



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Menifee County**

Feb. 2-5, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation2
 - Insights from the Review3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....5**
 - eleot Narrative8
- Improvement Priorities10**
 - Improvement Priority 110
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....11
 - Your Next Steps12
- District Capacity in Diagnostic Review13**
- Team Roster15**
- Appendix16**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings16
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....16
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning18
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning22
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning24
 - Student Performance Data.....27
 - Schedule44

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
Board Members	5
District-Level Administrators	7
Building-Level Administrators	1
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	3
Total	16

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:

Stakeholders describe the district as a family, with a small, welcoming environment where students' needs come first. The district's mission and vision statements are visible and referenced in multiple ways, including in the "Menifee Minute" communications, board meeting agendas and displays throughout the district. Stakeholder interviews revealed that the mission and vision guide much of the district's work. Survey data show that 82% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 85% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Additionally, 82% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults care about children's well-being (7)." Stakeholders also noted many non-academic ways in which students excelled. (FFA, Health Occupations Students of America (HOSA), Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG) and the district's Portrait of a Learner (POL) were all highlighted as ways to help students meet their potential. Board members referred to these initiatives as points of pride. Additionally, they expressed confidence in district leadership and were hopeful about a positive trajectory with new school leadership. Conversely, students and families were less confident about academic preparation. Family and student survey results revealed that 54% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child had learning experiences that were unique to their needs (17)", and 42% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Most stakeholders identified growth areas, such as academic systems, including common classroom/instructional expectations, continued work on the high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs), professional learning community (PLC) implementation fidelity and tiered instruction with academic interventions.

The district serves a student population where 76.2% are economically disadvantaged, compared to the state average of 60.8%. Stakeholder interviews and the superintendent's presentation reflected a shared conviction that a strong education can open doors for students and create lasting, positive change in the community. To that end, the district pursues multiple grant and professional learning opportunities to support students' academic and non-academic needs. Stakeholders noted participation in multiple grants, including the Kentucky Comprehensive Literacy (KyCL) grant (also referred to as the Striving Readers grant), which includes required professional learning hours through the Kentucky Writing Project, a grant with Partners for Rural Impact (PRI) and a Byrne safety grant that helped update safety features at the high school. Additionally, various training opportunities have been provided to teachers, including participation in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics HQIR training, Vibrant Learning training in collaboration with the University of Kentucky, ethics training through Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (KEDC), "Gold Standard PBL" training and mental health professional learning. Additionally, the district also used funds to support Menifee County High School by creating a dean of students position to strengthen relationships and support restorative practices. Additional support services for Menifee County High School include a full-time nurse, a school resource officer, a Pathways therapist and access to Community Family Clinic. While the district is to be commended for seeking multiple opportunities for professional learning and grant assistance to benefit students, the team found a lack of coherence and alignment of grants and programs.

Interviews revealed a strong commitment to the district's vision, mission and core values. Evidence provided by the district demonstrated that these themes serve as guideposts. District leaders noted a culture of mutual support and collaboration. School board members expressed confidence in the district's leadership. A review of artifacts and stakeholder interviews indicated that the district's core beliefs are central to its culture.



Interview data highlight a renewed focus on collaboration between K-12 building leadership and the district, as evidenced by regularly scheduled meetings with school leaders. Central Office Leadership Accountability (COLA) meetings address and monitor multiple school and district-wide initiatives. Additionally, these meetings provide an opportunity for district and school leadership to discuss and monitor building-level initiatives. Interviews and artifacts identify the need for a systematic process to track the implementation of district initiatives and monitor actionable goals.

The 2025-2026 comprehensive district improvement plan (CDIP) addresses the district's long- and short-term goals. A needs assessment was conducted, and the "2025/2026 Student Voice for CDIP Signed Agenda" and "2025 CDIP Planning Committee Working Session Slides" demonstrated that multiple stakeholder groups had the opportunity to provide input on the CDIP's development. Interviews confirmed that data aligned with the CDIP goals are reviewed and discussed by district personnel at most board meetings, as evidenced by the board meeting agendas provided to the team.

According to the CDIP, three- to five-year goals were established in reading and math to meet or exceed the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) projected proficiency levels. Additionally, objectives to close the achievement gap focus on students with disabilities (SWD) and aim to raise student performance by three percentage points in reading and three percentage points in math, as measured by the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA). According to interview data, a key success factor in these efforts was the adoption and implementation of an HQIR in core subject areas. Interviews revealed that district and school leadership have identified the use of HQIRs as a common instructional expectation, but stakeholders reported that HQIRs across both schools were partially and inconsistently coherent and aligned. Most stakeholders spoke of plans to renew stalled systems, but the team found little evidence of implementation.

Interviews with district leaders and a review of the "2025–2026 Comprehensive District Improvement Plan" revealed a strategic shift toward 'the basics' by prioritizing Key Core Work Processes (KCWP) 1, 2 and 5 for both reading and mathematics. Unlike the 2024-2025 plan, which focused on local accountability, teacher induction, and Deeper Learning, the current iteration streamlines activities across both content areas. This approach emphasizes curriculum-based professional learning, the KDE unit internalization process and the use of HQIR-aligned walkthroughs and assessments to monitor classroom delivery. The realignment supports the establishment of foundational strategies to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction and implement real-time adjustments to address gaps between instruction and student achievement.



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

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.1	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	93%	7%	0%	0%
A2	2.1	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	7%	71%	21%	0%
A3	2.3	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	7%	57%	36%	0%
A4	1.6	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.	43%	50%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.8				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.6	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	36%	64%	0%	0%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	7%	86%	7%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	50%	50%	0%	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).	14%	86%	0%	0%
B5	2.0	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	14%	71%	14%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.8				

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.2	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	14%	50%	36%	0%
C2	1.9	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	21%	64%	14%	0%
C3	2.4	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	71%	21%	7%
C4	2.4	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	14%	43%	36%	7%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.2				

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.1	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	7%	71%	21%	0%
D2	2.1	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	36%	29%	29%	7%
D3	2.1	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	7%	71%	21%	0%
D4	2.1	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	14%	64%	21%	0%
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	1.3	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	71%	29%	0%	0%
E2	2.0	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	14%	71%	14%	0%
E3	2.1	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	7%	71%	21%	0%
E4	1.5	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	64%	21%	14%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.7				



F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.5	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	7%	43%	43%	7%
F2	2.5	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	7%	36%	57%	0%
F3	1.8	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	43%	43%	7%	7%
F4	2.0	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	21%	57%	21%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.2				

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.9	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	50%	14%	29%	7%
G2	1.6	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	57%	21%	21%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.5				

eleot Narrative

For the last eight years, the district has used the eleot to conduct district walkthroughs. Stakeholder interview data indicate that the eleot walkthroughs conducted by the district resulted in high ratings across all learning environments, except for the Digital Learning Environment. Stakeholders further reported that these ratings were a concern, as the scores did not align with student performance data. Additionally, these district ratings did not align with the school's Diagnostic Review Team ratings. Interview data revealed that district stakeholders identified a need to recalibrate the use of the eleot through additional training. Interviews and document reviews showed that specific environments and indicators have been identified as district priorities. However, data has

been inconsistently used to inform classroom- and student-level instructional decisions. The district has focused on the Equitable Learning Environment, specifically “Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)”, which was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms. Student survey data supported observational data as 72% of students chose “do the same work as everyone else,” and 66% chose “listen to teachers talk” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” The team supports the district’s desire to focus on differentiated instruction, which would provide data on the implementation of Tier 1 core instruction and the multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS).

The observational data also revealed that it was evident/very evident in 57% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” In correlation with these indicators, observational data also revealed that it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” These data indicate a need for additional district-level guidance to ensure consistent instructional and behavioral expectations are implemented schoolwide.

Leadership interviews also raised concerns about the expectations set for students and whether there’s a true belief that all students can reach high levels of achievement. Several interviewees said the high-quality instructional resources (HQIR) felt too demanding and did not always align with students’ actual needs. Levels of rigor and expectations can be assessed by looking at the data from the High Expectations Learning Environment. The overall rating for this learning environment was 1.8 on a 4-point scale. More specifically, it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” and it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” Additionally, 46% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution we uphold high expectations for learning (12).” The district can foster higher expectations for students by supporting school leaders in intentionally planning and implementing the rigor embedded in the HQIR.

Interviews often emphasized the importance of students taking ownership of their learning. However, the team observed little evidence of this in classroom observations. For example, it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Survey data identified 66% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they use “a variety of information to determine learners’ progress (20).” In addition, it was evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2).”

While the district has long utilized the eleot® tool, the significant discrepancy between internal ratings and independent observational data underscores a critical need for systemic recalibration. The team recommends that the district use these findings to strengthen instructional support and school-improvement initiatives.



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

Create a system to track and evaluate the impact of district strategies (e.g., HQIR implementation, MTSS, Tier 1 instruction) so district and school leaders can make timely, informed adjustments to ensure planned goals translate into actual student achievement.

Standard 26: Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.

Findings:

For the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of students in grades 8, 10 and 11 who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA was below the state average in all subject areas. In addition, the percentage of students meeting the ACT benchmark was below the state average in English, reading and math in 2024-2025.

Multiple stakeholder interviews suggest that the adoption and implementation of the HQIRs at the high school lacks consistency. The “24/25 PD Plan with Active Shooter” and “Ethics Training on Agenda” supported interview data indicating that basic training on HQIRs has been provided to instructional staff. Stakeholder interviews revealed that the district expects the HQIR to be used, but implementation has been inconsistent. High school leadership is revamping a unit internalization process to help ensure that teachers understand how to unpack the HQIR for daily instructional use. Interviews with district and school leadership highlight a commitment to strengthening core instruction by leveraging PLC meetings to build the “why” behind the HQIR, especially in English language arts and math. This shift is reflected in the 2025-2026 CDIP and illuminates the district’s dedication to continuous improvement.

Stakeholder interviews, artifact reviews and the superintendent’s overview presentation also highlighted the district’s efforts to obtain grant funding to establish district initiatives outside of HQIR implementation. During the 2024-2025 school year, staff members participated in 24 hours of professional learning through the Kentucky Writing Project (KWP) to enhance writing as a required component of one grant. While this initiative did not appear to immediately align with activities and strategies in the CDIP, interviews indicated that writing is a barrier to student achievement on assessments in the Odell Education High School Literacy Program. Furthermore, some stakeholders noted that the district relies on grant funding to offset the financial burden of training. The team noted that at times, grant funding did not directly align with the goals in the CDIP. This reliance on external funding highlights the need for a framework that validates the effectiveness of all initiatives, ensuring that the time educators spend in professional learning is an investment that directly advances the district’s planned goals for student success.

Interviews revealed a focus on college and career readiness initiatives during the 2024-2025 school year, including opportunities for high school students to engage in pathways, work experience and dual credit classes that enable students to earn an associate’s degree concurrently with their high school diploma. These partnerships have increased the percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness standards. However, stakeholder perception data and interviews revealed a discrepancy between the academic rigor expected in instruction and the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS). Survey data revealed 72% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults have high expectations for learning (10)”, and 46% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12).” Additionally, observational data revealed it



was evident/very evident in 0% 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).” District and board member interviews confirmed observational and survey data, indicating a need for more challenging, rigorous academic opportunities for students.

Interview data indicate that while many students excelled in the post-secondary opportunities provided, some were enrolled in these pathways without the necessary academic support. Leadership reported that MTSS existed at all levels to address gaps in learning; however, the team found limited evidence of a systemic process to ensure these tiers were implemented consistently. While individual data trackers were described as the primary tool for monitoring progress, specifically for the 8th-grade transition, artifact reviews suggest they are not consistently updated across all grade levels. Additionally, observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).

These inconsistencies in MTSS were evident at the high school, where district leadership shared that the PLC structure is currently in transition. Interviews revealed that over the last year, PLC meetings have been ineffective, with most meetings focusing on administrative tasks. Stakeholders expressed confidence that PLCs are now moving in the right direction, as the new principal is focused on renewing a data-centered PLC. Professional learning is still needed to improve secondary staff’s understanding of the MTSS framework, demonstrating that the district’s focus on continuous improvement has yet to yield a documented, monitored system of instructional support.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish a formal monitoring schedule and reporting protocol for district-wide initiatives (e.g., HQIR, MTSS, Tier 1) to evaluate implementation consistency and fidelity across all buildings.
- Implement and monitor a coherent observation and feedback framework (e.g., HQIR-aligned walkthroughs) to determine whether support for teachers is translating into improved instructional practices.
- Implement a systematic review cycle to evaluate the alignment of grants and professional learning with the CDIP, providing a framework for regularly assessing external funding against district goals.
- Regularly implement a standardized evaluation process that utilizes student achievement data to continually assess program effectiveness, ensuring that decisions to sustain, adjust or discontinue initiatives are part of a cycle of continuous improvement.

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.



District Capacity in Diagnostic Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the functioning and capacity of the district to determine its ability to manage an intervention in each school identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI). As outlined in 703 KAR 5:280, Section 4, the determination of the district's level of functioning and ability is based on an assessment of capacity in the following areas:

- The district demonstrates maintenance and communication of a visionary purpose and direction committed to high expectations for learning as well as shared values and beliefs about teaching and learning;
- The district leads and operates under a governance and leadership style that promotes and supports student performance and system effectiveness;
- The district establishes a data-driven system for curriculum, instructional design, and delivery, ensuring both teacher effectiveness and student achievement;
- The district ensures that systems are in place for accurate collection and use of data;
- The district ensures that systems are in place to allocate human and fiscal resources to support improvement and ensure success for all students; and
- The district ensures that a comprehensive assessment system, which generates a range of data about student learning and system effectiveness and uses the results to guide continuous improvement, is implemented.

Following its review of extensive evidence and in consideration of the factors outlined above, the Diagnostic Review Team submitted the following assessment regarding the district's capacity to the Commissioner of Education:

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district has the capacity to manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district requires intensive support in order to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district does not have the capacity to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the Menifee County district has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school, Menifee County High School.

The district has demonstrated the ability to lead and support a visionary purpose for teaching and learning. This was evident through the artifact review, the institution leader's presentation and the stakeholder interviews. The district articulates a vision and mission, which are visible throughout the institution, on various communication examples and recited at each board meeting. Additionally, district and school leadership regularly calibrate through principal and district leadership Tier 1 meetings, both scheduled and informal. Stakeholders agreed on PLC inconsistencies, especially at the high school level; however, many stakeholders noted an anticipated positive shift in PLC implementation with new leadership.

The district leads and operates under a governance and leadership style that promotes and supports student performance and system effectiveness. Kentucky School Board Association (KSBA) policies were listed in the uploaded evidence. Additionally, some board meeting agendas were available. Stakeholders consistently shared



a student-centered decision-making process. Board members articulated trust in a shared vision and governance process.

The district establishes a data-driven system for curriculum, instructional design and delivery, ensuring both teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Multiple stakeholders referred to data shared during COLA, Tier 1 meetings, Student Intervention Team (SIT) and PLCs; however, most stakeholders agreed on a need for stronger PLC fidelity, especially at the high school level. Board members noted some regular student data sharing occurs during board meetings. Some stakeholders mentioned an MTSS process; however, most stakeholders reported that tiered instruction and intervention were needed at the high school level. Most stakeholders noted the training for and use of the HQIRs was not consistent with the district's instructional vision.

The district creates systems for accurate collection and use of data. Stakeholders demonstrated a commitment to regular instructional data collection and feedback using the eleot tool, noting eight years of collected eleot data. However, stakeholders also noted inflated results offered a skewed perception compared to student performance results and are planning recalibration with the KDE Educational Recovery (ER) staff. Other noted data sources were i-Ready Assessment Suite, formative and summative assessment data, behavior data and KSA data. However, the extent to which data was used in a systematic process to change instructional practices at all levels was not immediately evident.

The district ensures that systems are in place to allocate human and fiscal resources, which were evident in evidence and artifact review, stakeholder interviews, and the institution leader's presentation. A vision for all facilities to be centrally located was articulated. Additionally, the district's nickel tax helps foster facility upgrades and renovations. District leadership has demonstrated stability in their positions. Stakeholders also referred to many grants, partnerships and programs, but a process for monitoring and ensuring alignment between these and the instructional vision, mission, beliefs and values was not clear and could be a growth area.

Finally, based on artifacts and interviews, the district has continued to revise a balanced assessment system with the goal of using results to guide continuous improvement. Stakeholders referred to a balanced assessment system in the district. Teachers use HQIR assessment formatively, and KSA-like assessments summatively. Currently, the high school does not use a universal screener.



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
William Gordon	William Gordon (Bill) has over 40 years of experience as a teacher, principal, area superintendent, chief operations officer and lecturer in K-20 public education in Florida. He is currently serving as an associate lecturer in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Central Florida (UCF). In this position, he teaches both face-to-face and online courses in educational law, educational finance, systems and organizational leadership, politics and governance and educational leadership to master's and doctoral degree-seeking students. He is a member of the 3rd Education Class of Leadership Florida, the state's most respected nonpartisan convener of leaders on critical issues facing Florida's future.
Tom Stewart	Tom Stewart has 30 years of experience in Kentucky public education. He has taught at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Additionally, he has four years of experience in school district administration, serving as instructional supervisor, district assessment coordinator, teacher quality and professional learning coordinator and personnel director. Also, he has served as an assistant professor of teacher education and an associate professor of educational administration, research and leadership. Tom is currently an Educational Recovery Director (ERD) for the KDE.
Charlotte L. Jones	Charlotte L. Jones has over 28 years of experience in education, including 12 years with KDE as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL), supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching high school social studies and serving as gifted/talented coordinator, building assessment coordinator and vice chair of the school-based decision-making council. She is a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) and Jim Shipley & Associates in School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence and Classroom Continuous Improvement. Charlotte has presented at state and national conferences on successful continuous improvement practices in schools.
Kathy House	Kathy House has 31 years of experience in public education. She has taught at the elementary, middle and high school levels as both a special education teacher and an instructional coach. She also has six years of school administrative experience, having served as a middle school assistant principal and principal. Additionally, she spent seven years as chief academic officer for a school district, where her responsibilities included serving as human resource director, gifted and talented coordinator, instructional supervisor, professional learning coordinator and interim director of special education. Kathy currently serves as affiliate faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership, Evaluation and Organizational Development at the University of Louisville and as the chief of educator success for the Ohio Valley Educational Cooperative.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed Trend and current data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	2
8. The governing authority demonstrates a commitment to learners by collaborating with leaders to uphold the institution's priorities and to drive continuous improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate minimal commitment to learners and rarely support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders seldom collaborate on the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate some commitment to learners and sometimes support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to focus the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions demonstrate a commitment to learners and support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to collaboratively further the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions are regularly reviewed to ensure an uncompromised commitment to learners and the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to consistently and intentionally collaborate to further the institution's improvement.	3

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
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
10. Leaders demonstrate expertise in recruiting, supervising, and evaluating professional staff members to optimize learning.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members without consideration of contribution to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders rarely use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders seldom supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders sometimes use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders routinely use data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders regularly implement practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	Leaders intentionally and consistently identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders consistently use analyzed data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders implement and monitor documented practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	2
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	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
15. Learners' needs drive the equitable allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources.	Professional staff members rarely analyze learners' needs and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources. Resources are rarely allocated in alignment with documented learners' needs or to ensure equity for learning.	Professional staff members sometimes analyze learners' needs, current, and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are sometimes based on current or updated data.	Professional staff members routinely analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are routinely based on current data and at predetermined points in time.	Professional staff members engage in a systematic process to analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are consistently based on current data at any point in time.	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.	2
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	2

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	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.	2
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.	2
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	2

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
8th-Grade Reading	N/A	44	N/A	41	31	42
8th-Grade Math	N/A	36	N/A	37	21	40
8th-Grade Social Studies	N/A	35	N/A	35	23	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	N/A	49	N/A	47	34	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	N/A	45	N/A	49	23	49
10th-Grade Reading	39	46	53	46	37	47
10th-Grade Math	21	34	40	36	30	41
11th-Grade Science	*	11	*	6	*	22
11th-Grade Social Studies	24	38	27	38	27	38
11th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	40	45	42	45	30	41
11th-Grade On Demand Writing	26	42	44	43	17	45

Plus

- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 14 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by 19 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased by three percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased by two percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in writing on demand increased by 18 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

Delta

- According to the 2024-2025 KSA, 8th-grade students scored significantly lower in all content areas compared to the state average.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 16 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined by 10 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics declined by 10 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing declined by 27 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.



Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

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

High School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	*	64	*	62	*	59
Percent Score of 60-80	*	26	*	26	*	27
Percent Score of 100	*	8	*	9	*	11
Percent Score of 140	*	2	*	3	*	3



Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmarks on the ACT

Content Area	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
English	20	47	33	44	31	44
Reading	25	44	28	42	36	41
Math	8	33	17	30	14	30

Plus

- The percentage of students meeting English benchmarks on the ACT increased by 11 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting reading benchmarks on the ACT increased each year from 25% in 2022-2023 to 36% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting math benchmarks on the ACT increased nine percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of students meeting benchmarks on the ACT fell below the state average in all areas.



Graduation Rate

Year	School Four-Year	State Four-Year	School Five-Year	State Five-Year
2022-2023	89	91.4	89.9	92.5
2023-2024	94.1	92.3	94.2	93.4
2024-2025	96.2	93.5	96.1	94.2

Plus

- The school's four-year graduation rate increased each year from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The school's four-year graduation rate was above the state average for both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The school's five-year graduation rate increased each year from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The school's five-year graduation rate was above the state average for both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Delta

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



Post-Secondary Readiness

Year	School	State	School w/ High Demand	State w/ High Demand
2022-2023	73.1	79.1	80.6	83.5
2023-2024	82	81	89	86
2024-2025	93.3	83	97	88.8

Plus

- The percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness increased each year from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness with high demand increased each year from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness was above the state average for both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness with high demand was above the state average for both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness was below the state average in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness with high demand was below the state average in 2022-2023.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	N/A	N/A	31
Female	N/A	N/A	41
Male	N/A	N/A	22
White	N/A	N/A	31
African American	N/A	N/A	*
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	*
Asian	N/A	N/A	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	*
Two or More Races	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners plus Monitored	N/A	N/A	*
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	24
Students with Disabilities with IEP	N/A	N/A	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 10 percentage points higher than all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was nine percentage points lower than all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 19 percentage points lower than female students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was seven percentage points lower than all students in 2024-2025.

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

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

Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was five percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	N/A	N/A	23
Female	N/A	N/A	24
Male	N/A	N/A	22
White	N/A	N/A	22
African American	N/A	N/A	*
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	*
Asian	N/A	N/A	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	*
Two or More Races	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners plus Monitored	N/A	N/A	*
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	N/A	N/A	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was two percentage points lower than that of female students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was below that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 13 percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	N/A	N/A	34
Female	N/A	N/A	47
Male	N/A	N/A	22
White	N/A	N/A	32
African American	N/A	N/A	*
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	*
Asian	N/A	N/A	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	*
Two or More Races	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners plus Monitored	N/A	N/A	*
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	27
Students with Disabilities with IEP	N/A	N/A	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA was 13 percentage points higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 12 percentage points below that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 25 percentage points below that of female students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was seven percentage points below that of all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	N/A	N/A	23
Female	N/A	N/A	41
Male	N/A	N/A	*
White	N/A	N/A	22
African American	N/A	N/A	*
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	*
Asian	N/A	N/A	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	*
Two or More Races	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners	N/A	N/A	*
English Learners plus Monitored	N/A	N/A	*
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	N/A	N/A	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 18 percentage points higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade white students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was below that of all students in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	39	53	37
Female	48	70	44
Male	29	40	27
White	39	53	37
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	46	35
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 10th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was seven percentage points higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 10 percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 17 percentage points lower than that of female students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was two percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 26 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 13 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade white students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 16 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined by 11 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	21	40	30
Female	*	48	27
Male	26	33	33
White	21	41	29
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	*	34	28
Students with Disabilities with IEP	20	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was three percentage points higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by seven percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 10th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was three percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was six percentage points lower than that of male students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was two percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 21 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 12 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 10th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by six percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.



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

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

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	24	27	27
Female	*	29	30
Male	26	25	24
White	24	28	28
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	*	18	23
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	17

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was three percentage points higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased by five percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was three percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was six percentage points lower than that of female students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was four percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students with disabilities with an IEP scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 10 percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	40	42	30
Female	*	48	42
Male	26	36	19
White	41	45	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	37	35	23
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 12 percentage points higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 11th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 11 percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was seven points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics has consistently decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	26	44	17
Female	32	55	30
Male	*	31	*
White	26	47	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	24	38	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 13 percentage points higher than that of all students in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The scores for 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased by 27 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased by 25 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased by 29 percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 2, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
2 p.m. – 3 p.m.	Superintendent Presentation	District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, Feb. 3, 2026

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

Wednesday, Feb. 4, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 5, 2026

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

