



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Milton Elementary School**

March 2-5, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation2
 - Insights from the Review3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....6**
 - eleot Narrative9
- Improvement Priorities12**
 - Improvement Priority 112
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....13
 - Improvement Priority 214
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....14
 - Your Next Steps15
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review16**
- Team Roster18**
- Appendix19**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings19
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning19
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning21
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning23
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning25
 - Student Performance Data.....28
 - Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress30**
 - Schedule43

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	1
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	8
Certified Staff	6
Noncertified Staff	6
Students	28
Parents	8
Total	58

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 found that Milton Elementary School has demonstrated a measurable and observable shift in school culture that is contributing to emerging improvements in conditions for teaching and learning. Stakeholder perception data reflect increased confidence in leadership, stronger staff collaboration and improved student engagement.

According to surveys, 95% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my school, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)", indicating growth in staff perceptions of collaborative culture and shared responsibility. Additionally, 2025-2026 Kentucky IMPACT Working Conditions Survey (IMPACT) results show that staff satisfaction with school leadership increased from 20% to 97% from 2023 to 2025, and school climate increased from 39% to 93% over the same period. These data further reinforce the positive trajectory in climate and leadership effectiveness.

Interviews with teachers and staff consistently reflected a shared belief that expectations for professionalism, accountability and student support have strengthened over the past two years. Stakeholders described an increased sense of collegiality and a family-like atmosphere grounded in mutual respect and a shared commitment to student success. Students remarked that they feel safe and that there are numerous adults in the building whom they trust if they have a problem or need someone to talk to.

Classroom observational data indicated that students demonstrate appropriate behavior, respect for peers and responsiveness to teacher direction. In 71% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)." These findings suggest that the cultural shift is not only perceptual but also observable in classroom practice. This strengthened culture provides a stable foundation for sustained instructional growth and continuous improvement.

The school uses a network of community and organizational partnerships to improve both instructional capacity and student well-being (e.g., Ohio Valley Educational Cooperative [OVEC], Seven Counties, Mountain Comprehensive Care Center), as well as retired teachers who support new teachers and educators on certification pathways. Stakeholder perception indicates accessibility and effectiveness.

These partnerships seek to enhance educator effectiveness, reduce isolation among new teachers and provide students with critical social-emotional and mental health resources. Interview data indicate that staff perceive these partnerships as valuable, contributing to both retention and instructional consistency. This presence of structured external support reflects leadership's commitment to building capacity and sustaining improvement through collaborative networks.

The school has adjusted its response to intervention (RTI) program by increasing the frequency of meetings from once per semester to monthly review cycles. This shift demonstrates a move from reactive intervention toward proactive, ongoing student monitoring. The move to monthly RTI meetings to discuss the multi-tiered system of supports reflects the beginning of an embedded continuous improvement process that ensures students are identified and supported in a timely manner. Evidence (e.g., artifacts tracking students and the services they received, the principal's presentation about services for at-risk students, teacher interviews) also revealed that



additional supports are in place for students. Collectively, these findings reflect a school in active transition toward a more coherent, data-informed and student-centered RTI system.

During the 2023-2024 school year, the school engaged in a Two-Day Review conducted by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to identify targeted priorities for strengthening instructional practices and improving student outcomes. Two priorities for improvement were to refine the professional learning community (PLC) process and to align curriculum and instructional practices with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS). Since that time, the school has taken initial steps to address these priorities.

Weekly PLC meetings have been established for classroom teachers, and leadership reports that structures have been implemented to strengthen these meetings, including increased leadership presence, agendas and a more consistent focus on feedback and discussions. Additionally, the school has adopted high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) for reading and mathematics, signaling a commitment to improving instructional coherence and alignment to the KAS.

While these structures represent important progress, observations of PLC meetings, interviews and artifact review (e.g., PLC agendas, reflection notes) suggest that the implementation of these efforts remains in the initial stages. Teachers currently participate in PLC meetings alongside educators from the neighboring elementary school who teach similar grade levels or subjects. While this model was intended to support collaboration and shared learning, interviews with teachers indicate that differences in pacing, instructional approaches and school-specific needs have limited the extent to which these meetings support collaborative lesson planning or instructional decision-making that directly impacts classroom practice. Teachers consistently expressed a desire for additional opportunities to collaborate with colleagues (e.g., special education teachers, interventionists, gifted/talented teachers) within their own school context to internalize units, plan instruction and analyze student data together. A review of artifacts, including PLC agendas, provided limited evidence of collaborative lesson design or structured processes for analyzing student work and planning instructional adjustments. These patterns suggest that while PLC structures are in place, the conditions necessary for sustained collaborative planning and professional learning are still developing.

The school's adoption of HQIRs for reading and mathematics represents another positive step toward strengthening instructional coherence. However, evidence from classroom observations indicates that full implementation of these resources is still evolving. Progress-monitoring components are included within these instructional materials; however, teachers reported that many are still working to internalize the curriculum and determine how to effectively integrate it with existing resources. Several newer and non-certified teachers indicated that they would benefit from additional coaching, instructional guidance and structured planning time with colleagues to deepen their understanding of the curriculum and instructional expectations.

Classroom observations further indicated that lessons were frequently structured and orderly, yet opportunities for deeper student engagement, differentiation and ownership of learning were not consistently evident. For example, during team observations, it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners engaged in activities and learning that were challenging but attainable (B2)." While students were often compliant and participating in assigned tasks, the team found limited evidence that instruction consistently invited learners to question, explore, design or apply their learning in ways that foster sustained curiosity, collaboration or authentic problem-solving. Small group instruction, differentiation and problem-solving components included in HQIRs were rarely observed in classroom practices. Teacher interviews revealed a lack of training and coaching for implementing and optimizing resources to improve instruction.

The school has made notable progress in strengthening its culture and climate and has begun implementing PLC structures. The adoption of HQIRs represents meaningful, foundational efforts to improve instructional practices. As these structures continue to evolve, strengthening the focus and function of PLCs is critical. When strategically designed, PLCs can provide opportunities for educators to collaboratively internalize HQIR units, analyze student data, refine instructional strategies and design learning experiences that actively engage students through meaningful discourse, activation of prior knowledge and authentic problem-solving. Continued refinement of these



collaborative structures will support the school's next stage of growth as it moves beyond initial implementation of resources toward cultivating dynamic instructional practices that promote deeper cognitive engagement and improved student learning outcomes.



Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 17 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	1.5	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	65%	18%	18%	0%
A2	2.6	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	41%	59%	0%
A3	2.8	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	24%	76%	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.	65%	18%	12%	6%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.1				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.9	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	35%	41%	24%	0%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	24%	53%	24%	0%
B3	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	71%	24%	6%	0%
B4	1.8	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	35%	47%	18%	0%
B5	2.2	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	18%	41%	41%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.5	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	6%	35%	59%	0%
C2	2.2	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	18%	47%	35%	0%
C3	2.4	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	18%	29%	47%	6%
C4	2.7	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	35%	59%	6%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.7	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	41%	47%	12%	0%
D2	1.6	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	59%	24%	12%	6%
D3	2.3	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	6%	59%	35%	0%
D4	1.6	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	65%	18%	12%	6%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.8			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.8	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	47%	29%	24%	0%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	12%	47%	41%	0%
E3	1.9	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	24%	59%	18%	0%
E4	1.5	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	65%	24%	12%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.6	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	41%	59%	0%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	29%	65%	6%
F3	2.5	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	18%	23%	53%	6%
F4	2.5	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	6%	41%	53%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.6			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	76%	6%	12%	6%
G2	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	71%	12%	18%	0%
G3	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	76%	18%	6%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.4			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 17 classroom observations to gain insight into instructional practices and the learning environments. These observations provided meaningful insight into classroom culture, learner engagement, instructional delivery and formative assessment practices across the school. Across many classrooms, the team observed well-managed learning environments characterized by established routines and generally respectful interactions between teachers and learners. In some classrooms, students demonstrated an understanding of behavioral expectations and classrooms reflected structures that support orderly learning conditions. For example, it was evident/very evident in 71% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” However, it was

evident/very evident in 59% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teachers and each other (F1).” These patterns suggest that several classrooms provide predictable and structured environments that support a positive foundation for learning. Students discussed in interviews how they felt safe, as 85% of 3rd-, 4th- and 5th-grade students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make us feel safe (3)” and 91% of 6th-grade students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults make decisions to keep us safe (3).”

Observational patterns also reflected a somewhat supportive learning environment, in which learners appeared comfortable interacting with their teachers and peers. It was evident/very evident in 59% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1).” In addition, it was evident/very evident in 76% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” These data suggest that educators foster equitable and respectful environments in some classrooms. The team noted that norms were posted throughout the classrooms, in hallways and other common areas. It was apparent that students and adults treated each other with respect and care.

While classroom environments sometimes reflected conditions conducive to learning, instructional practices demonstrated greater variability across classrooms. Opportunities for learners to engage in rigorous learning experiences were not consistently evident. The High Expectations Learning Environment earned an overall average rating of 1.9 on a 4-point scale, which suggests a lack of advanced cognitive demand in instruction. For example, it was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high-quality work (B3)” and in 18% 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).” These findings suggest that instructional tasks often emphasize completion of activities rather than deeper cognitive engagement. There was a lack of artifact data showing that students are challenged or instruction is differentiated to meet learners’ needs. Interviews with leaders and professional staff also revealed that small-group instruction and more data-driven decision-making to meet student needs were goals and areas for growth.

Patterns of learner engagement reflected a similar level of inconsistency. While students were frequently attentive and compliant during instruction, opportunities for meaningful discourse and collaborative learning were less consistently observed. Overall, the Active Learning Environment earned an average rating of 1.8 on a 4-point scale, indicating that student-centered instructional practices were not consistently embedded across classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate (D1)” and in 18% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2).” Observational data suggest that instruction is often delivered through teacher-directed approaches, with few opportunities for students to engage in collaborative problem-solving or apply learning in authentic contexts. Project-based learning was observed in many classrooms; however, survey data revealed that 65% of 3rd-, 4th- and 5th-grade students and 59% of 6th-grade students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12).”

Observations also revealed opportunities to strengthen instructional responsiveness to individual learner needs. While classrooms generally reflected fairness and consistency in expectations, differentiated learning opportunities were less frequently observed. It was evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” These patterns suggest that instructional adjustments designed to address varied readiness levels, interests and learning preferences may not be consistently embedded in lesson design and delivery.

Similarly, opportunities to strengthen progress-monitoring and feedback practices were inconsistently evident across classrooms. In 12% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” While it was evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)”, consistent mechanisms that support learners in monitoring their own progress toward learning goals were less visible. These findings suggest that formative assessment practices and feedback cycles may not be systematically embedded in daily instruction to guide adjustments in teaching and learning.



The team expressed concerns about the limited use of technology for learning. For example, in the Digital Learning Environment, it was evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).” While some classrooms incorporated technology in ways that supported student learning, digital tools were more often used as supplemental resources rather than as mechanisms to promote inquiry, collaboration or deeper learning experiences.

Observational data indicated variability in instructional practices regarding rigor, active learning, differentiation and formative assessment. While pockets of stronger instructional practice were observed, these practices were inconsistently implemented across classrooms. Collectively, these findings suggest an opportunity to strengthen shared expectations for high-quality instruction to ensure that all learners experience engaging, rigorous and responsive learning environments across classrooms.



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

Provide and support ongoing professional learning regarding instructional practices and the implementation of resources, drawing on multiple qualitative and quantitative data sources, to build the capacity of leaders and teachers.

Standard 6: Professional staff members receive the support they need to strengthen their professional practice.

Findings:

A review of student performance data indicates that Milton Elementary School has consistently performed below state averages on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA). In 2024-2025, 26% of students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 4th-grade reading, compared to 50% statewide. In 5th-grade reading, 50% of students statewide scored Proficient/Distinguished, compared to 11% at Milton Elementary School. Similar trends were evident in mathematics and science. In 5th-grade mathematics, 14% of students scored Proficient/Distinguished, compared to 43% statewide and 16% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished, compared to 37% statewide.

Survey data further indicates challenges in professional learning and teacher development. Results from the IMPACT survey indicated that responses about professional development vary. For example, 45% of staff responded favorably to the question, “At your school, how valuable are the available professional development opportunities?” By contrast, 95% responded favorably when responding to the question, “Overall, how much do you learn about teaching from the leaders at your school?”, reflecting variation within perspectives.

Survey and interview data further revealed variation in perspectives related to professional learning and development of instructional capacity. While survey data indicated 85% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)”, interviews with teachers revealed concerns regarding the level of professional learning, training and instructional support provided to staff. Stakeholders reported that the faculty includes several non-certified teachers and educators who are new to the profession, increasing the need for structured professional learning and coaching. Although PLCs have been established and meet weekly, teachers reported not receiving the level of training or targeted instructional support necessary to improve classroom practices.

Artifacts indicate that PLC agendas have been developed; however, interviews suggest that these meetings often lack clear communication, preparation and structured professional learning that is needed to support meaningful instructional improvement. Teachers reported that discussions frequently focus on logistics rather than on a deep examination of instructional practice or the use of HQIRs.

Classroom observations further reflected a lack of preparation for instruction and a lack of deep understanding of the curriculum. Observations showed limited levels of student engagement and higher-order thinking in many classrooms. In 18% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher-order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating or synthesizing) (B4).” Additionally, in 12% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learner discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1).”

A review of documents and artifacts also revealed limited evidence of a coherent professional learning system. The “2024–2025 Raider Professional Learning” document states an intention to provide time for educators to work



independently and collaboratively with a focus on instructional planning and learning environments through initiatives such as Trust, Accountability and Grace (TAG) visits, Mentoring and Inspiring New Teachers (MINT) and PLC meetings. However, evidence demonstrating the consistent implementation of these initiatives was not provided.

Additionally, documentation did not include a comprehensive professional learning plan specific to Milton Elementary School. The team found little evidence of a systematic process for using student or instructional data to determine professional learning priorities aligned with students' academic and non-academic needs. Furthermore, beyond the requirements of the Kentucky Teacher Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (TPGES), no documented process for ongoing instructional coaching, feedback or professional growth was identified.

Artifacts indicated limited use of a school-specific walkthrough tool, and evidence suggests that instructional feedback from leadership is inconsistent and not part of a systematic process for monitoring and improving instructional practice.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Clarify and communicate instructional expectations for resource use and articulate how expectations align with the school's vision and mission.
- Establish a formal process to orient teachers to the resources, expectations and instructional processes and procedures required in the adopted curricula.
- Focus professional learning around a PLC structure and process to reflect teacher and school-specific needs.
- Develop a systematic and data-informed process for identifying professional learning for leaders and staff.

Improvement Priority 2

Implement and monitor the identified curriculum to eliminate instructional variability, ensuring that all students experience rigorous, relevant learning.

Standard 12: Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.

Findings:

Teacher perception data reveals a discrepancy in beliefs and observed outcomes. One hundred percent of teachers agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8)”, while observational and stakeholder data indicate inconsistent implementation of practices that fully address student needs and promote rigorous learning. While there was some evidence showing an established structure for PLCs to meet, there was a lack of evidence demonstrating teachers’ collaboration centered around internalizing units and lessons, HQIR curriculum implementation and use of embedded instructional practices.

The comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) noted continued monitoring of Amplify Core Knowledge Language Arts (CKLA) HQIR implementation and professional development to support its success in classrooms. Conversely, the “First Grade PLC Notes” indicated that teachers use multiple curricular resources to supplement and supplant Tier 1 instruction. The team observed numerous curricula (e.g., Amplify CKLA, University of Florida Literacy Institute (UFLI), Heggerty, Reading Street, Literacy Footprints) being used, but teachers were unable to articulate how these resources work together.

Teachers reported a lack of resources to implement the curriculum with fidelity. Educator interviews and informal observations revealed a lack of consumable and non-consumable materials to support HQIRs. According to the IMPACT survey, 75% of teachers responded that they “struggled some” (55%) or “struggled quite a bit” (20%) when asked, “Overall how much does your school struggle due to a lack of resources?” Additionally, the “Plus/Deltas PLC Update” artifact identified the lack of completing a full cyclical Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) process during PLCs as a possible hindrance. These data suggest that the current PLC processes are not aligned to support effective curriculum implementation.

By embedding processes for internalization into PLCs, opportunities for analyzing student work and formative assessment data and aligning a walkthrough and feedback process, the school can strengthen Tier 1 instruction to ensure all learners receive consistent, relevant and inclusive instruction.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Internalize units and lessons to connect lesson design, lesson components and instructional strategies of the HQIRs to the four PLC questions.
- Support teacher collaboration centered around HQIR curriculum implementation and the use of embedded instructional practices.
- Create and use a walkthrough tool and schedule to monitor implementation of HQIRs, including pacing, lesson structures, use of embedded engagement strategies and use of embedded differentiation strategies in order to provide targeted feedback and coaching to teachers.
- Develop a structured, documented mentoring and coaching program for educators and leaders to ensure the integrity and impact of implementing curricular resources.



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 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 lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

The principal at Milton Elementary School has served in the leadership role since 2023. She has worked intentionally to improve the effectiveness of the school through a deliberate transformation of the school culture, prioritizing collaboration, communication and support for staff. Stakeholders praised the principal for fostering a positive environment in which they feel heard, valued and encouraged to share ideas. The "Weekly Staff Check-Ins" document illustrates a process the principal has implemented to facilitate connection with staff, support them through challenges, celebrate successes and provide opportunities for staff to recognize colleagues. Furthermore, the principal has strengthened community partnerships by inviting organizations and families to play an active role in the school's growth.

The Diagnostic Review Team found clear evidence that the principal utilized findings from the 2023-2024 Two-Day Review report to initiate the school's improvement efforts. The principal has supported a district initiative focused on strengthening collaborative PLCs by partnering with a neighboring elementary school, increasing her presence during PLC meetings and utilizing a shared Google Drive that houses common lesson plans, assessments and projects aligned to support continuous improvement. Additionally, the "Standards Checklist with Dates" documents when each standard is taught and supports the school in ensuring instruction remains aligned with the curriculum, pacing, alignment and curriculum coverage.

Interviews revealed that while teachers have collaborated to ensure alignment between HQIR and the KAS, teachers and leaders rarely engage in collaborative unit or lesson internalization to deepen their understanding of the instructional resources as a lever to strengthen Tier 1 instruction and improve student achievement.

Leadership training is needed to ensure that the principal understands how the selected HQIR can support Milton Elementary School in achieving its instructional goals. Further learning should include a deeper understanding of



the design of the HQIR and the processes required to support effective curriculum implementation. Support from experts with deep knowledge of the selected HQIR could further strengthen the principal's capacity to ensure teachers receive the guidance and support needed to effectively implement the curriculum.

Additionally, the principal should be empowered to align professional learning, the walkthrough process, ongoing coaching and follow-up support to optimize effective curriculum implementation within the school's context. Mentoring and coaching from the OVEC along with Educational Recovery (ER) staff support and intentional leadership training would further strengthen leadership capacity and the principal's ability to lead the school's continuous improvement efforts.

As the instructional leader, the principal should guide the refinement and implementation of a PLC-driven continuous improvement process that supports teachers and leaders in collaboratively deepening their understanding of the HQIR, practicing and implementing evidence-based instructional strategies and analyzing student work to determine the effectiveness of instructional practices. Providing the principal with the autonomy and support necessary to guide stakeholders through this work will further support the principal's ability to effectively lead the school.



Team Roster

The Diagnostic Review Team is a group of professionals with varied backgrounds and professional experiences. All Lead Evaluators and Diagnostic Review Team members complete Cognia training and elect certification to ensure knowledge and understanding of the Cognia tools and processes. The following professionals served on the Diagnostic Review Team.

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
Rachael McDaniel	Rachael McDaniel has over 25 years of experience in public education at the elementary, middle and high school levels, as well as at the post-secondary level. She has been a special-needs teacher, English language arts instructor and reading specialist. Over the last decade, she has served as a principal and principal lead, primarily in Title I schools, focusing on school transformation and improvement. In addition, she has taught numerous college courses. Rachael provides consultation to schools and systems in data analysis, instructional improvement, mentorship, finance and school culture.
Kanna Edison-Swain	Kanna Edison-Swain has 19 years of experience as an educator. She is currently in her ninth year as an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS) for the KDE. She taught high school math for seven years in Louisville, Kentucky. Following her classroom experience, she served as a district instructional coach for three years with the role of supporting Jefferson County middle and high schools with curriculum design, curriculum implementation and instructional coaching. In her current position she is assigned to support schools by assisting in strategic thinking/planning, building sustainable systems and providing coaching for leaders.
Amy Jeziorski	Amy Jeziorski has 22 years of experience in education. She is currently in her fifth year serving as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with KDE, focusing on building sustainable systems to drive continuous improvement and equipping teachers and leaders for success. Her classroom experience includes special education, gifted education and comprehensive programming at the elementary level. In addition to classroom experience, Amy has supported students and teachers as a reading interventionist, instructional coach and district-based literacy resource teacher.
Keary Walker	Keary Walker has dedicated over 22 years to the field of education, gaining experience at every level. His administrative background is comprehensive, having served as a principal at both the elementary and college levels and as an assistant principal at the middle and high school levels. He has spent most of his career working within urban school districts. Additionally, Keary served as a district math coach for student teachers in math and science for two years and spent seven years teaching high school mathematics.

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders seldom use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders sometimes use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use analyzed current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use a formal, systematic process for analyzing current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	1
27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.	The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices.	The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	2
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	2

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

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	20	46	10	47	*	47
4th-Grade Reading	*	48	26	50	26	50
5th-Grade Reading	*	48	*	46	11	50
6th-Grade Reading	28	48	*	49	*	52
3rd-Grade Math	13	43	*	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	29	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	*	41	14	43
6th-Grade Math	14	38	*	42	*	41
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	16	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	*	42	*	39	*	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	*	47	20	47	*	47
5th-Grade On-Demand Writing	*	39	20	39	*	38

Plus

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

Delta

- In 2024-2025, the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was 26% compared to 50% at the state level.
- In 2024-2025, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was 11% compared to 50% at the state level.
- In 2024-2025, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math was 14% compared to 43% at the state level.
- In 2024-2025, the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 16% compared to 37% at the state level.

Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

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

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	20	10	*
Female	27	*	*
Male	16	*	*
White	20	11	*
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	17	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading decreased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	13	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	16	*	*
White	13	*	*
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	11	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math was 13% for White students and all students in 2022-2023.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	*	26	26
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	40	39
White	*	27	24
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	28	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was 26% in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined from 40% in 2023-2024 to 39% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading declined from 27% in 2023-2024 to 24% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	29	*
Female	*	29	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	30	*
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	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math was 29% for female students and all students in 2022-2023.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	16
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	28
White	*	*	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	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 16% on the KSA in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 28% on the KSA in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA was 18% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	11
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	10
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	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- In 2024-2025, the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA was 11%.
- In 2024-2025, the percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA was 10%.

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

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

Plus

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

Delta

- In 2024-2025, the percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA was 14%.
- In 2024-2025, the percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA was 15%.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	*
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 5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	*	20	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	21	*
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	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- In 2023-2024, the percentage of all 5th-grade students and White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 20% and 21%, respectively.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	*	20	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	21	*
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	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- In 2023-2024, the percentage of all 5th-grade students and White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 20% and 21%, respectively.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	28	*	*
Female	43	*	*
Male	13	*	*
White	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	20	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- In 2022-2023, the percentage of all 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was 28%.
- In 2022-2023, the percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was 13%.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	14	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	20	*	*
White	15	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- In 2022-2023, the percentage of all 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math was 14%.
- In 2022-2023, the percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was 20%.

Schedule

Monday, March 2, 2026

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

Tuesday, March 3, 2026

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

Wednesday, March 4, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:45 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, March 5, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

