Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:

Menifee County High School

Feb. 2-5, 2026

cognia™

Table of Contents

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	4
Certified Staff	14
Noncertified Staff	2
Students	8
Parents	6
Total	38

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:

The Diagnostic Review Team identified the school's cohesive community as a positive attribute, as reflected in stakeholder surveys and interviews. Teachers, parents and students value the relationships they have with one another. Stakeholder perception data supported interview data as 82% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcome (1)", and 85% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Additionally, 88% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." Stakeholder interviews also revealed that teachers consistently identify the student body, the safe campus environment and the strong sense of belonging as the best aspects of their school. The school creates opportunities for their students to interact with the community through organizations such as Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG) and the FFA.

Interviews and student performance data revealed that a strength of the school is its robust commitment to post-secondary readiness. The percentage of students meeting post-secondary readiness and post-secondary readiness with high demand was above the state average in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025. In addition, the school's four-year graduation rate has increased each year from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. The 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 four-year graduation rates also exceeded the state average. While the school has celebrated secondary readiness, graduation rates and success in athletics and student organizations, the principal identified a need to elevate the school's priority to include a focus on academic excellence.

The school's mission statement is "We are Menifee; Where we ensure every student transitions on a pathway to a successful future in academia, military, or career." To support this mission, the school provides diverse curricular, co-curricular and athletic programs. Students have access to dual-credit courses through partnerships with the University of Kentucky Dual Credit Partnership and Maysville Community Technical College. The school fosters student connection and career readiness by offering work-based learning opportunities with Gateway and Partners for Rural Impact, alongside community-centered programs like FFA and JAG. Although there are many opportunities for students to become involved, stakeholders noted a significant curricular deficit in foreign language and the visual or performing arts, highlighting these as areas for future development to meet comprehensive student needs.

Since assuming her role on Dec. 15, 2025, the principal prioritized completing the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) to meet the submission deadline. The principal's overview presentation and stakeholder interviews indicated an emphasis on continuous improvement. Stakeholders highlighted strategies that the principal prioritized during her first few weeks at the school, which include meeting with stakeholders to gain feedback, observing professional learning communities (PLC) meetings, reviewing schoolwide data and working with the current administrative team (i.e., assistant principal, dean of students, counselor) and district leadership. This feedback resulted in the CSIP objectives, which aim to increase achievement in math and reading for economically disadvantaged students and for students with disabilities, as measured by the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA). The CSIP also includes three- to five-year goals to increase the number of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading and math.

There is an identified need for enhanced instructional coaching and feedback for certified staff. Interview data revealed that, although her tenure has been short, the principal has attended PLC meetings and continues to

gather feedback from staff. In addition, interviews, artifacts and the overview presentation revealed that the principal and assistant principal have completed 30 walkthroughs in the two months since becoming principal. Interview data indicated that educators received feedback from these walkthroughs. The principal expressed a desire to increase the frequency of walkthroughs and depth of feedback. The team identified a need for ongoing coaching and follow-up support for teachers.

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

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 14 formal observations in core content classrooms using the eleot. In addition, the team also conducted informal observations in common areas and non-core classrooms throughout the school. The observational data revealed that the Well-Managed Classroom Learning Environment was the highest-performing learning environment. While this remains an area for improvement rather than an established strength, "Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)" was evident/very evident in 57% of classrooms. Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)." Stakeholder interviews suggest that the recent integration of 8th-grade students correlates with increased

behavioral challenges. There was little evidence of a plan or strategy to prepare students or teachers for this new grade configuration. Additionally, there was limited evidence to support the systematic teaching or reteaching of behavior expectations.

While stakeholder interviews identified the school as having a highly cohesive environment, observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)" and 43% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults take time to get to know me (4)." Student interviews highlight the principal's efforts to incorporate activities that engage students in the school environment and support community among students, as it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1)."

Observational data indicate a critical deficiency in instructional rigor and student cognitive engagement. Notably, 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)." The team identified a significant correlation between this absence of rigor and low levels of active participation, as it was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." Additionally, making connections to real-life experiences can also increase the engagement and rigor in the learning environment, but it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that "learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)."

The team also identified areas for growth in the High Expectations Learning Environment. Observational data revealed that 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)," it was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)" and it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning (G3)." Strengthening shared expectations is essential to promoting a collaborative, problem-solving learning environment.

The team's analysis of instructional data revealed a significant correlation between the High Expectations and Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environments. Specifically, the data highlight that effective feedback loops would help students achieve and maintain high-quality standards; however, current classroom performance in these areas is limited as it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)" and 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)." Furthermore, a critical link exists between self-direction and self-monitoring as it was evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms that "learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5)" and it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)."

The team identified a notable discrepancy between classroom observations and student perception surveys in the Equitable Learning Environment. While 67% of students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement "the adults treat us with respect (2)", observational data indicate that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)" is evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms. Additionally, the team observed that instruction was primarily whole-group and teacher-directed. It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Again, student survey data corroborated 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)"

Stakeholder groups commended the new principal's commitment to student welfare and educational climate. To build on this momentum, the team recommends utilizing this leadership transition to enhance academic rigor and refine instructional frameworks. By formalizing continuous improvement cycles, specifically through actionable

feedback loops and systematic monitoring of student progress, leadership can reconcile the disparity between the school's positive social climate and the imperative for a more challenging, autonomous and high-performing academic culture.

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

Refine the current PLC structure to include a formal data protocol that requires identifying needs and planning for timely reteaching during core instruction and supplemental instruction during a designated period to address foundational gaps in student performance.

Standard 27: Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.

Findings:

While some grade levels demonstrated an increase in the number of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024, the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished remained the same or decreased for all grade levels from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025. Additionally, the percentage of students who scored Proficient/Distinguished was lower than the state averages for all grade levels and content areas in 2024-2025. Although the school has surpassed the state average in graduation rate and post-secondary readiness metrics, as previously noted, academic readiness remains a concern.

The principal has prioritized participation in PLC meetings. Stakeholder interviews, documents and artifacts revealed that weekly PLC meetings take place and teachers are expected to bring data to these meetings. The "PLC Data Tracker 2025-2026" included data analysis procedures; however, the procedures were inconsistently applied across content areas. In addition, while a part of the "PLC Data Tracker 2025-2026" includes a section titled "Shift", it is not explicit as to how reteaching and content will be delivered so that the identified students' learning needs are met. Additionally, observational data indicate 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 findings underscore an immediate necessity to formalize data-driven protocols. By refining the process for assessing student performance, teachers can better coordinate responsive, targeted reteaching strategies.

Survey data supported interview and observational data as 55% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had support when I needed it (18)", and 42% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Additionally, 59% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests, and potential (8)." These findings align with student performance data and stakeholder interviews that highlight a disconnect between how students score on formative assessments and their overall performance on the KSA. Families observed this disconnect, as 63% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child received support based on their needs (21)."

While production days were established to foster community and provide remediation, data from stakeholder interviews suggest a disconnect between intent and implementation. Rather than addressing foundational academic deficits, these sessions are often used to complete overdue assignments or long-term projects. At this time, the school has had two production days; the principal shared that she plans to implement one production day each month for the remainder of the school year. The school is encouraged to refine its master schedule to better support intervention and to use assessment data to identify and address foundational learning gaps during

---

these periods. This will help ensure a highly responsive environment that directly meets each student's diverse academic needs.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Create a formal data protocol that regularly analyzes formative data.

- Implement the created data protocol during PLC meetings.

- Use PLC meetings to identify the need for reteaching or acceleration during instruction.

- Evaluate the master schedule to ensure time is allotted frequently to address foundational gaps in student learning.

Improvement Priority 2

Communicate and implement common instructional expectations (i.e., "Teacher Look-Fors [Anchored to Student Expectations]"). Consistently monitor the implementation of these expectations to ensure teachers receive timely, actionable feedback and coaching to support and improve instruction.

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

Findings:

The 2024-2025 KSA data reveal that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished is below the state averages in all grades and content areas; similarly, the percentage of students meeting benchmark on the ACT in English, reading, and math was below the state average in 2024-2025. Stakeholder interviews indicated that students may earn dual credits and become college-ready; however, many are unable to score at a proficient level on state and national assessments or pass placement tests from area colleges. This identifies a disconnect between the school's instructional curriculum and the expectations of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) and national assessments.

The principal overview presentation indicated that the administrative team collaborated with teachers to identify common classroom expectations for students. As a result, the "MCHS Student Classroom Expectations" document was created. To support teachers in implementing these student expectations, the "Teacher Look-Fors (Anchored to Student Expectations)" were created. At this time, the "Teacher Look-Fors (Anchored to Student Expectations)" document had not yet been shared with teachers. The "Teacher Look-Fors (Anchored to Student Expectations)" identified instructional strategies that, when delivered with the high-quality instructional resource (HQIR), would support high expectations for learning. It will be essential that the administrative team provide explicit professional learning to support teachers in implementing and understanding these identified look-fors.

Survey data supported the need for increased expectations for students, as 46% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)", and 50% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)." Observational data corroborated survey data as it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that learners both "strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teachers (B1)" and "engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)."

Additionally, stakeholder interviews confirmed that while administrative walkthroughs are conducted, the resulting feedback remains inconsistent in both frequency and application. Furthermore, there is a systemic lack of follow-up coaching to help teachers refine their practices based on observational data. To improve in these areas, the Diagnostic Review Team recommends developing a formalized walkthrough instrument aligned with the "Teacher Look-Fors." Implementing this tool will facilitate the delivery of timely, actionable feedback and should be paired with professional development to foster a culture of continuous instructional improvement.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Communicate the created "Teacher Look Fors (Anchored to Student Expectations)."

- Provide professional learning to support teachers in implementing these strategies during Tier 1 instruction.

- Establish a walkthrough form based on the "Teacher Look Fors" to provide teachers with timely, actionable feedback.

- Follow up with teachers based on walkthrough feedback to provide targeted coaching support.

Your Next Steps

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

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

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.

- Develop plans to address the Improvement Priorities identified by the Diagnostic Review Team.

- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.

- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

☐ The team has chosen not to reflect on the principal's capacity to lead the school's turnaround efforts.

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

☐ It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

☐ It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school and should be reassigned to a comparable position in the district.

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

While the principal moved from her previous school to Menifee County High School in December, stakeholder interviews reveal she is consistently visible throughout the building and has already improved communication, as well as created a culture of collaboration with staff. Prior to stepping into the role as principal at the high school, the principal developed a 30-60-90 day plan to delineate the steps needed to support the turnaround and improve outcomes for all stakeholders. According to interviews and a review of the provided evidence, "Teacher Meeting and KCWP & CSIP Feedback," the principal immediately met with staff to identify the strengths and opportunities for growth within the school and used that information to build the CSIP. In addition, interviews and a review of evidence demonstrate that she has regularly sought stakeholder feedback to make the school more effective for all.

While HQIRs were selected for English, math and science, many stakeholders report a lack of commitment to their consistent use within instruction. The principal has expressed a desire to include high school teachers in developing a mission and vision for instruction. This will be an important step as she prepares the staff for improvement and instills mutual commitment and accountability. The principal will need to communicate and provide professional learning, feedback and coaching around clear expectations for high quality, student-centered instructional practices.

The principal and/or members of the administrative team attend or facilitate PLCs, which meet each Wednesday and include some data analysis and embedded professional learning. Data analysis may include formative or benchmark assessments; however, the depth of the analysis and clear next steps are inconsistent, and there is limited monitoring for implementation of those next steps. The principal should ensure PLC meetings include a

clear protocol for ongoing analysis of student performance data, resulting in actionable next steps for interventions and student supports.

The principal is well respected by stakeholders and has established a positive working relationship with central office staff, the administrative team and her professional support staff. In addition, the principal has spoken of her unwavering dedication to the community and her sense of urgency about the turnaround work at Menifee County High School. This commitment will help the principal continue to leverage her support from the school and community for ongoing continuous improvement.

Team Roster

The Engagement Review Team is a group of professionals with varied backgrounds and professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Diagnostic Review Team members complete Cognia training and eleot 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
Teresa Poole	Teresa A. Poole has 25 years of experience in K-12 education, having served as a science teacher, high school assistant principal, elementary principal, director of curriculum and associate superintendent. She currently serves as the dean of the school of education and an associate professor at a private university.
Jennifer Wilt	Jennifer Wilt has 31 years of experience as an educator in public schools. She has served as a high school associate principal, middle school principal, instructional coach and high school teacher. She is currently an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), where she supports schools in aligning curriculum, instruction and assessment with state standards and coaches leaders on continuous improvement processes related to the development and refinement of systems.
Nick Pannell	Nick Pannell has more than 22 years of experience in public education. He has served as a high school teacher, assistant principal and principal. He currently serves as an ERL liaison with KDE in the Office of Continuous Improvement and Support, where he works to empower and equip educators to build sustainable systems for continuous improvement focused on student learning.
Tanya Jury	Tanya Jury currently serves as the director of high school curriculum, instruction and assessment and as the English as a second language director. She has more than 20 years of experience in education, having held positions as a teacher, instructional coach, assistant principal and principal at both the middle and high school levels.

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.	1

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

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.	1

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	3
25. Leaders promote action research by professional staff members to improve their practice and advance learning.	Leaders rarely create a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution or learning environments. Professional staff members seldom engage in action research to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in few or no learning opportunities for professional staff members about action research.	Leaders occasionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, sometimes engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in some learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders regularly create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, routinely engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders intentionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, consistently engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities customized for professional staff members about action research.	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.	1
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	2
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	1
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	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 3 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased by 2 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 ten percentage points from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 11th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics declined by ten 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 in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Graduation Rate

Year	School Four-Year	State Four-Year	School Five-Year	State Five-Year
2022-2023	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 that of all students in 2024-2025.

Delta
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was nine percentage points lower than that of all students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 19 percentage points lower than that of female students in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was seven percentage points lower than that of 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 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 2023-3034 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 2023-3034 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 all 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
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, Feb. 3, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Interviews / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3:30 p.m. – 4:30 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 and Virtual Interviews	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