diagnostic Review in Jan. 2023. Since that review, the school has transitioned to a new principal. The prior Diagnostic Review yielded two improvement priorities.

Improvement Priority 1 instructed the school to establish, implement, monitor and communicate a documented, systematic continuous improvement process that provides clear direction for improving conditions that support learning for all stakeholders. This process should include data analysis and implementation procedures that meet learners' academic and non-academic needs. The school has implemented a CSIP for success, such as the “Kerrick Vision Board” that anchors the school's work in the four pillars of turnaround leadership, talent development, instruction and culture. Continuous improvement was demonstrated through evidence, which included multiple PDSA cycles, a “Roles and Responsibilities” chart and “Improvement Priority Heat Mapping” to document progress toward current improvement priorities, the “Kerrick Principal Data Review Presentation 2025” and “45 Day Plan Cycles” to monitor initiatives. Improvement Priority 2 directed the school to develop, implement and evaluate a coaching and feedback system that is monitored to ensure instructional practices are adjusted based on student performance aligned to mastery of the Kentucky Academic Standards. The coaching and feedback system includes regular walkthrough data collection, a tiered coaching plan, “Hype and Help” meetings for specific multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) and a leadership team, “Command Central”, that uses walkthrough data to guide coaching and professional growth. Leadership is shifting toward more teacher-led and peer-to-peer feedback. Interviews indicated that inconsistencies exist in how feedback is shared. While the system has made meaningful progress, consistent follow-through remains an area for continued development.

Kerrick Elementary is making great progress towards its current improvement priorities as demonstrated through their turnaround plan and “The Kerrick Strategic Plan.”

The school received a total of \$389,394 over three years to support school improvement efforts. Of this amount, \$250,111 was allocated through school improvement funds (SIF) Cohort 4. These funds were used to purchase Open-Up Resources, provide EL Education virtual workshops for teachers, acquire supplemental texts to strengthen EL Education literacy instruction, expand classroom libraries and purchase intervention materials and supplies. The school also received \$139,283 through SIF Cohort 5. These funds supported a full-time certified resource teacher who provided instructional feedback, coaching and PLC support, as well as two part-time teachers/substitutes who used Simple Solutions to supplement and reinforce EL Education and IM



instruction. A review of evidence and artifacts shows that the school maintains a spreadsheet to track and monitor SIF expenditures. Interviews and artifact reviews indicate that the funds spent to date have had a positive impact on the school, particularly those used to support additional instructional personnel. Overall, the school has demonstrated fiscal responsibility in its use of SIF funds.

In reviewing the turnaround plans and improvement efforts, evidence shows that the STaT was developed and meets every two weeks to concentrate on key improvement priorities, the turnaround plan and overall learning progress. The meeting minutes reflect consistent monitoring of goals, regular data analysis and timely adjustments with ongoing input from a broad range of stakeholders. The team focuses on all components of the turnaround plan from the CSIP, including PLCs, feedback and coaching, professional learning and the MTSS system.

The school's resource allocation review indicates that the leadership team has been intentional in how staff and time are distributed throughout the building. The MTSS framework has been used effectively to allocate human resources for small group instruction across all grade levels. A new master schedule was created to protect core instructional time and ensure students have access to Tier 1, grade-level instruction. The Diagnostic Review Team also found evidence that the school has been a responsible steward of the school improvement funds that it has received and has developed plans using the resources purchased to improve.

A review of evidence and interviews clearly shows strong district support throughout the school's improvement journey. District representatives meet weekly with the principal and administrative team to conduct classroom visits and review progress toward identified improvement priorities. To further streamline efforts, the district consolidated its support meetings, allowing the principal to remain on-site and provide more direct support to teachers. Evidence indicates that this partnership has strengthened the school's focus and alignment with clear plans established to sustain and build on this collaboration moving forward.

# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school. The principal has taken deliberate, strategic actions to strengthen the school's effectiveness for students, staff, families and the community. These efforts ensure that all stakeholder groups have meaningful opportunities to engage in the school's improvement priorities and contribute to a shared vision for success.

The Diagnostic Review Team noted clear evidence that the principal used the findings from the 2023 Diagnostic Review as a foundation for launching Kerrick Elementary's improvement efforts.

The principal established a clear and collaborative improvement process. The "Kerrick Vision Board" and the "Command Central Team" serve as foundational structures that anchor the school's work in the four pillars of turnaround leadership, talent development, instruction and culture. These systems reflect the expectation that school leaders develop and sustain coherent frameworks that guide continuous improvement. By maintaining focus and alignment across initiatives, the principal ensures that improvement efforts are purposeful, strategic and responsive to student needs.

The principal demonstrates strategic thinking and planning through evidence-based inquiry and systematic data use. Through consistent data analysis, progress monitoring and goal setting, the principal fosters a culture of readiness, shared accountability and collective ownership of results. Teacher-led PDSA cycles demonstrate this commitment to research-informed practice, empowering educators to plan, test, analyze and refine instructional strategies. This approach not only strengthens classroom practice but also builds staff capacity to engage in ongoing improvement. A potential area for growth is refining the scope of concurrent initiatives and PDSA cycles, allowing the school to concentrate more intentionally on one or two focus areas to maximize impact and ensure sustained improvement.



The school's PBIS framework and system is in place to reinforce positive, predictable and supportive learning environments. Additionally, the STaT meets regularly to monitor "45 Day Plan Cycles," support active PDSA cycles and sustain a coaching and feedback system aligned with professional learning priorities. These structures demonstrate a systematic, data-driven approach to improvement.

The principal also fosters leadership capacity across the school by involving multiple stakeholders in decision-making and offering diverse professional learning opportunities connected to current initiatives. This leadership model strengthens the school's ability to sustain improvement over time for leaders to build organizational capacity and empower others to contribute to schoolwide progress.

Perhaps the principal's greatest strength is a deep passion for student achievement and an unwavering belief in continuous growth. The commitment to being a lifelong learner and systems thinker reinforces a culture of improvement and keeps the school community focused on elevating outcomes for all students. Through intentional leadership, the principal is effectively guiding the school toward sustained, meaningful and measurable improvement.

# Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Lana E. Williams</b>	Lana E. Williams is a veteran educational leader with over 30 years of experience in teaching, school leadership and district administration. She currently serves as a Carolina Teacher Induction Program (TIP) coach at the University of South Carolina, supporting novice teachers through coaching, professional learning and leadership development. Lana is also the owner and operator of L&E Leadership Services, a consulting agency focused on executive coaching, human resource management and providing temporary professionals to meet diverse organizational needs. She has held senior leadership roles, including superintendent, chief instructional officer, executive director, principal and director of alternative education.
<b>Holly Linville</b>	Holly Linville has 25 years of experience in education, serving in both instructional and administrative roles. She currently serves as an Education Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). She spent three years as an assistant superintendent in a Kentucky public school district and previously held multiple district-level leadership positions, including director of curriculum and instruction, director of pupil personnel and district assessment coordinator. Earlier in her career, Holly taught intermediate mathematics for 13 years.
<b>Kelcey Gilvin</b>	Kelcey Gilvin has over 12 years of experience in education. Kelcey previously taught and served as a department lead. She currently serves as an academic program consultant at the elementary level. Kelcey has served on the Kentucky Social Studies Standards Review Panel and worked at the collegiate level with education students seeking Kentucky certification.
<b>Jackie Thompson</b>	Jackie Thompson is in year 27 in education. She was a teacher department lead, program review coordinator and instructional coach in four Kentucky school districts. Jackie is in year seven with KDE as a continuous improvement coach, where she supports schools and districts across the state in developing, implementing and monitoring their improvement plans. Along with her teammates, Jackie also develops and presents professional learning at the state and local levels in response to specific requests, needs and district and school improvement plans/priorities.

# 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.	3

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.	3
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.	3
6. Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.	Professional staff members receive few or no resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members rarely receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive some resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members periodically receive mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. Professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	Professional staff members consistently receive adequate resources and assistance based on data and information unique to the individual. A formal structure ensures that professional staff members receive personalized mentoring and coaching from leaders and peers.	2

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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.	3

## 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.	3

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 grand expectations and learner-centered practices.	Instructional activities are primarily designed around curriculum objectives with little or no focus on learner needs and interests. Professional staff members rarely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their individual potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on needs and interests typical of most students. Professional staff members infrequently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Most learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members routinely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members consistently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	2
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	2

## 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.	3
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.	3
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the	Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the	Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the	Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the	3

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
organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	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.	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.	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.	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.	
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.	3
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.	3

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.	3
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.	3
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	3

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

# Student Performance Data

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

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	10	46	22	47	17	47
4th-Grade Reading	18	48	12	50	28	50
5th-Grade Reading	15	48	*	46	12	50
3rd-Grade Math	10	43	*	43	19	43
4th-Grade Math	17	42	12	43	19	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	11	41	12	43
4th-Grade Science	3	35	*	34	19	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	*	42	4	39	9	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	11	47	16	47	10	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	4	39	16	38

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentages of Proficient/Distinguished have been below state average in all content areas on the 2024-2025 KSA and years prior.

## Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	44	26	36	29	37	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	15	35	20	35	41	35
Percent Score of 100	22	24	18	23	8	22
Percent Score of 140	19	14	27	13	14	13

### Plus

- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment was higher than the state average of 13% on the 2024-2025 assessment.
- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment has been higher than the state average for three consecutive years.

### Delta

- The percentage of students receiving zero points for progress on the ACCESS assessment has been higher than the state average for the last three years.
- The percentage of students receiving 140 points on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	10	22	17
Female	*	27	15
Male	11	17	19
White	17	*	15
African American	*	*	18
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	20	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	10	*	19
Female	6	*	24
Male	14	*	*
White	13	*	*
African American	*	*	12
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	*	*	*

#### Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus

#### Delta

- Student performance level data categories of Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished (NAPD) were suppressed for public reporting.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	18	12	28
Female	19	18	*
Male	*	*	31
White	*	14	*
African American	*	11	*
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	*	13	*
Economically Disadvantaged	19	12	28
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 4th-grade reading on the KSA increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting for most subgroups.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	17	12	19
Female	19	11	13
Male	*	13	*
White	8	19	26
African American	18	*	*
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	16	12	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.

#### Delta

- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	3	*	19
Female	*	*	13
Male	*	*	25
White	*	*	30
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	19
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 4th-grade science on the KSA increased from 3% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	15	*	12
Female	21	*	14
Male	*	*	10
White	*	*	15
African American	14	*	*
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	*	*	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- Student performance-level data for 5th-grade reading were suppressed for all subgroups in 2023–2024, and for most subgroups in both 2022–2023 and 2024–2025 for public reporting.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	11	12
Female	*	*	14
Male	*	*	*
White	*	13	*
African American	*	8	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	8	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- Over the last three years, 5th-grade performance level data in math were suppressed for most student subgroups, leaving no available comparison data.



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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	*	4	9
Female	*	7	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	11
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	*	*	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- For 5th-grade social studies in 2023–2024, performance-level data were suppressed for most student subgroups, and all subgroups were suppressed in 2022-2023 for public reporting.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	11	16	10
Female	13	24	11
Male	10	*	10
White	15	*	11
African American	9	20	14
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	13	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 5th-grade editing and mechanics decreased across all subgroups with available (non-suppressed) data from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 on the KSA assessment.



## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade On-Demand Writing

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

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 5th grade editing and mechanics decreased across all subgroups with available (non-suppressed) data from 2023–2024 to 2024–2025 on the KSA.

# Schedule

## Monday, January 12, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
4 p.m.- 4:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team
5:45 p.m.	Principal Presentation	Kerrick Elementary	Diagnostic Review Team

## Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:45 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	Kerrick Elementary	Diagnostic Review Team
9 a.m.- 4:20 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
4:20 p.m.- 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team
5:30 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

## Wednesday, January 14, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team
9 a.m.- 4:20 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
4:20 p.m.- 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team
5:30 p.m.- 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

## Thursday, January 15, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m. – 2:20 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team

