



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Knight Middle**

Feb. 2-5, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	5
eleot Narrative	9
Improvement Priorities	11
Improvement Priority 1	11
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Improvement Priority 2	14
Potential Leader Actions:.....	15
Your Next Steps	16
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	17
Team Roster	19
Appendix	20
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	20
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	20
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	22
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	25
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	27
Student Performance Data.....	30
Schedule	43

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	4
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	2
Certified Staff	27
Noncertified Staff	1
Students	9
Parents	5
Total	49

Performance Standards Evaluation

Diagnostic Reviews are based primarily on the evaluation of evidence that reflects an institution’s ability to meet the expectations as defined by the essential Diagnostic Review Standards, which are a subset of the Cognia Performance Standards. These standards define the elements of quality that research indicates are present in an institution that is continuously improving. The standards provide the guideposts to becoming a better institution.

The Diagnostic Review Team applies a four-level rubric to determine the degree to which the institution demonstrates effective practices that reflect the expectations of each standard. The rubric scale is designed to indicate the current performance of the institution. The Diagnostic Review Team's findings and the rubric for each standard are in this report's appendix.

Insights from the Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the processes, programs and practices within the institution to arrive at the findings of the team. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

Strengths and Continuous Improvement

Data from the principal presentation, interviews across stakeholder groups, classroom observations and informal observations throughout the school confirm that care for students is a defining strength of Knight Middle. Leadership, faculty and staff are intentional in creating a welcoming environment where students feel seen, valued and supported. The team observed a strong sense of belonging across the school, with adults consistently demonstrating genuine care and positive relationships with students. This culture of care is especially notable given the school's changing demographics.

During the principal presentation, it was shared that the multilingual learner (ML) population more than doubled, increasing from 122 students in 2023-2024 to 249 students in 2024-2025. Additionally, over 75 percent of students qualify for free and reduced-price meals. Despite these shifts, the Diagnostic Review Team observed that inclusivity is a clear strength. For example, morning announcements were delivered in both English and Spanish to ensure all students could access schoolwide communication. During Black History Month, daily announcements highlighted the contributions of African Americans and concluded with the statement, "Black History is American History," thereby reinforcing a message of belonging and shared history.

Also, the Diagnostic Review Team observed intentional efforts to incorporate diversity and representation into classroom instruction in some settings. Students engaged with lessons that reflected a range of identities and experiences, including language arts lessons featuring the poetry of Maya Angelou, social studies lessons on the Little Rock Nine and current event discussions related to immigration and popular culture, such as Bad Bunny. In addition, video resources included English audio with Spanish closed captioning to support access for MLs. It was further noted that the school is deliberate in ensuring students see themselves represented among faculty and staff. During her interview, the principal stated that she uses Teach Kentucky, a teacher recruitment program in the Louisville area that prioritizes diverse candidates, to support hiring practices that reflect the student population with respect to both race and gender.

The school also demonstrates a strong commitment to supporting students' mental and emotional well-being. The school has a mental health team, which consists of three school counselors, an additional mental health counselor and an art therapist. There is also a student assistance team, an attendance team and security administrators. These supports further contribute to a school culture in which students feel safe, supported and cared for.

While the care and support provided to students is evident, the next phase of the school's continuous improvement journey must focus on leveraging these relationships to improve academic outcomes. Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data, included in the appendix of this report, indicates low levels of student proficiency across grade levels and content areas. Additionally, students have consistently performed below state averages across grade levels and content areas. These outcomes highlight the need to strengthen instructional practice schoolwide and to build teacher capacity in instructional design, delivery and assessment.



Classroom observations revealed several instructional areas in need of improvement. While learning targets were posted, and in some cases, discussed, their use appeared largely compliance based. There was limited evidence that teachers revisited learning targets throughout lessons to support students' understanding of lesson outcomes or to help students monitor their progress. Instruction was primarily teacher-directed and delivered through whole-group instruction and independent seatwork. The Diagnostic Review Team observed limited evidence of active learning, collaboration or opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking. Although overall classroom management was generally effective, students appeared more compliant than cognitively engaged.

The Diagnostic Review Team also noted a lack of formative assessment practices embedded within lessons during observations. There was little evidence of checks for understanding during or at the conclusion of instruction to determine whether students were meeting learning targets. As a result, teachers were not observed adjusting instruction in real time or using formative data to inform subsequent lessons. Additionally, there was minimal evidence of differentiation; students were generally learning the same content in the same way, regardless of readiness level or need for enrichment or support.

Interviews with leaders and faculty revealed a shared belief that teacher capacity is being developed through professional learning communities (PLCs) and the use of data. Stakeholders identified the use of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data and KSA data as strengths of their PLC work. However, this focus on summative and benchmark data was not reflected in daily classroom instruction. Because these data sources do not inform day-to-day instructional decisions, there is a disconnect between collaborative planning and classroom practice. This reveals an opportunity to support teachers in designing lessons informed by formative assessment data, incorporating differentiation to support struggling learners while providing appropriate rigor for on-level and advanced students and implementing engaging instructional strategies that promote collaboration and critical thinking.

PLCs should also be leveraged to build teacher capacity in the development and use of formative assessments, as well as in analyzing formative data to inform instructional adjustments during and after lessons. In addition, while the school provided a classroom walkthrough schedule as part of its artifacts, classroom observations and interviews did not clarify how feedback is delivered to teachers or how expectations for implementation and follow-up are communicated. Classroom walkthroughs should be utilized as an instructional coaching tool, grounded in objective observation and focused on providing actionable feedback and support to improve instructional practice.

Beyond PLCs and walkthroughs, developing a coherent professional learning plan grounded in student and instructional data will be essential to improving academic outcomes. When asked about professional development to build teacher capacity, the team was told that every faculty meeting serves as professional development. However, a review of artifacts indicated that faculty meetings primarily function as opportunities for information sharing rather than as job-embedded professional learning designed to improve instruction.

In conclusion, the school has established a foundation rooted in care, inclusivity and meaningful relationships with students. By intentionally strengthening instructional design, formative assessment practices, professional learning structures and instructional feedback systems, the school is well-positioned to leverage this foundation to improve academic outcomes for all students.



Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 29 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.3	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	80%	13%	7%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	34%	59%	7%
A3	3.1	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	21%	52%	28%
A4	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions, and dispositions.	76%	14%	3%	7%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.1				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.9	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	31%	55%	10%	3%
B2	2.1	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	21%	52%	28%	0%
B3	1.3	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	69%	31%	0%	0%
B4	2.0	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	24%	55%	21%	0%
B5	1.7	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	34%	59%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.8			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.1	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	21%	45%	34%	0%
C2	2.2	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	24%	34%	38%	3%
C3	2.7	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	7%	31%	45%	17%
C4	2.7	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	7%	28%	55%	10%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.4			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.1	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	28%	45%	17%	10%
D2	1.9	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	48%	24%	21%	7%
D3	2.0	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	28%	48%	17%	7%
D4	1.4	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	69%	24%	0%	7%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.4	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	66%	28%	7%	0%
E2	2.1	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	28%	41%	28%	3%
E3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	24%	55%	17%	3%
E4	1.3	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	79%	14%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.7	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	7%	31%	45%	17%
F2	2.2	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	14%	48%	38%	0%
F3	2.2	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	31%	24%	38%	7%
F4	2.2	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	21%	41%	31%	7%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.4			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.6	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	69%	7%	17%	7%
G2	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	76%	7%	14%	3%
G3	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	76%	10%	10%	3%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.5			



eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 29 observations in core content classrooms and several informal observations in non-core content classrooms, the cafeteria and hallways.

The Well-Managed Learning Environment and the Supportive Learning Environment were the highest-rated environments. Each received an overall rating of 2.4 out of 4.0. The Diagnostic Review Team observed collegial relationships among students and positive relationships between teachers and students.

In 65 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” Similarly, in 62 percent of classrooms, it was also evident/very evident that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and one another (F1).” These observational data identify a connection between classrooms where positive relationships between learners and their teacher support a respectful learning environment. Student survey data mostly aligns with this trend as 67 percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” Another correlation between the Well-Managed and Supportive Learning Environments is students’ willingness to take risks in their learning, which reduces the frequency of off-task behavior and disruptions. For example, it was evident/very evident in 41 percent of classrooms that “learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback) (C2)”, and it was evident/very evident in 38 percent of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).” When an environment is created with shared expectations that support risk-taking in learning, students’ off-task behavior can be minimized.

Overall, findings from the Well-Managed and Supportive Learning Environments indicate that in some classrooms, there was an opportunity to leverage students’ positive behavior and relationships with teachers to increase engagement and buy-in for classroom instruction and learning. However, because consistent behavioral expectations and daily routines were not universally observed, the school is encouraged to leverage internal models in which expectations and routines are consistently implemented to support these foundational systems across all classrooms.

The Equitable Learning Environment ranked third highest, with an overall rating of 2.1. In 80 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” In 66 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2).” It was evident/very evident in 10 percent of classrooms that “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 (A4).” In 7 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).”

To better meet the diverse learning needs of students, it is recommended that school leadership provide teachers with targeted support, including professional development, curriculum resources, observation and instructional coaching to ensure differentiated learning experiences are consistently implemented.

The Diagnostic Review Team did not consistently observe learners having opportunities to actively participate in lessons. Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 28 percent of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2).” Observations highlighted that instruction frequently relied on teacher-directed, whole-group delivery, with limited structures in place to promote student participation beyond independent seatwork. For example, it was evident/very evident in 27 percent of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teachers predominate (D1)”, and it was evident/very evident in 7 percent of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Also, 63 percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that will prepare me for my future (11).”

The team observed that some, but not all, teachers provided feedback during classroom instruction. In 31 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2).” In correlation with this, it was evident/very evident in 0 percent of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” When teachers consistently provide learners with feedback to improve their understanding, learners are more likely to demonstrate and thereby describe high-quality work. Survey results identified “give a grade” (70 percent) and “give quizzes” (58 percent) as the top two answers selected when students were asked, “What four phrases best describe the ways your teachers measure your learning progress (24)?” This aligns with observational data collected by the team as it was evident/very evident in 20 percent of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)”, and it was evident/very evident in 7 percent of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E4).” These findings suggest that student progress monitoring and feedback most frequently occur at the summation of learning and not daily to inform instruction. Ensuring that learning targets are revisited throughout lessons and through quick formative checks is important so students can monitor their progress toward meeting lesson expectations.

While students have access to technology in their classrooms, the Digital Learning Environment emerged as the lowest-rated learning environment, with an overall rating of 1.5. In 24 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).” It was evident/very evident in 13 percent of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).”

Providing teachers with targeted professional development focused on effective integration of digital resources into instruction can significantly enhance the quality of classroom learning. When equipped with these skills, teachers can design lessons that promote active learning, foster collaboration and strengthen students’ critical thinking skills.

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

Develop, implement and monitor lesson design and delivery processes which ensure classroom learning activities allow all students to be engaged, challenged and included in the learning process.

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

Findings:

Across multiple sources of evidence, the school demonstrates a clear commitment to high learning expectations; however, this commitment is not yet consistently reflected in classroom practices or student outcomes. Student performance data, observations, artifacts, interviews and survey results collectively indicate that while some incremental gains are evident, instructional rigor, differentiation and student engagement have not been implemented with sufficient consistency or depth to meet the diverse academic needs of students.

Student performance data reveal persistent and significant gaps between school and state averages in reading. The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 22 percent in 2023-2024 to 31 percent in 2024-2025, which was below the state average of 52 percent in 2024-2025. The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 23 percent in 2023-2024 to 16 percent in 2024-2025. In mathematics, modest gains were observed across all grade levels, with 8th-grade proficiency increasing to 17 percent in 2024-2025; however, math performance across grades remains less than half the state average. Eighth-grade social studies, editing and mechanics and on-demand writing results similarly remain well below state averages, despite a gradual improvement in on-demand writing. Collectively, these data suggest that instructional practices have not resulted in sustained, schoolwide improvements in rigor, differentiation or mastery of grade-level standards. Classroom observational data reinforced this conclusion.

Although the principal articulated a vision for rigorous, differentiated instruction and reducing the percentage of students performing at the Novice level, observed instruction did not consistently align with this vision. Significant instructional time was lost, particularly during morning routines, limiting opportunities for deep learning. While learning targets were commonly posted at the beginning of lessons, they were rarely revisited or used as tools for student reflection, progress monitoring or advocacy for additional support or challenge. Instruction was largely teacher-directed, with limited evidence of students as active participants in their learning.

Observed indicators of high-quality instruction were present in a relatively small percentage of classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 21 percent 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).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 28% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” While some classrooms demonstrated student discussion, as it was evident/very evident in 27 percent of classrooms that “learners’ discussion/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)”, and some classrooms were observed to have active engagement, as it was evident/very evident in 24 percent of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in learning activities (D3)”, these practices were not prevalent enough to indicate a schoolwide culture of rigorous, student-centered learning. The limited use of digital tools for problem-solving, collaboration or creation further suggests missed opportunities to deepen engagement and rigor.



Artifacts reviewed by the team provide additional insight into instructional coherence. The team reviewed the “Classroom Expectations Example” and the “Classroom Management Plan Example” that outlined classroom expectations; however, it was unclear whether these expectations were consistently applied across classrooms. Professional development artifacts indicate a strong emphasis on external curriculum training, with limited evidence of professional learning focused on instructional design, differentiation or effective implementation of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs). This imbalance suggests that while teachers are exposed to curriculum programs, they may not receive sufficient support to translate these resources into rigorous, responsive classroom instruction.

Interviews further highlight gaps between expectations and practice. Multiple stakeholders echoed the principal’s emphasis on rigorous, differentiated instruction; however, interviews revealed confusion between differentiation and accommodations. For example, the use of audio translation for MLs was described as differentiation, indicating the need for a clearer understanding of instructional strategies that adjust content, process or product based on student readiness and need. Interviews also revealed a limited understanding of HQIRs, with some stakeholders unable to define or describe them accurately. This represents a significant opportunity to strengthen instructional capacity.

While stakeholders expressed appreciation for team structures and the implementation of PLCs, there was little evidence that this collaborative time is used to plan rigorous lessons, analyze instructional effectiveness or refine instructional practices. Faculty meetings were described as professional development opportunities, yet topics were largely logistical or technical rather than instructional (e.g., use of Clever and designing infographics). The principal acknowledged that student discourse, collaborative learning and teacher-to-teacher learning are areas for growth, aligning with observational findings. Additionally, limited reference to Extended School Services (ESS) suggests that this resource is underutilized in addressing diverse academic needs. Interviews also revealed uncertainty about the role of the academic instructional coach, whose support appears to focus primarily on testing rather than on instructional improvement.

Survey data reflected a notable gap in perceptions between stakeholder groups and observational data. For example, 80 percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that the school has “high expectations for learning (10)”, 83 percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they “uphold high expectations for learning (12)” and 80 percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they “deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8).” Conversely, student responses indicate a less positive perception of their learning experience, as 61 percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that they had “lessons that made me want to learn new things (12).” This divergence suggests that while adults believe high expectations are in place, students may not consistently experience instruction that is engaging, rigorous or responsive to their needs.

In synthesis, evidence indicates the school has articulated high expectations for learning and has made incremental gains in some areas of student performance; however, instructional practices are not yet consistently rigorous, differentiated or student-centered. Instructional time is not maximized and differentiation is inconsistently understood and applied. Opportunities for student engagement, discourse and ownership of learning are limited. Professional learning structures exist but are not strategically focused on strengthening instructional quality. To support its continuous improvement efforts, the school will need to build shared understanding of high-quality instruction, intentionally develop internal instructional capacity and ensure that daily classroom practices align with the school’s stated expectations and student learning needs.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Develop, implement and monitor a consistent lesson design process that includes clear learning targets, planned differentiation and student-centered instructional strategies aligned to grade-level standards.
- Build teacher capacity in differentiated instruction through targeted professional learning, coaching and PLC structures to ensure the needs of all learners are met.



- Establish expectations for student-centered learning and student agency by ensuring that lessons include collaboration, discussion, problem-solving and opportunities for student choice and ownership of learning.
- Support the use of HQIRs by providing time and guidance for leaders and teachers to research, implement and refine materials that enhance rigor, engagement and inclusion.



Improvement Priority 2

Develop, implement and monitor a process for the use of formative assessment data to guide instructional design and delivery.

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

Findings:

Multiple sources of evidence indicate that the school does not have a coherent, consistently implemented or monitored process for using formative assessment data to guide instructional design and delivery. While stakeholders express a belief that the school is data-driven, the collective evidence suggests that data use is largely summative, compliance-oriented and focused on student identification rather than on real-time instructional adjustment.

Student performance data, as detailed earlier in this report, reveal students have consistently performed below the state average on the KSA, indicating a persistent achievement gap. This trend underscores the need for a robust formative assessment process that allows educators to identify learning gaps early, adjust instruction responsively and monitor progress over time. However, the ongoing reliance on summative outcomes suggests that instructional adjustments are not occurring frequently enough to address learning needs before they become entrenched.

Classroom observations further reinforce this conclusion. Observations did not reveal evidence of systematic use of formative assessment data to inform instructional decisions or subsequent lesson adjustments. Student-facing indicators of formative assessment were present at low levels across classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 7 percent of classrooms that learners “monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” and “understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” In 31 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)” and evident/very evident in 20 percent of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3).” Additionally, the use of digital tools to support learning did not appear to be intentionally leveraged to gather or analyze formative data, as it was evident/very evident in 24 percent of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).” Although the principal referenced strengthening PLC work as a support for teachers, observations suggest that this potential has not been translated into classroom-level practice.

Artifacts reviewed during the visit further highlight the absence of a clear formative assessment process. While student work samples were provided, the lack of accompanying rubrics made it unclear how students or teachers monitor progress toward learning targets. Professional development artifacts indicate a strong emphasis on externally driven curriculum training (e.g., Adolescent Literacy Model, Expeditionary Learning, Illustrative Math), with limited evidence of professional learning focused on building internal capacity around formative assessment design, analysis and instructional response. PLC agendas, data trackers and walk-through documents suggest that data-related initiatives are primarily compliance-driven, rather than intentionally focused on actionable analysis and continuous instructional improvement.

Interviews with leaders and educators consistently revealed a narrow conception of data use that centers on MAP and KSA results. While these data sources are valuable for benchmarking and long-term planning, they do not support immediate instructional decision-making. MAP assessments are administered every nine to 12 weeks, and KSA is administered annually, limiting their usefulness for identifying misconceptions, providing timely support or adjusting next-day instruction. Although some stakeholders reported administering formative assessments weekly and reviewing results in PLCs, this frequency still does not allow for real-time instructional



adjustments. In several interviews, summative assessments were described as tools for informing instruction, indicating a misunderstanding between assessment for learning (formative) and assessment of learning (summative).

Additionally, interviews revealed that data use is primarily focused on identifying students for intervention, labeling “bubble students” or predicting proficiency on state assessments. While identification is an important first step, there was little evidence of expectations or structures for translating data into concrete instructional changes. Grouping decisions based on MAP data were described; however, given the infrequent administration of the assessment, these groupings are not flexible or responsive to ongoing student learning. Interviews also identified confusion about what constitutes growth on the MAP assessment, pointing to a need for shared understanding and capacity-building around data interpretation. When asked about monitoring improvement, stakeholders referenced data sources but were unable to articulate a clear, repeatable process, further indicating the absence of a system for monitoring the impact of instructional adjustments.

Survey data present a more optimistic perception of instructional responsiveness, particularly among families and educators. For example, 82 percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that we “base our improvement efforts on learners’ needs (5).” Family agreement was slightly lower, as 72 percent agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15).” Finally, students reported less agreement around differentiated instruction, with 51 percent who agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” When considered alongside observational data and artifact reviews, the survey results highlight a gap between perception and practice.

Taken together, the evidence indicates that the school lacks a clearly defined, consistently implemented and monitored process for using formative assessment data to guide instructional design and delivery. Data use is largely summative, episodic and identification-focused, rather than formative, continuous and instructional. While structures such as PLCs exist and stakeholders express a commitment to being data-driven, these structures have not resulted in systematic use of formative assessment to inform daily instruction or monitor improvement over time. Strengthening internal capacity around formative assessment literacy, clarifying expectations for actionable data use and establishing a clear process for monitoring instructional adjustments will be critical steps toward improving student academic outcomes.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish clear, non-negotiable expectations for the consistent use of formative assessment within daily instruction, including how data should inform instructional decisions and differentiation.
- Build teacher capacity through targeted professional development, modeling and coaching focused on designing and implementing high-quality formative assessments aligned to learning targets.
- Embed formative assessment use into instructional planning and PLCs by requiring teachers to analyze formative data and plan differentiated instructional responses based on student needs.
- Monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs and feedback, to observe formative assessment practices and provide actionable coaching to improve instruction.



Your Next Steps

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

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

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

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal at Knight Middle has the capacity to lead the turnaround efforts of the school. The current principal has been in the position for two years. Upon taking the principal's position, she immediately began a schoolwide initiative to improve climate and culture, including adopting a new school motto, "Be Engaged, Be Empowered, Be Empathetic." Likewise, the principal established expectations for meeting every child, every need, every day. This focus on the whole student permeates every initiative throughout the building. The school's instructional leadership team began the process of reestablishing norms and expectations around teaching and learning. The team noted through evidence review and walkthrough data, two non-negotiables in particular, standards-focused instruction and learning targets, were evident in most classrooms. The school has adopted HQIRs in both reading and math. The principal has also used school resources to ensure teachers have the appropriate support to be successful. The principal has begun restructuring PLCs to ensure teachers have the necessary skills to create engaging, student-centered classrooms.

While the principal has focused a great deal of time, energy and attention on classroom instruction, she recognizes there is still a lot of work to be done. Leadership prioritized student engagement and student discourse as two areas of growth during the 2025-2026 school year. It was evident from interviews and artifacts that this has been a priority for the school. However, classroom observations indicated limited evidence that these priorities were being implemented regularly. Additionally, the principal indicated the need for adjusting instruction to meet the individual learners' needs, specifically for identified subgroups. Although the team found examples where school leadership embedded culturally inclusive language to support the needs of the growing ML population, classroom instruction was seldom differentiated to meet their learning needs.

An area of growth for the principal, noted by the team, is the development of systems. While the school has defined the PLC process and continues to monitor and adjust it, several processes still need attention. Interviews revealed the school's positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) was not always implemented consistently. The team noted a significant amount of data, both academic and non-academic, was collected; however, a systematic process for prioritizing, disaggregating and communicating data was not fully implemented. While the school has partially addressed this through their leadership team, the current structure still needs revision and refinement.

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
Staci L. Kimmons	Staci Kimmons has over 20 years of experience as an educator, serving as a school counselor, as well as an administrator at the elementary, middle, high school and district levels. Stacy currently serves as a Diagnostic Review lead evaluator for Cognia and as an Educational Technology Partnership Manager in Georgia.
William Philbeck	William Philbeck has served in numerous capacities over his 32 years in education. He spent his early career as a classroom teacher, instructional coordinator and department lead. William has served as an elementary principal, an adjunct professor and as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). Currently, William works part-time for KDE and for the University of the Cumberlands.
Heather Hall	Heather Hall has over 21 years of experience in education. Currently, she serves as an ERL with the KDE supporting CSI schools. Prior to that, she was a Literacy Coaching Specialist for KDE. In addition, she served as a curriculum specialist and has experience as an elementary classroom teacher.
Lucy Moore	Lucy Moore has 47 years of experience in education. Her experience includes being a teacher (business and English) and then a district administrator in charge of professional development, textbooks, migrant education, RSVP program and teacher interns.

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.	3
2. Learners' well-being is at the heart of the institution's guiding principles such as mission, purpose, and beliefs.	Staff members seldom demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions may not be based on its stated values.	Staff members occasionally demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members routinely demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented, and are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members continually demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented and regularly reviewed for consistency with its stated values.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
3. Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.	Leaders establish conditions that rarely result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders seldom collaborate with stakeholders. Institutions choose areas of focus that are rarely based on data about learners.	Leaders establish conditions that occasionally result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus that are sometimes based on data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that regularly result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders routinely collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that consistently result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders consistently collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions implement a formal process to choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	2
5. Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners.	The institution's operating practices rarely cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members may or may not interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, or consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members rarely work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's operating practices somewhat cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members generally interact with respect and cooperation, periodically learn from one another, and somewhat consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members sometimes work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members regularly interact with respect and cooperation, often learn from one another, and routinely consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members often work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration and are monitored for fidelity of implementation. Professional staff members consistently interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, and consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members intentionally and consistently work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	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

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
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	2
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	3

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
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	2

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders seldom use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders sometimes use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use analyzed current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use a formal, systematic process for analyzing current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	1
27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.	The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices.	The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	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.	1

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

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Reading	26	48	22	49	31	52
7th-Grade Reading	35	45	19	47	22	48
8th-Grade Reading	16	44	23	41	16	42
6th-Grade Math	12	38	*	42	15	41
7th-Grade Math	14	37	9	39	17	43
8th-Grade Math	7	36	8	37	17	40
7th-Grade Science	*	23	8	22	*	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	7	35	21	35	17	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	19	49	28	47	26	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	12	45	21	49	32	49

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 22 percent in 2023-2024 to 31 percent in 2024-2025; however, overall performance remains well below the state average of 52 percent.

- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 35 percent in 2022-2023 to 22 percent in 2024-2025, remaining below the state average of 48 percent.
- According to the 2024–2025 KSA data, the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 23 percent in 2023–2024 to 16 percent in 2024-2025, remaining below the state average of 42 percent.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased slightly from 12 percent in 2022-2023 to 15 percent in 2024-2025; however, overall performance remains well below the state average of 41 percent.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 9 percent in 2023-2024 to 17 percent in 2024-2025; however, overall performance remains well below the state average of 43 percent.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math has increased slightly each year from 7 percent in 2022-2023 to 8 percent in 2023-2024 and to 17 percent in 2024-2025; however, overall performance remains well below the state average of 40 percent.
- According to the 2024-2025 KSA data, the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies declined from 21 percent in 2023-2024 to 17 percent in 2024-2025, remaining below the state average of 39 percent.
- According to the 2024-2025 KSA data, the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics declined slightly from 28 percent in 2023-2024 to 26 percent in 2024-2025, remaining below the state average of 49 percent.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing has increased each year from 12 percent in 2022-2023 to 21 percent in 2023-2024 and to 32 percent in 2024-2025; however, overall performance remains well below the state average of 49 percent.

Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	74	68	74	66	68	60
Percent Score of 60- 80	19	24	17	23	22	26
Percent Score of 100	3	7	7	8	9	10
Percent Score of 140	3	2	2	3	1	3

Plus

- The percentage of ELs receiving 140 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment was above the state average in 2022-2023.

Delta

- The percentage of ELs receiving zero points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was above the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of ELs receiving 60-80 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of ELs receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	26	22	31
Female	29	22	33
Male	23	21	28
White	27	21	41
African American	16	18	23
Hispanic or Latino	23	17	22
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	58	*	41
English Learners	10	*	6
English Learners plus Monitored	22	16	24
Economically Disadvantaged	26	20	28
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 33 percent compared to 31 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 41 percent compared to 31 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 28 percent compared to 33 percent for female students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade African American students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 23 percent compared to 31 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 22 percent compared to 31 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade EL students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 6 percent compared to 31 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 28 percent compared to 31 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	12	*	15
Female	*	*	14
Male	11	*	16
White	12	*	21
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	11
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	18
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	11	*	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 16 percent compared to 15 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 18 percent compared to 15 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 14 percent compared to 16 percent for male students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 11 percent compared to 15 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 13 percent compared to 15 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	35	19	22
Female	43	22	26
Male	30	17	20
White	44	30	28
African American	20	10	19
Hispanic or Latino	29	14	17
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	50
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	10	*
Economically Disadvantaged	31	19	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 7th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 26 percent compared to 22 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 50 percent compared to 22 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 20 percent compared to 22 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade African American students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 19 percent compared to 22 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Hispanic or Latino students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 17 percent compared to 22 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 20 percent compared to 22 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	14	9	17
Female	*	10	15
Male	11	9	18
White	13	*	17
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	10	14
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	8	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 15 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Hispanic or Latino students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 14 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 15 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	8	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	7	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	17	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of Two or More Races 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science in 2023-2024 was 17 percent.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 7 percent in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished was 8 percent in 2023-2024.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	16	23	16
Female	19	24	18
Male	12	23	15
White	14	30	18
African American	*	13	13
Hispanic or Latino	21	21	14
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	23
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	18	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	19	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 18 percent compared to 16 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 23 percent compared to 16 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 15 percent compared to 16 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 13 percent compared to 16 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 14 percent compared to 16 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math was 14 percent compared to 16 percent for all students in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	7	8	17
Female	*	13	18
Male	8	5	16
White	*	10	21
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	13	18
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	31
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	7	7	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in science was 18 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in science was 18 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in science was 31 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in science was 16 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	7	21	17
Female	7	26	15
Male	8	17	18
White	*	24	23
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	17	19	13
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	31
English Learners	19	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	18	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	7	18	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 18 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 31 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 15 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latine students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 13 percent compared to 17 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 18 percent.



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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	19	28	26
Female	19	36	27
Male	19	23	26
White	19	41	36
African American	*	18	*
Hispanic or Latino	24	23	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	54
English Learners	24	5	*
English Learners plus Monitored	23	5	*
Economically Disadvantaged	20	21	24
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 27 percent compared to 26 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 54 percent compared to 26 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 24 percent compared to 26 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	12	21	32
Female	*	29	39
Male	7	*	27
White	*	28	38
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	24
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	54
English Learners	*	*	9
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	9
Economically Disadvantaged	12	18	31
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 39 percent compared to 32 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Two or More Races students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 54 percent compared to 32 percent for all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 27 percent compared to 32 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 24 percent compared to 32 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade ELs students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 9 percent compared to 32 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade ELs plus Monitored students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 9 percent compared to 32 percent for all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 31 percent compared to 32 percent for all students in 2024-2025.



Schedule

Monday, Feb. 2, 2026

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

Tuesday, Feb. 3, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, Feb. 4, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:45 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 5, 2026

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