



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Marion C. Moore School

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	8
Improvement Priorities	10
Improvement Priority 1	10
Potential Leader Actions:.....	11
Improvement Priority 2	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Your Next Steps	13
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	14
Team Roster	16
Appendix	17
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	17
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	17
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	19
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	21
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	23
Student Performance Data.....	26
Schedule	51

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	3
Building-Level Administrators	8
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	12
Certified Staff	73
Noncertified Staff	13
Students	32
Total	141

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:

A culture of care for students was a strength at Marion C. Moore School. Staff and student interviews, along with informal observations in hallways and classrooms, reflected strong rapport and positive relationships between students and teachers. The hallways were welcoming, and student work was displayed. During stakeholder interviews, educators consistently identified diversity and inclusion as key strengths of the school community, noting intentional efforts to ensure students feel valued and supported. According to the principal's presentation, the student population includes 32% of multilingual learners (MLs). To help with this high population of MLs, the school has employed teachers who are fluent in Spanish, Arabic and Nepali. Students expressed strong relationships with teachers during stakeholder interviews.

Survey data further reinforced these findings. When asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?", 62% of students selected "safe." The Diagnostic Review Team observed that assistant principals and counselors regularly set up workstations in hallways to be on-site and assist with student safety. Additionally, the school installed two weapon detection scanners at student entryways. Results from the Upbeat teacher survey, conducted by an independent education and consulting company, show an increase in positive responses toward Safety and Order from 69% in spring 2025 to 77% in fall 2025 (6). Posters throughout the school include a Quick Response (QR) code that students can scan to report bullying and safety issues. The "Student Support Behavior Intervention Handbook" and the "Restorative Behavior Matrix" outlined a structured process for addressing behavioral referrals.

The school demonstrated a commitment to supporting the whole student through intentional structures and resources. Teachers described meeting students where they are and providing wrap-around supports to address academic, social and emotional needs, with mental health identified as a top priority. To support this focus, the school expanded staffing by adding three mental health professionals, two nurses and a social worker. Additionally, the school's academy model organizes students and teachers into smaller learning communities, allowing staff to build deeper relationships and collaborate more effectively around individual student needs. The academy structure is also designed to align with future career pathways, providing students with opportunities for hands-on learning and certifications in areas such as health sciences and community services. The "High School Activities" document listed 25 unique extra-curricular activities available for students to join. The principal's presentation highlighted several community partnerships with local businesses that provide students with exposure to career options and post-secondary opportunities beyond high school.

Instructional support for teachers was identified as a developing strength through the work of professional learning community (PLC) leads, instructional coaches and assistant principals. While the PLC system is still being refined and implemented with varying levels of consistency, teachers reported a growing sense of collaboration within their teams and felt supported by their PLC leads and colleagues. The team reviewed artifacts related to the PLC protocol and agendas, including the "Copy of Unit 1 PLC Protocol: CFA 25-26", which outlined one academy's PLC process for reviewing student work samples, facilitating teacher discussions on which learning targets might need to be retaught and identifying implications for students who did not achieve mastery. While stakeholder feedback indicates this process is not being implemented effectively across all academies, it reflects the early stages of monitoring and adjusting instruction based on student data. Additionally, the "2025-



2026 New Teacher Committee Skeleton” outlined a plan to support new teachers through a cohort-based professional development model. Stakeholder feedback revealed that the teachers participating in this cohort felt well supported.

The Diagnostic Review Team reviewed multiple artifacts related to schoolwide communication, including “2024-2025 Turnaround Team Agenda MCM”, “25-26 Marion C. Moore CSIP Phase III” and “25-26 – Marion C. Moore School – JCPS Instructional Systems Monitoring Tool”. Evidence indicated that school leadership identified communication as a priority to align the middle and high schools into a unified school community. Artifacts indicated that the school leadership uses two weekly communication structures. The Monday report is a weekly email sent to staff to outline day-to-day expectations, upcoming calendar events (e.g., professional development, meetings) and an instructional highlight to set the instructional focus for the week. The school also uses a “Feel Good Friday” communication to recognize and celebrate students and staff. Leadership noted that these communication efforts are intended to improve clarity and ensure consistency across a large staff.

Stakeholder interviews revealed that communication remains a barrier for staff. Teachers reported receiving a high volume of emails, often containing extensive information, making it difficult to identify key messages that require action. Additionally, staff shared that communications intended for specific groups are frequently sent to the entire school population. Interviews indicated this practice has contributed to information overload. As a result, teachers stated they do not consistently read all emails and sometimes miss information related to policies, procedures and PLC expectations.

Stakeholders consistently stated in interviews that the no-cell phone policy is a practice that has been implemented and consistently monitored. Informal observations by the team indicated the policy was being enforced in hallways and classrooms. Artifacts and stakeholder interviews indicated that, while system creation has been a focus, many protocols have not been implemented or monitored with fidelity. Teacher interviews revealed that policy implementation varies across classrooms and administrators. Team members reviewed the “2024-2025 Turnaround Team Agenda MCM” and found that the team stopped meeting in Jan. 2025. Interviews further indicated that teachers and staff were not consistently involved in developing the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP), and many were unable to articulate the school’s improvement goals. Several stakeholders noted that after the school exited comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) status, work related to improvement priorities was reduced or discontinued. The principal’s presentation indicated the vision for a priority on the principal’s three Cs: coherence, consistency and connectedness; a strategy to align initiatives, strengthen expectations and build a unified school community. In interviews, many staff members reported hearing about the three Cs, but few consistently described what each represents or how it connects to their daily work.



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

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.4	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	76%	11%	11%	2%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	4%	20%	76%	0%
A3	2.9	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	2%	15%	78%	5%
A4	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions, and dispositions.	38%	44%	15%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.2				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.8	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	25%	67%	7%	0%
B2	2.3	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	13%	44%	40%	4%
B3	1.7	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	42%	47%	11%	0%
B4	2.1	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	15%	58%	25%	2%
B5	2.0	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	24%	55%	16%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.3	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	13%	49%	38%	0%
C2	2.1	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	29%	31%	38%	2%
C3	2.4	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	7%	45%	45%	2%
C4	2.6	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	9%	29%	56%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.3			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.8	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	36%	45%	16%	2%
D2	1.9	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	45%	24%	27%	4%
D3	2.1	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	13%	62%	24%	2%
D4	1.6	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	62%	22%	15%	2%
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	1.7	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	40%	49%	9%	2%
E2	2.1	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	18%	56%	22%	4%
E3	2.1	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	15%	65%	18%	2%
E4	1.7	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	40%	47%	11%	2%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

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.	9%	16%	65%	9%
F2	2.6	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	4%	31%	64%	2%
F3	2.1	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	29%	36%	31%	4%
F4	2.3	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	5%	60%	35%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.4			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	65%	20%	13%	2%
G2	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	73%	11%	13%	4%
G3	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	80%	13%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.4			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 55 classroom observations using the eleot. The Well-Managed learning environment received the highest overall rating average of 2.4 on a 4-point scale. In most classrooms, teacher-student interactions were positive. It was evident/very evident in 74% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teachers and each other (F1).” These observational data align with stakeholder feedback showing 73% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that adults “make decisions to keep us safe” (3) and 82% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that adults “think about children’s safety when making decisions (3).” Classroom observations showed it was evident/very evident in 61% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” Supporting this finding, team members noted

staff/student interactions during transition times that mostly demonstrated rapport and care for the well-being of the whole student. Additionally, teachers expressed in interviews that student behavior has improved significantly over the past few years. While pockets of negative behaviors were observed, classroom observational and survey data showed mostly consistent behavioral structures that support a positive and orderly learning environment across classrooms. The “Restorative Behavior Matrix” was developed for an embedded professional development (ePD) program to provide teachers with resources to address negative student behaviors in their classrooms.

Classroom observational data revealed inconsistent implementation of learner-centered instructional practices, particularly in differentiation, rigor and student ownership of learning. In the Equitable Learning Environment, it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)”, indicating limited adjustment of instruction to meet diverse learner needs. Similarly, survey data showed that 46% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “lessons were changed to meet my needs (13)”, and 64% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that their child “had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15).” High school students scored below the state average on ACT benchmark measures in English, reading and math for 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025. Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data from 2024-2025 showed that the percentage of students reaching Proficient/Distinguished was lower than the state average across all tested content areas and grade levels. Collectively, these results indicate a need for more consistent and responsive instructional practices that adapt to students’ different learning needs.

The High Expectations Learning Environment received an average rating of 2.0 on a 4-point scale, and the Active Learning Environment earned an overall average score of 1.9. In 7% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that learners “strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher” (B1). Survey data supports the need for higher ordered thinking, showing 60% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me think in new ways (15)” and 63% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had many ways to show my teachers what I learned (19).” During stakeholder interviews, students expressed that most teachers did not incorporate high expectations. Survey data shows that 62% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “At my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8).” This reflects the need for more frequent and intentional opportunities for learners to engage in rigorous tasks, articulate expectations and demonstrate understanding through varied and active learning experiences.

While educators reported using multiple data sources for decision-making and assessing learner progress, these practices were not consistently observed. When surveyed, 76% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “I used a variety of information for decision-making that affected my area of responsibility (21).” Similarly, 79% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “I used a variety of information to determine learners’ progress (20).” Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that “learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5).” Teacher interviews showed that the use of multiple data sources to drive instruction was inconsistent across the school. Collectively, these findings point to a need for greater coherence between the use of data for instructional decision-making and the consistent application of those practices within classroom instruction.

Stakeholder interviews revealed significant leadership and teacher turnover. The school has experienced five principals over the past 10 years. Stakeholders shared that staffing instability has affected the consistent implementation of schoolwide systems and practices. Teachers reported feeling that policies and expectations were not consistently applied across staff. Additionally, staff noted that they often did not understand the purpose behind many school-wide decisions. When asked “Which four words best describe, in general, your institution’s culture (24)”, 24% of educators selected “transparent.”

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 explicit common expectations that lead to non-negotiable practices (e.g., evidence-based instructional strategies) for Tier 1 instruction aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS).

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

Findings:

The Diagnostic Review Team reviewed the “Diagnostic Review Presentation MOORE *draft*”, which identified the school’s vision: “Marion C Moore school will be a place where students want to be, adults want to work and the community is proud to have their children attend.” While this vision focuses on school culture, it does not clearly articulate expectations for instructional practices or student outcomes. Educator survey data indicated that when asked, “Which four words do you think best describe, in general, the interactions you experience with your colleagues? (26)”, 72% selected “collaborative”, 66% selected “personable” and 58% chose “genuine”, which were the most frequently selected words. Stakeholder interviews revealed that some teachers felt unappreciated and uncertain about how instructional expectations relate to daily practice. Stakeholder interviews also indicated that although the school leadership team often collects teacher feedback, staff do not see evidence that their input informs schoolwide instructional decisions. Collectively, this suggests that the school has not fully implemented or operationalized an instructional vision to drive Tier 1 instruction.

The “2024-2025 Turnaround Team Agenda MCM” and “25-26 Marion C. Moore CSIP Phase III” documents indicate that the school has begun establishing instructional expectations, including the use of learning targets and the implementation of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs). Classroom observational data reflected inconsistent application of these practices. The High Expectations Learning Environment received an overall average rating of 2.0. Learners who “strive to meet or articulate high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” were evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms. Educator survey data further indicated that 57% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “At my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12).” Teacher interviews revealed that although instructional expectations have been introduced, many teachers do not consistently align those expectations with daily instructional practice, indicating inconsistent implementation of Tier 1 instructional strategies across classrooms.

The “Walkthrough Tool Analysis”, “Explore Walkthroughs” and “Moore Walkthrough Tool”, related to monitoring, feedback and coaching cycles, indicated that the school has established a walkthrough process, including a defined schedule and technology-supported tools for collecting observational data. Interviews with school leadership confirmed that intentional planning about the walkthrough system occurs, and a review of artifacts showed that the tools are aligned with current instructional expectations, including learning targets and the use of HQIRs. While some administrators and instructional coaches reported discussing walkthrough feedback directly with teachers, teacher interviews revealed that most feedback is delivered via email. Teachers shared that due to the volume of email communication, walkthrough feedback emails are not consistently reviewed or used to inform instructional practice.

Evidence indicated that multiple data sources are available to support instructional planning, including the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) results, walkthrough data and standards-based instructional resources. Interviews revealed that there is currently no comprehensive, schoolwide process for consistently using these



data sources to monitor instructional impact or guide next steps within PLCs or coaching cycles. Most recent MAP data showed low levels of proficiency across grade and content areas, with reading proficiency ranging from 18% to 41% and mathematics proficiency ranging from 15% to 32% across grades six through eight. Additionally, KSA data revealed that the school scored below the state average in all tested content areas and grade levels. While assistant principals and instructional leaders participate in walkthroughs and provide feedback, interviews indicated that expectations for how data should be analyzed, discussed and used to adjust Tier 1 instruction are not consistently defined or monitored. Additionally, the extent to which assistant principals are systematically supported to model instructional expectations, analyze instructional data and provide differentiated coaching varies across leadership roles.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Develop and communicate a clear instructional vision that articulates the purpose and rationale for Tier 1 instructional expectations, incorporating input from multiple stakeholder groups.
- Establish explicit, common expectations for Tier 1 instruction aligned to the KAS, including non-negotiable instructional practices (e.g., clearly articulated learning targets, bell-to-bell instruction, aligned formative and summative assessments, deconstructed standards, backward lesson design, lesson internalization).
- Align classroom walkthrough tools and look-fors with the established Tier 1 instructional expectations and implement consistent monitoring processes, including timely feedback and coaching cycles to support implementation fidelity across classrooms.
- Build the instructional leadership capacity of assistant principals through a structured system that includes modeling of expectations, calibration of instructional practices and ongoing coaching aligned to Tier 1 instructional priorities.

Improvement Priority 2

Leverage the school's instructional vision to refine, implement and monitor a PLC process that systematically uses student and teacher data (e.g., walkthroughs, evaluations, formal and informal assessments) to guide instructional decision making, strengthen instructional practices and ensure instructional strategies are responsive to individual learner needs.

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

Findings:

Evidence indicated that the school has established formal PLC structures, including a PLC schedule, facilitator guides, protocols requiring a tangible product and resources for PLC leads. Artifacts also showed that teachers have access to multiple sources of student data, including MAP, common formative assessments, Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) and KSA results. However, observational and interview data provided minimal evidence that PLC meetings are consistently focused on analyzing student learning data or using findings to inform instructional adjustments. Teacher interviews revealed that PLCs are often perceived as a compliance-oriented requirement rather than a process designed to impact instructional practice. Additionally, "PLC meeting agendas" reveal that not all PLCs meet on a regular basis, and attendance at the PLCs is an ongoing concern.

While the "PLC Protocols" include tools for standards deconstruction, assessment alignment, student work analysis and planning, the Diagnostic Review Team found limited evidence that data analysis consistently resulted in changes to instructional strategies or differentiation within Tier 1 instruction. Classroom observational data supported this finding, as it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Stakeholder interviews described challenges in implementing instructional strategies that addressed diverse learner needs while maintaining rigorous learning experiences.

Topics on the reviewed "PLC meeting agendas" included scaffolding, ML strategies and the Adolescent Literacy Model (ALM). Additionally, a review of artifacts showed an ML-focused book study, demonstrating intentional efforts to support instructional practices for diverse learners. Walkthrough data embedded in ALM professional learning materials further showed initial monitoring of strategy implementation. Teacher interviews reflected appreciation for teacher-led PLCs that provide opportunities to share instructional strategies and best practices; however, stakeholder feedback consistently indicated a need for greater differentiation within the PLC structure. Staff noted that PLC support is often designed to meet the needs of new educators, with fewer differentiated learning opportunities tailored to veteran teachers. Survey data show that 60% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)."

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish a cross-collaboration team to revisit and refine the school's mission and instructional vision to strengthen staff culture and clarify academic expectations.
- Collaborate with stakeholders to identify and monitor a succinct, reliable set of student and instructional data sources used consistently across grade levels to inform teaching and learning within PLCs.
- Develop a structured feedback loop that allows teachers to share input on PLC sessions, instructional strategies and overall effectiveness and ensure all PLC leads receive cohesive training to facilitate PLCs consistently and effectively in alignment with the instructional vision.



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 requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

The Marion C. Moore School principal accepted the position on Aug 1, 2025, and is the fifth school principal within 10 years. She demonstrates urgency in addressing the CSI status, as evidenced by the principal's presentation, the artifacts review and stakeholder interviews. The principal embraces a systems approach, understanding the importance of how the creation and implementation leads to changes in the learning environment. She has established and communicated her three Cs approach: coherence, consistency and connectedness; however, she will need support to engage staff in an ongoing process of planning for continuous improvement.

The Diagnostic Review Team examined multiple pieces of evidence, conducted numerous classroom observations and interviewed a variety of stakeholders. The team observed mostly orderly procedures during hallway transitions and in common areas. Additionally, observations and stakeholder interviews indicated an atmosphere of care, concern and support for the diverse groups of students.

School leadership should review and revise the school's vision and mission, aligning it directly with school improvement and recognizing the need for meaningful involvement from all stakeholders. Current stakeholder input indicates family involvement is lacking, while community and business partners are regularly engaged through academy advisory boards. Moreover, the principal was unable to secure family interviews. The principal will require support in developing intentional strategies to engage all stakeholders in decision-making and ensure consistent communication about improvement efforts.

The previous Diagnostic Review Report, dated Jan. 2023, identified PLC systems as an area of need. The school has partially addressed this; subsequently, the current structure needs refinement as it has unintentionally become a checklist rather than a process utilized to reflect and change instructional practices. This is necessary to ensure teachers collaboratively plan for effective Tier 1 instruction, disaggregate data, plan next steps and

adjust instruction. Multiple sources of data (e.g., walkthrough, College Equipped Readiness Tool [CERT], common formative assessments, attendance, KSA, behavior) are collected, but little evidence supports the development and implementation of action plans to improve student performance. Classroom observations revealed a lack of student engagement and high-quality instruction. The eleot data indicated learners who “strived to meet or were able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” were evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms. Additionally, learners who “engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that required the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)” were evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms. Observations revealed that teachers deliver mandated curricula to students, but little evidence supported a common practice of lesson internalization, including the deconstruction of KAS appearing in lessons. Additionally, the principal has attempted to establish walkthroughs to evaluate and monitor classroom instruction; however, inconsistent frequency and absence of a clear instructional vision have hindered efforts to improve student achievement.

Finally, stakeholder interviews revealed the need to ensure clear and concise communication with staff. While the principal has attempted to improve communication, many stakeholder interviews indicated that, at times, various members of the leadership team are inconsistent in communicating a unified message regarding priorities and initiatives; moreover, stakeholder interviews continued to indicate that staff felt overwhelmed with the number of emails received from varying levels of leadership. The principal will need support to develop protocols within the leadership team, ensuring all staff receive accurate and succinct communication.



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
Julie Taylor	Julie Taylor has spent over 25 years fostering student success in her roles as both a teacher and an administrator. With extensive experience in virtual and hybrid learning environments, she specializes in school improvement, collaborating with low-performing schools to drive meaningful change. Julie has served in roles including educator, principal and director of academic impact.
Donna Bumps	Donna Bumps is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), where she supports turnaround schools across the state in developing and implementing sustainable continuous improvement systems. She has 26 years of experience as an educator, having served as a middle and high school teacher, assistant principal and high school principal. Donna is trained in Jim Shipley Systems and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL). She has also contributed to multiple Diagnostic Review teams over several years, serving as both a team member and an associate-lead evaluator.
Christi LeFevers	Christi Lefevers brings over 28 years of experience in education, having served in a wide range of impactful roles. Christi serves as an ERL with KDE, where she leads continuous improvement initiatives. During her eight years as principal, her former middle school was recognized as a National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence, reflecting her commitment to academic excellence and transformative leadership.
Melissa Scott	Melissa Scott brings over 30 years of dedicated service in education, with a deep commitment to student success and school improvement. She currently serves as the federal programs supervisor for Decatur City Schools, overseeing critical initiatives that support academic achievement and equity. Melissa began her career as an English teacher and cheerleading coach. Her experience includes positions as assistant principal at the elementary, middle and high school levels, an instructional assistant principal and an alternative school principal. Known for her collaborative leadership style and focus on continuous improvement, she has consistently worked to build strong school cultures that empower both students and educators.
Donna Jones Hocker	Donna Jones-Hocker serves as an ERL for the KDE, specializing in driving school turnaround initiatives. In this capacity, she partners with institutions across the state to architect and execute sustainable systems for continuous improvement. With an 18-year tenure in education, Donna has cultivated expertise through diverse leadership and instructional roles, including middle school teacher, high school associate principal and K-8 principal. Her strategic approach is reinforced by specialized training in NISL, Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) and Cognitive Coaching.
Mary Maldonado	Mary Maldonado is a career educator with 23 years of experience. She is in year 10 of administrative leadership as a Title I principal. Drawing on her experience as a curriculum coach, she specializes in advancing literacy and closing achievement gaps, while delivering measurable gains for exceptional populations. She is an advocate for professional learning communities and empowering collaborative teams to use data-informed instruction to drive sustainable classroom growth.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
17. Learners have the support and opportunities to realize their learning potential.	Professional staff members give little or no consideration to individual learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Academic and non-academic opportunities are limited and standardized according to grade levels or a predetermined sequencing of courses. Learners frequently encounter a variety of barriers when accessing academic and non-academic offerings that would be well-suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are rarely challenged to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members consider varying learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access to some variety in academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners may encounter barriers when accessing some academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are sometimes challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members know their learners well-enough to develop and provide a variety of academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access and choice in most academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners rarely encounter barriers when accessing academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members develop relationships with and understand the needs and well-being of individual learners. Academic and non-academic experiences are tailored to the needs and well-being of individual learners. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards maximal levels of achievement and self-efficacy without barriers or hindrances by schedules or access to academic and non-academic offerings.	2
18. Learners are immersed in an environment that fosters lifelong skills including creativity, curiosity, risk taking, collaboration, and design thinking.	Learners engage in environments that focus primarily on academic learning objectives only. Little or no emphasis is placed on non-academic skills important for next steps in learning and for future success. Learning experiences rarely build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration or design-thinking.	Conditions within some aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in some experiences that develop non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Some learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions within most aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Collectively, the learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions across all aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in ongoing experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. A formal structure ensures that learning experiences collectively build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	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.	2
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	2

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

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Reading	27	48	28	49	26	52
7th-Grade Reading	16	45	23	47	23	48
8th-Grade Reading	27	44	15	41	20	42
6th-Grade Math	12	38	19	42	16	41
7th-Grade Math	*	37	13	39	20	43
8th-Grade Math	13	36	11	37	17	40
7th-Grade Science	*	23	*	22	*	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	17	35	15	35	18	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	22	49	16	47	22	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	27	45	19	49	23	49
10th-Grade Reading	27	46	25	46	16	47
10th-Grade Math	13	34	14	36	10	41
11th-Grade Science	*	11	*	6	*	22
11th-Grade Social Studies	18	38	17	38	13	38

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)
11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	19	45	18	45	15	41
11th-Grade On Demand Writing	13	42	21	43	21	45

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 15% percent in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was below the state average in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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	78	68	52	66	55	60
Percent Score of 60- 80	16	24	26	23	24	26
Percent Score of 100	5	7	14	8	15	10
Percent Score of 140	0	2	7	3	7	3

Plus

- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 0 points for progress was 52%, while the state average was 66% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 0 points for progress was 55%, while the state average was 60% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 60-80 points for progress was 24% compared to the state's average of 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 100 points for progress was 14% compared to the state's average of 8% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 100 points for progress was 15% compared to the state's average of 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 140 points for progress was 7% compared to the state's average of 3% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 140 points for progress was 7% compared to the state's average of 3% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 0 points for progress was 78%, while the state average was 68 percent in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 60-80 points for progress was 26% compared to the state's average of 23% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of middle school ELs scoring 100 points for progress was 5%, while the state average was 7% in 2022-2023.

High 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	64	64	53	62	41	59
Percent Score of 60- 80	25	26	30	26	30	27
Percent Score of 100	8	8	13	9	20	11
Percent Score of 140	3	2	4	3	9	3

Plus

- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 0 points for progress was 53%, while the state average was 62% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 0 points for progress was 41%, while the state average was 59% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 60-80 points for progress was 25% compared to the state average of 26% in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 100 points for progress was 13% compared to the state average of 9% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 100 points for progress was 20% compared to the state's average of 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 140 points for progress was 3% compared to the state average of 2% in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 140 points for progress was 4% compared to the state average of 3% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of high school ELs scoring 140 points for progress was 9% compared to the state average of 3% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- Percentages were not low enough to qualify as a delta.

Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmarks on the ACT

Content Area	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
English	25	47	21	44	28	44
Reading	23	44	21	42	25	41
Math	12	33	9	30	10	30

Plus

- The percentage of high school students meeting benchmark on the ACT in English increased from 21% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of high school students meeting benchmark on the ACT in reading increased from 21% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of high school students meeting benchmark on the ACT in math increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 10% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The high school performed below the state average in the percentage of students meeting ACT benchmark scores in English, reading and math in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Graduation Rate

Year	School Four-Year	State Four-Year	School Five-Year	State Five-Year
2022-2023	84.5	91.4	90.1	92.5
2023-2024	86.2	92.3	85.8	93.4
2024-2025	88.4	93.5	88.9	94.2

Plus

- The school's four-year graduation rate increased from 84.5% in 2022-2023 to 86.2% in 2023-2024.
- The school's four-year graduation rate increased from 86.2 % in 2023-2024 to 88.4% in 2024-2025.
- The school's five-year graduation rate increased from 85.8% in 2023-2024 to 88.9% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The school's four-year graduation rate was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The school's five-year graduation rate was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Post-Secondary Readiness

Year	School	State	School w/ High Demand	State w/ High Demand
2022-2023	65.4	79.1	71.6	83.5
2023-2024	61.5	81	68.4	86
2024-2025	65.6	83	72.4	88.8

Plus

- The percentage of students meeting the post-secondary readiness criteria increased from 61.5% in 2023-2024 to 65.6% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting the post-secondary readiness with high demand criteria increased from 68.4% in 2023-2024 to 72.4% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of students meeting the post-secondary readiness criteria was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting the post-secondary readiness with high demand criteria 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	27	28	26
Female	31	30	33
Male	23	27	21
White	30	*	29
African American	20	17	13
Hispanic or Latino	33	26	25
Asian	*	*	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	10	*
English Learners plus Monitored	23	24	15
Economically Disadvantaged	24	26	27
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on reading increased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on reading increased from 30% in 2023-2024 to 33% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on reading increased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 27% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 73% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 26% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 28% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 26% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 10% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 15% 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	19	16
Female	11	13	16
Male	12	25	16
White	13	22	22
African American	5	13	*
Hispanic or Latino	14	22	18
Asian	*	24	33
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	3	8	*
English Learners plus Monitored	9	15	9
Economically Disadvantaged	11	17	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 25% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 5% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 33% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 3% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of all 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 22% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 9% in 2024-2025.



- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 14% 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	16	23	23
Female	18	27	26
Male	14	19	19
White	14	26	19
African American	17	19	17
Hispanic or Latino	15	22	24
Asian	*	44	48
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	14
English Learners plus Monitored	*	10	17
Economically Disadvantaged	17	21	21
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 27% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2023-2024 with another increase in 2024-2025 to 24%.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 44% in 2023-2024 to 48% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 10% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of all 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading remained at 23% in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading remained at 19% 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade ELs who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 14% 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	*	13	20
Female	*	12	16
Male	10	14	23
White	11	23	*
African American	*	4	15
Hispanic or Latino	*	13	28
Asian	*	*	19
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	6	14
English Learners plus Monitored	*	8	14
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 10% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024, with another increase in 2024-2025 to 23%.
- The percentage of 7th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 4% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math in 2024-2025 in math increased from 6% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 8% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- All scores were below the state averages 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	*	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	27	15	20
Female	32	16	25
Male	24	14	15
White	34	21	21
African American	13	10	16
Hispanic or Latino	33	12	20
Asian	38	24	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	19	*
English Learners	11	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	14	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	27	14	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 10% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 47% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- All scores were below the state averages 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	13	11	17
Female	11	*	18
Male	14	9	15
White	16	11	18
African American	7	10	12
Hispanic or Latino	13	7	17
Asian	27	24	24
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	12	9	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 10% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 7% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- Percentages were not low enough to qualify as a delta.

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	17	15	18
Female	20	14	18
Male	15	16	18
White	19	16	19
African American	9	12	14
Hispanic or Latino	23	15	15
Asian	33	35	47
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	14	30
English Learners	9	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	12	*	4
Economically Disadvantaged	18	15	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 12% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 35% in 2023-2024 to 47% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students who are Two or More Races scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 30% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies remained at 15% in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 12% in 2022-2023 to 4% in 2024-2025.

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	22	16	22
Female	28	19	28
Male	18	14	15
White	30	18	29
African American	15	15	17
Hispanic or Latino	23	16	19
Asian	21	24	29
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	18	14	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	21	16	19
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students who are Two or More Races scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	27	19	23
Female	38	*	30
Male	18	18	16
White	27	*	22
African American	19	18	15
Hispanic or Latino	37	17	29
Asian	43	35	41
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	20	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	27	18	22
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 35% in 2023-2024 to 41% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 22% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 38% in 2022-2023 to 30% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 10th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	27	25	16
Female	32	25	19
Male	23	25	14
White	28	37	29
African American	13	*	8
Hispanic or Latino	38	21	*
Asian	50	*	40
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	46	36	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	9	6	*
Economically Disadvantaged	23	23	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify for a plus

Delta

- The percentage of all 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of African American 10th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of Hispanic or Latino 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 38% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 50% in 2022-2023 to 40% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students who are Two or More Races scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 46% in 2022-2023 to 36% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students who are ELs plus monitored scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 23% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 10th-Grade Math

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	13	14	10
Female	13	*	*
Male	12	18	13
White	15	25	18
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	15	11	9
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	23	*	*
English Learners	*	5	6
English Learners plus Monitored	*	5	6
Economically Disadvantaged	*	14	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 10th-grade ELs scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 5% in 2023-2024 to 6% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade ELs plus monitored scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 5% in 2023-2024 to 6% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 9% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade Science

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade Social Studies

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	18	17	13
Female	18	17	8
Male	17	17	17
White	23	21	24
African American	10	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	23	25	*
Asian	36	25	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	17
English Learners	6	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	6	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	15	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 25% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of all 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies has remained at 17% 2022-2023 through 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade Asian students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 25% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	19	18	15
Female	19	20	13
Male	20	16	17
White	*	24	26
African American	*	7	*
Hispanic or Latino	32	20	12
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	28
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	17	14	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 11th-Grade On-Demand Writing

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	13	21	21
Female	18	29	20
Male	8	15	21
White	13	25	27
African American	5	*	12
Hispanic or Latino	22	26	25
Asian	*	30	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	20	35
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	7	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	21	19
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 21% in both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 5% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students who are Two or More Races scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing increased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 35% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 29% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 26% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 21% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 2, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3:15 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
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
6:45 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:30 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
7:30 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Virtual Teacher Interviews Via Zoom (NTI Day)	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 5, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9:30 a.m. – Noon	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members