



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Maryville Elementary School

Feb. 23-26, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction 2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation 2
 - Insights from the Review 3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results 5**
 - eleot Narrative 8
- Improvement Priorities 10**
 - Improvement Priority 1 10
 - Potential Leader Actions: 11
 - Improvement Priority 2 12
 - Potential Leader Actions: 13
 - Your Next Steps 14
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review 15**
- Team Roster 17**
- Appendix 18**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings 18
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning 18
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning 20
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning 22
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning 24
 - Student Performance Data 27
 - Schedule 40

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	1
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	6
Certified Staff	23
Noncertified Staff	7
Students	7
Parents	5
Total	50

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

Survey data showed high levels of trust among families and educators at Maryville Elementary School. For example, 91% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 90% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)." Additionally, 92% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)", and 90% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." In interviews, stakeholders described the school as safe, welcoming and family-like, highlighting a culture and climate built on strong relationships that support student safety and trust.

Classroom observations also supported a focus on developing positive learning climates. Throughout many classrooms, routines were clear, school-wide expectations were in place and generally, there were collegial, positive interactions between students and adults. It was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)." Formal and informal observational data showcase positive relationships among many teachers and students. Also, 72% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 79% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Many efforts have been made to refocus on instruction. Students' external and non-academic needs have become a priority, as there have been increased challenges with student behaviors. In alignment with this, there are ongoing struggles to provide high-quality, rigorous instruction in all classrooms. This suggests that students do not experience consistent learning opportunities, and their non-academic needs are the primary focus. These conditions contribute to academic instability and a lack of readiness to fully engage in and provide a strong platform for academic growth.

The school has begun developing processes that will lead to systems that support learners academically and behaviorally. The school's multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) process focuses on students' academic and behavioral needs. Academic support includes the use of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) in mathematics and reading, supported by the i-Ready Assessment Suite Diagnostic Tool to inform data-driven decision-making and create small student groups. Also, coaching cycles, a teacher mentoring program and peer observations have been introduced to incorporate diverse feedback for teachers to use within the MTSS process to determine how students should be placed in tiers. Behavioral supports include implementing positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) around Patriot's Pride and using Patriot points and Golden Ticket Days as incentives to increase student voice and choice. Additionally, a tiered system has been implemented regarding student behavior, outlining minor versus major infractions and where they should be addressed - in the classroom or with an administrator. Maryville Elementary School has developed explicit expectations for Tier 1 (core), Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.

A review of artifacts and evidence revealed that systems are unclear or incoherent due to high staff turnover, which has significantly impacted the learning environment. The principal shared in her presentation that 62% of staff are non-tenured, further indicating a significant need for sustained teacher support and retention. The administrative team has been in a cycle of training and retraining for the last three years, and oftentimes, efforts to focus on instruction are at the surface level. While teachers can speak about grouping students and using data to



inform their instructional practice, their statements indicated that they may not fully understand how to meet the needs of diverse learners. Observations indicated that differentiation of instruction rarely occurred, as most students worked on the same tasks during instruction. It was evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Similarly, while formative, summative and i-Ready data are used to determine intervention placement, they are used minimally to restructure core instruction. This pattern indicates that emphasis should be placed on unit internalization and instructional design.

While professional learning community (PLC) meetings are underway, artifacts reinforce the finding that unit internalization and instructional design must become the primary focus of teacher learning and development. The PLC meeting agendas are collaborative in nature; however, the team found that, across the school, there is a lack of clear and consistent PLC focus, even though the four guiding PLC questions are aligned with the Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle. Given this, limited time is spent unpacking what students must know and be able to do or on how instruction must shift for those who continue to struggle with the content or have mastered it. Because of this, collaborative time provides little instructional coherence, differentiation across classrooms or purposeful structures for sharing best practices and strategies that guide instructional decision-making with clear purpose and expectations (non-negotiables). In addition, based on stakeholder interviews, there is a misconception about what coaching is and when it occurs during the coaching cycle, which affects teacher practices.



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 on 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 27 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	2.0	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	41%	26%	26%	7%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	33%	63%	4%
A3	2.8	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	22%	74%	4%
A4	1.9	Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions, and dispositions.	33%	44%	22%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.4				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.0	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	26%	44%	30%	0%
B2	2.1	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	15%	56%	30%	0%
B3	1.7	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	56%	22%	22%	0%
B4	1.9	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	37%	37%	26%	0%
B5	2.1	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	19%	48%	33%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.6	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	0%	52%	41%	7%
C2	2.3	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	11%	48%	41%	0%
C3	2.7	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	7%	22%	67%	4%
C4	2.6	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	4%	44%	41%	11%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			



D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.3	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	19%	37%	37%	7%
D2	1.5	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	67%	19%	15%	0%
D3	2.5	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	0%	56%	37%	7%
D4	1.9	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	33%	44%	19%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.1			

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.	44%	41%	15%	0%
E2	2.4	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	7%	48%	41%	4%
E3	2.3	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	15%	41%	41%	4%
E4	1.6	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	59%	26%	15%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.0			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.9	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	22%	70%	7%
F2	2.7	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	37%	56%	7%
F3	2.3	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	11%	48%	41%	0%
F4	2.2	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	11%	56%	33%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	78%	19%	4%	0%
G2	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	81%	15%	4%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	96%	4%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 27 observations in core content classrooms. The team also conducted informal observations in non-core classrooms and common areas. Most students interacted positively with one another and showed a positive attitude toward adults. For instance, in 77% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teachers and each other (F1).” Survey data showed 79% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults treat us with respect (2).” In 71% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3).”

Although students are supported by their teachers and peers to understand content, observational data indicated that instruction in many classrooms lacked rigor and fell below the appropriate depth of knowledge level. It was evident/very evident in 26% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” The data also showed that it was evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” In many classrooms, whole-group instruction occurred, contributing to some student disengagement. Also, in 44% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).”

In some classrooms, instructional time was not maximized. Instances of students using “class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)” were evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms. The team found that students were often not actively engaged in learning in many classrooms, as it was evident/very evident in 44% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1).” It was evident/very evident in 30% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” These findings contrast with interview data, where educators highlighted the use of HQIRs and Kagan structures to increase student engagement. Observational data indicate that student engagement is a high-need area for improvement.

In addition, the team identified a lack of differentiated instruction in many classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Additionally, in 23% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).”

The use of technology by students showed similar patterns, where students rarely used technology to learn. It was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that learners use digital tools/technology to “gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1)” and “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2).” It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that learners “use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” These data suggested that technology was rarely used as a tool to promote inquiry, collaboration and engagement or higher-order thinking.

These findings suggest a need for increased rigor, engagement and coherence in the systems used for teaching and learning. Emphasis should be placed on developing systems and clarity on how to use HQIRs to plan, design and deliver lessons aligned with Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) to ensure every learner achieves academic growth and success in every classroom.

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

Implement and monitor an authentic school-wide continuous improvement process using data and feedback to guide instruction, strengthen student academic outcomes and sustain a culture of growth for all stakeholders.

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

Findings:

Maryville Elementary School lacks evidence of a clearly developed, communicated, implemented and monitored continuous improvement process designed to improve student performance.

Although artifacts, such as the "2025-2026 CSIP Maryville Elementary" and "SBDM Agendas and Minutes-Reviewing CSIP", indicate the school creates a comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) and shares it with stakeholders for review, the team found little evidence that the CSIP has been fully implemented and monitored to improve student learning. The limited size of the administrative staff, combined with the increasing demand to support students' non-academic needs, has led to a decreased focus on continuous improvement. School leaders can increase the effectiveness of the CSIP by routinely monitoring the school's implementation through a 30-60-90 day plan with shared stakeholder responsibilities. In addition, opportunities exist to expand the use of the PDSA process currently used in PLCs to additional areas of the school to facilitate the continuous improvement process.

The "Maryville Elementary Staff Handbook 25-26", "PBIS Handbook" and "MTSS Handbook" are intended to provide policies and communicate expectations, yet there is little evidence that they are being used or referenced to hold teachers accountable or to monitor implementation fidelity. Limited teacher training or a lack of capacity may contribute to many teachers' inability to demonstrate all the school's non-negotiables. Dedicated, targeted professional development may lead to greater teacher understanding of the non-negotiables and continuous improvement.

The school benefits from positive relationships and high trust among many educators and families, with both often describing Maryville's best feature as the family-like feel. Survey results affirm this, as 91% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults care about children's well-being (7)", 91% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults know and do their work well (11)" and 94% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." These findings align with survey data from educators, as 90% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", 90% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I used a variety of resources to meet learners' needs and interests (19)" and 90% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I provided opportunities for learners that align to their needs (18)." During stakeholder interviews, it was consistently shared that teachers truly care about the students and do everything they can to meet the growing needs of students. Teachers often stressed that students experience high-trauma and come from struggling family situations; therefore, educators feel the need to spend extensive time focused on the non-academic needs of students. This emphasis on the non-academic needs underscores the administrative team's increased urgency to cultivate a trauma-informed and responsive environment at Maryville Elementary School, which should be embedded in all professional learning.



With the positive outlook from most educators and families, the school is well-positioned to foster shared leadership and collective responsibility as a critical piece of the continuous improvement process.

Survey data highlights a misalignment in the current continuous improvement process, indicating a need for a robust, clearly communicated process to support school improvement efforts and enhance student performance. Educator survey results indicated that 90% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution we base our improvement efforts on learners’ needs (5).” However, student survey results indicated that 73% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults try new things to make our school better (6).” Additionally, the family surveys showed that 84% agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults are committed to trying new things to improve (6).” The survey data from students, families and educators demonstrated a gap in the understanding of improvement efforts at the school. The team found little evidence that stakeholders are aware of or understand the school’s academic performance data or the purpose of the continuous improvement process.

Fifth-grade students’ trend data reflected the most noticeable declines across all indicators on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA). The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished declined in every indicator over the last three years. In reading, the percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 40% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025. In math, the percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished decreased at the same rate, dropping from 40% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025. In social studies, 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025. For editing and mechanics and on-demand writing, 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 51% and 30% in 2022-2023 to 22% and 15% in 2024-2025, respectively. All reported subgroups had a decrease in the percentage who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, math, editing and mechanics and on-demand writing scores from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024. In social studies, the percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished decreased 5 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

These trends mirror concerns shared by stakeholders during interviews that student trauma often disrupts the learning environment, minimizing the focus on student learning and engagement. In response, teachers have been exposed to HQIRs and have begun using them to increase student collaboration and engagement. However, professional learning has been minimal, and observations indicate that the resources and strategies are not being used school-wide to support student academic growth; hence, the administrative team must ensure that all stakeholders engage in the continuous improvement process.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Provide staff with dedicated time (e.g., faculty meetings, Bullitt Days, PLCs) for targeted professional learning to support teachers’ knowledge and understanding of curriculum, instruction and assessment.
- Provide staff with dedicated time for targeted professional learning centered on instructional practices (e.g., delivery, instructional strategies, student engagement).
- Consistently monitor and evaluate the continuous improvement process (e.g., 30-60-90 day plan, CSIP, PDSA).
- Strengthen the PLC protocol to create a uniform process for data analysis, such as checks for understanding, formative and summative data.



Improvement Priority 2

Ensure all students engage in rigorous, learner-centered instruction aligned to KAS by strategically planning, implementing and monitoring clear instructional expectations to ensure students' academic needs are met.

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

Findings:

An analysis of student performance, interviews, surveys, documents and observational data indicates the learning experience at Maryville Elementary School is slowly shifting in a positive direction; however, as of now, instruction is not consistently rigorous, engaging or aligned to grade-level standards in all classrooms. These findings are amplified by the high, ongoing turnover rate among teachers, which limits the school's ability to focus on continuous improvement. Student performance data show gaps in proficiency rates compared to the state. For example, 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading in 2024-2025 were 18% compared to 50% statewide. In math, 3rd-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 was 30% compared to the state average of 43%, and 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished were 18% compared to 43% statewide. Eighteen percent of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in science in 2024-2025, compared to 37% statewide. In 5th-grade social studies, 15% of students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025, compared to 38% statewide. Also in 2024-2025, 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 22% compared to 47% statewide and in on-demand writing 15% scored Proficient/Distinguished compared to 38% statewide. These data trends show an extensive need across all curricula to ensure Tier 1 core instruction is effective, rigorous and aligned to grade-level standards, as well as a need for increased instructional and learning expectations in all classrooms.

According to interview data, educators report that student disruptions impact teaching and learning. Thus far, the school has processed 139 major incidents and 156 minor incidents for 2025-2026. This tracking is ahead of where the school has been over the past two years, with 133 and 124 major incidents, respectively, from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025. However, minor incidents have decreased compared to the previous year when 225 minor incidents were processed.

Perception evidence from students, families and educators provide mixed results but highlight the need for increased engagement, rigor and real-life application within academic tasks. Additionally, stakeholders reported that the instructional coach serves as the primary instructional leader rather than the principal. Student survey results showed 69% agreed/absolutely agreed, "In the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12)." Family survey results showed 88% agreed/absolutely agreed, "The adults have high expectations for learning (10)." Educator survey results showed that 75% agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)", and 65% agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)." While school leadership communicates the need for high expectations and expects those to be visible in every classroom, gaps exist across student experiences, family perceptions of expectations, educator reports of expectations and the learning environment.

Survey results show that 68% of students chose "give a grade" when asked, "Which four phrases best describe how your teachers know you are learning (24)?" When asked, "Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?", 50% of students selected "do the same work as everyone else", and 58% chose "listen to teachers talk." Finally, when asked, "Which four phrases best describe what adults say most of the time to students at school (23)?", 57% of students selected "be quiet", 51% selected "do what you are told", and 45% picked "listen to me." These findings suggest that instruction is mostly teacher-centered and focused on compliance rather than being student-centered and allowing student voice, choice and collaboration. Interview and observational data align with this pattern, as stakeholders reported the expectation to use HQIRs, but they reported limited understanding of how to engage students while dealing with behavioral issues and other non-academic factors that impede student learning. While students have opportunities to work with each other, the majority of tasks are one-dimensional without differentiation and heavily rely on completing i-Ready tasks.



During this time, many students seem disengaged or minimally involved in completing the virtual tasks on i-Ready MyPath. Interview data indicated that structures are in place to support learning; however, the team identified a need to refocus on instructional design and student engagement strategies to ensure consistent implementation and productive teaching and learning experiences for all learners.

A review of documents and artifacts indicates an initial implementation process to create cohesion throughout the school, with a renewed focus on meaningful teaching and learning that incorporates the whole child, but the variability in classroom experiences suggests that Tier 1 instruction is rarely consistently implemented across grade levels. The “Number Talks Walkthrough Tool and Feedback”, “eLeot Walkthrough Data and Analysis”, “Walkthrough Data and Feedback Fall and Winter 2025”, “Two Chicks and Arithmetic Coaching, Collaboration, Feedback”, “Activities that Develop Lifelong Skills and Differentiation” and “Extended Planning Dec. 2024 and Dec. 2025” suggest tools are being used to support instructional resource implementation expectations. Additionally, the team found artifacts that highlight an emphasis on data analysis, such as the “i-Ready Success Initiative”, “PDSA Unit Summative Data With Analyzed Results”, “i-Ready Fall Analysis Protocols” and “Maryville Universal Screener.” Stakeholder interview data point to the requirement for using HQIRs, and teachers have access to i-Ready Assessment Suite, MyView and the University of Florida Literacy Institute (UFLI), but implementation varies across classrooms. This variation, paired with the learner’s perception and performance patterns, shows a need to strengthen school-wide expectations for more authentic tasks aligned with grade-level standards and to provide opportunities for students to be consistently engaged in learning. Tasks must be relevant for students and promote inquiry, reasoning, collaboration and application.

Classroom observational findings further support the need to strengthen rigor, engagement and feedback practices that are most directly tied to Standard 21. Observational data indicated that in 33% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” In 30% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that learners “strive to meet or are able to articulate high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” and “engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” In 22% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)”, and in 26% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher-order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” It was evident/very evident in 44% of classrooms, that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominated (D1)”, in 15% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences(D2)”, in 44% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)” and in 23% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities and/or assignments (D4).” These findings align with student survey and interview data and KSA performance results. Summarily, the findings indicate a need for continuous refinement of instructional practices, including high-quality, rigorous, authentic tasks, student engagement strategies and embedded and responsive instructional practices for all learners.

Collectively, the evidence indicates that the school would benefit from a more coherent Tier 1 instructional framework that increases rigor and the quality of tasks, strengthens student engagement, ensures alignment with state standards and provides equitable access to high expectations and learner-centered instruction in every classroom. Additionally, the team recommends consistent monitoring of classroom instruction and adjustments based on the needs of all learners, including reteaching, intervention and enrichment.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Create a system to clearly communicate non-negotiables for standards-aligned, grade-level instruction for all students.
- Monitor the implementation of the instructional framework and adjust, as needed, to ensure alignment with HQIRs.
- Provide actionable feedback to teachers through embedded coaching cycles focused on rigorous, student-centered instruction and engagement.



Your Next Steps

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

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

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



Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

The principal has successfully led the school in creating a positive, welcoming and caring culture, as evidenced by walkthroughs, stakeholder interviews, observations (including eleot observations and informal observations) and artifacts. Classroom observations indicated "Learners who spoke and interacted respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)" were evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms. The principal is intentional about embedding multiple opportunities for celebrating both staff and students. The 2025-2026 Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey indicates that 71% of teachers responded favorably that the working environment was quite/extremely positive.

However, in the principal's three-year tenure, the KSA scores for both reading and math declined significantly in 2023-2024 and maintained in 2024-2025, despite communicated instructional expectations in both content areas. Classroom observations indicated a lack of instructional rigor in the classrooms, wherein it was evident/very evident that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)" in 30% of classrooms. Similarly, "Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)" was evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms. To address this, the principal should leverage strong staff support and the positive school culture by narrowing the focus to strengthen Tier 1 instruction. This can be accomplished by providing teachers with targeted professional learning opportunities designed to specifically support high-quality standards-aligned instruction. Additionally, the principal should collaborate with the district to streamline the instructional framework to establish a sharply focused, clearly communicated set of expectations.

In order for the school to be successful, the principal should strategically align all improvement efforts around a single, coherent focus on instruction. Stakeholder interviews indicated the instructional coach is seen as the

instructional leader. The principal should establish herself as the instructional leader for the school. The team found that the principal focuses on behavior management and intervention, which doesn't allow her the time to focus directly on instruction. This requires establishing clear systems that effectively support teachers in strengthening their instructional practice. With the support of district leadership, the principal should leverage strong relationships with staff to implement a continuous improvement system centered on a clear instructional priority.

Additionally, the PLC process should be reviewed to ensure protected time for teachers to collaborate and internalize HQIRs. Separate time should be dedicated to professional learning to build teacher capacity and support continuous growth. Finally, the principal should closely monitor the effectiveness of the school improvement initiatives through a balanced assessment system to ensure student achievement is increasing and that teachers clearly understand the narrowed focus, helping to prevent initiative fatigue.

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
Eugene Bellamy, Jr.	Eugene Bellamy, Jr., has 14 years of experience in education. Currently, he serves as the acting executive director/interim principal of a small, Title I charter school in South Carolina's third-largest school district. His past experiences include being an instructional paraprofessional, middle school math teacher, middle school assistant principal, middle school principal, digital platform coordinator, academic officer (director) of elementary and middle schools, professional development coordinator, district math specialist and director of federal programs and strategic planning. Eugene has worked as a field supervisor for a national alternative certification program and consultant with an emphasis on leadership and strategic planning, also.
Nellie Poe	Nellie Poe brings 30 years of experience in education. She has served as a middle school teacher (math, science, pre-engineering), academic dean and assistant principal. She currently works for the Kentucky of Education (KDE), serving as an Education Recovery Leader (ERL) liaison for more rigorous intervention (MRI) and CSI schools in central Kentucky. In this role, she supports ERs, district staff, teachers and administrators in implementing HQIRs, aligning district and school initiatives and developing and refining systems
Jenny Watson	Jenny Watson has 27 years of experience in education. Currently, she is the vice president of early learning and family power at the nonprofit Educate Northern Kentucky (NKY) located in Covington, KY. Prior to this, Jenny served as an elementary teacher for 12 years, an elementary school principal for six years and the assistant superintendent of Boone County Schools for eight years, overseeing curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional learning and all learning support services for 27 schools. Jenny also serves as an adjunct professor at Northern Kentucky University, teaching courses for master's level teachers as well as instructional leadership courses for aspiring school administrators. Jenny is an active member of the Kentucky Association of School Administrators and the Kentucky Women in Educational Leadership and is a mentor to new and aspiring educational leaders.
Sara West	Sara West currently serves as an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS) for KDE, working with CSI schools. She has 25 years of diverse experience in education, having served as a high school teacher in classrooms across the country and as an instructional coach. For the past three years as an ERS, she has devoted her work to empowering and equipping leaders and teachers to ensure every student is prepared to pursue a successful future.

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	3
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	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.	2
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	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)
3rd-Grade Reading	25	46	17	47	47	47
4th-Grade Reading	50	48	28	50	*	50
5th-Grade Reading	40	48	32	46	18	50
3rd-Grade Math	20	43	17	43	30	43
4th-Grade Math	31	42	26	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	40	41	23	41	18	43
4th-Grade Science	27	35	*	34	18	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	36	42	20	39	15	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	51	47	32	47	22	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	30	39	19	39	15	38

Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased by 30 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased by 10 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased by 22 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased by 22 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased 22 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased by 29 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The 2024-2025 KSA data revealed that 18% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in science compared to the state average of 37%.
- The 2024-2025 KSA data revealed that 15% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies compared to the state average of 38%.
- The 2024-2025 KSA data revealed that 15% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing compared to the state average of 38%.

Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	*	26	*	29	*	30
Percent Score of 60-80	*	35	*	35	*	35
Percent Score of 100	*	24	*	23	*	22
Percent Score of 140	*	14	*	13	*	13

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	25	17	47
Female	33	13	43
Male	16	21	50
White	26	16	49
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	21	21	39
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 34 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 18 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 39% compared to 47% for the all students group in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	20	17	30
Female	27	*	25
Male	13	29	36
White	19	13	31
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	15	21	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by 23 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished was 5 percentage points less than the all students group in 2022-2023.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	50	28	*
Female	55	38	*
Male	45	19	*
White	47	32	*
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	45	26	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- All reported 4th-grade subgroups had a decrease in Proficient/Distinguished reading scores from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	31	26	*
Female	28	27	*
Male	33	26	*
White	27	22	*
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	28	21	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- All reported 4th-grade subgroups had a decrease in Proficient/Distinguished math scores from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	27	*	18
Female	28	*	13
Male	27	*	*
White	27	*	15
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	23	*	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- All reported 4th-grade subgroups had a decrease in Proficient/Distinguished science scores from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	40	32	18
Female	65	29	29
Male	27	34	9
White	43	28	20
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	35	24	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- All reported 4th-grade subgroups had a decrease in Proficient/Distinguished reading scores from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	40	23	18
Female	*	*	25
Male	40	21	13
White	41	23	18
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	39	17	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- All reported 5th-grade subgroups had a decrease in Proficient/Distinguished math scores from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	36	20	15
Female	*	18	25
Male	27	22	*
White	35	17	18
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	*	15	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased 5 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	51	32	22
Female	71	36	32
Male	40	28	*
White	51	26	24
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	48	26	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

Delta

- All reported 5th-grade subgroups had a decrease in Proficient/Distinguished editing and mechanics scores from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	30	19	15
Female	*	*	25
Male	20	13	*
White	32	17	16
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	26	16	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

Delta

- All reported 5th-grade subgroups had a decrease in Proficient/Distinguished on-demand writing scores from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
5 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, Feb. 24, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, Feb. 25, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 26, 2026

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

