



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Powell County Middle School

Feb. 17-20, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	6
eleot Narrative	10
Improvement Priorities	12
Improvement Priority 1	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	13
Improvement Priority 2	14
Potential Leader Actions:.....	15
Your Next Steps	15
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	16
Team Roster	18
Appendix	19
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	21
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	23
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	25
Student Performance Data.....	28
Schedule	41

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	2
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	7
Certified Staff	24
Noncertified Staff	9
Students	22
Parents	6
Total	71

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

Powell County Middle School (PCMS) demonstrated a consistent focus on improving culture and safety measures to make the school a place where students feel accepted and want to be. Student and teacher interviews revealed an overall collegial atmosphere of support and care. It was evident in classrooms and hallways that teachers, administrators and students spoke to each other with mutual respect and care, reflecting their overall school culture. Throughout the school, a sense of nurture was evident. Stakeholder interviews revealed intentional efforts to strengthen student support systems and school culture through relationship-building structures. Survey data indicated that 92% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)." Additionally, 81% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that adults "treat us with respect (2)." When responding to the question, "Which four phrases best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?", 72% of families selected the word "welcoming" and 70% selected the word "respectful." Furthermore, educators consistently described the institution as supportive, structured and nurturing. Survey data indicated strong perceptions of student preparation and opportunity. For example, 98% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I provided opportunities to help learners acquire skills needed for their future (15)."

The Diagnostic Review Team found evidence that the initiatives to improve culture and climate have had a positive impact. The Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey (IMPACT) results showed improved staff-leadership relationships, increasing from 76% to 93% for a 17 percentage point increase from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. The overall school climate score improved from 43% to 63%, which was a 20 percentage-point gain from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. There was also improvement in every area except one, as the resource area declined by two percentage points from 44% to 42% from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. School leadership acknowledged these gains and also emphasized the need for a sense of urgency to improve instruction. Evidence gathered across multiple sources indicates that continuous improvement processes are emerging but are lacking clarity, consistent implementation or a process for systematically monitoring progress.

Observational, interview and survey data and a review of artifacts provided by the school indicate a strong and collaborative professional culture characterized by collegial support, positive relationships and shared commitment among most staff. Educator interview responses consistently emphasized teamwork, collaboration and a welcoming institutional environment. Survey data aligned with interview data as 100% of educators selected "welcoming" when asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?" Additionally, when responding to the prompt, "Which four words do you think best describe, in general, the interactions you experience with your colleagues (26)?", 94% of educators chose "collaborative."

Interview data and IMPACT survey results showed strong agreement regarding leadership effectiveness and feedback structures, with that item rated 81%, up from 54% in 2022-2023 to 2024-2025, reflecting significant growth from the previous survey cycle. Feedback and coaching also increased by 16 percentage points from 53% to 69% from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. Educators frequently described feeling appreciated, supported and valued by school leadership, with teachers highlighting administrative transparency, responsiveness and relational trust.

Observations and interviews indicated that school leadership demonstrates openness, transparency and reflective engagement in improvement efforts. The principal's overview presentation reflected a high degree of



transparency and ownership, modeling a culture of openness and continuous improvement. Educators also spoke positively about structured support systems, including the New Teacher Academy, which provides guided mentorship, professional learning and sustained onboarding. A review of the “New Teacher Academy Handbook” and interview data describing the assignment of a building-level mentor substantiated efforts to support these new educators.

Observational data revealed learning environments characterized by predictability, structure and respectful interactions. For example, instances where “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)” were evident/very evident in 84% of classrooms. Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 89% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations, and work well with others (F2).” Across classrooms and common areas, the team observed primarily orderly, well-managed environments reflecting established behavioral expectations and consistent routines. Hallways and shared spaces reflected similar patterns, with staff members monitoring transitions and learners demonstrating appropriate conduct. The team noted that behavioral flowcharts outlining expectations were visible across instructional and common spaces. Data showing a decrease in discipline referrals was included in evidence and showed a drop from 358 referrals in 2023-2024 to 263 in 2024-2025.

Interview, artifact and performance data indicated an emerging institutional focus on instructional improvement and learner outcomes. Educator interviews reflected openness to instructional refinement, with limited resistance communicated about improvement initiatives. Most teachers have embraced instructional changes and improvement efforts.

The comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) contained three- to five-year goals for both reading and math, including “by 2028, PCMS will increase the percentage of students scoring P/D [Proficient/Distinguished] in reading from 27% to 36%”, and “by 2028, PCMS will increase the percentage of students scoring P/D in math from 21% to 30%.” The school’s CSIP academic objectives are to “increase the percentage of students scoring P/D in reading on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) from 27% to 30% and decrease students scoring Novice by 10%”, and to “increase the percentage of students scoring P/D in math on KSA from 21% to 24% and decrease students scoring Novice by 10%.”

Student performance data showed measurable progress. State assessment results indicated gains across multiple content areas, including improvements in reading, mathematics and science proficiency. KSA 2024-2025 data showed that the percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 26% in 2023-2024 to 36% in 2024-2025, 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025 and 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science increased from 6% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025. These patterns suggest that institutional improvement efforts are contributing to emerging positive performance trends.

Leadership actions further showed a focus on measuring and increasing instructional effectiveness. For example, the principal demonstrated a transparent, reflective approach to performance data while modeling ownership and clarity about instructional challenges. Artifact reviews (e.g., agendas, data room charts, graphs) revealed intentional improvement efforts, including the initiation of structured training on unit internalization to strengthen instructional coherence. Interviews indicated recognition of a need to thoughtfully begin sequencing instructional improvements.

Evidence provided through the principal’s presentation, interviews, and artifacts revealed that professional learning community (PLC) meetings and ongoing walkthroughs have been designed to monitor instructional practices and support classroom-level refinement. The team found that although these structures have been put into place, the school lacks processes for reflection, feedback and implementation impact. The principal’s presentation and interview data indicated that the institution has recently engaged in intentional efforts to strengthen instructional systems and organizational coherence through continuous improvement efforts.

While the district has adopted high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) and provided initial professional development on their use, stakeholder interviews revealed a lack of clarity and understanding about the non-



negotiables in planning and instructional delivery related to the HQIRs. The team noted a lack of a shared process to ensure alignment of HQIR implementation across all classrooms. Discrepancies between articulated expectations and classroom-level instructional practices were evident. Observational data further showed inconsistencies across classrooms in instructional rigor, quality work expectations, differentiated learning opportunities and learner ownership. It was evident/very evident in 48% of classrooms that “learners are engaged in the learning activities (D3).” These patterns suggest an opportunity to strengthen instructional coherence and ensure alignment between institutional priorities and classroom implementation of curricular resources.



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 19 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.	63%	26%	11%	0%
A2	2.8	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	32%	58%	11%
A3	3.1	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	16%	63%	21%
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.	42%	53%	5%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.2				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.2	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	21%	42%	37%	0%
B2	2.5	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	0%	53%	42%	5%
B3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	26%	47%	26%	0%
B4	2.3	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	16%	42%	37%	5%
B5	2.4	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	5%	47%	47%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.3			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.8	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	0%	26%	63%	11%
C2	2.6	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	0%	42%	53%	5%
C3	2.6	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	5%	37%	47%	11%
C4	2.9	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	26%	58%	16%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.8			



D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.3	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	21%	42%	26%	11%
D2	2.4	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	21%	21%	53%	5%
D3	2.5	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	11%	42%	32%	16%
D4	2.1	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	42%	18%	32%	11%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.3			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.9	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	32%	47%	21%	0%
E2	2.5	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	11%	32%	53%	5%
E3	2.3	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	16%	37%	47%	0%
E4	1.9	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	32%	42%	26%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.2			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.1	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	21%	53%	26%
F2	3.1	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	11%	68%	21%
F3	2.6	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	11%	16%	74%	0%
F4	2.6	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	0%	42%	53%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.9			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.9	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	47%	26%	16%	11%
G2	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	74%	11%	5%	11%
G3	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	79%	16%	0%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.6			



eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 19 formal classroom observations in all core content areas, as well as informal observations in other classrooms and prevalent areas throughout the school. These observations provided meaningful insights into patterns in classroom culture, learner engagement, instructional delivery and formative practices.

The Diagnostic Review Team noted that behavioral expectations were consistently implemented across many classrooms. Observational data indicated that learners frequently demonstrated appropriate behavior and respectful interactions. For example, it was evident/very evident in 89% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)” and evident/very evident in 79% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” Additionally, in 74% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” The team noted learning environments characterized by emotional safety and positive relationships, as it was evident/very evident in 74% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1).” Educator interview responses aligned with these findings, as teachers consistently described a collaborative professional culture characterized by collegial support, teamwork and strong administrative responsiveness to ensure structures and resources for positive environments for learning. Students talked about the high level of care they felt at the school and said they had an adult they could go to if needed. Students and staff consistently expressed appreciation for how quickly and thoroughly the school administration handled problems and for the proactive approaches taken to foster a safe and nurturing environment.

While classroom culture and relationships reflect mostly positive conditions for learning, instructional practices demonstrated greater variability. Observational data indicated opportunities for deeper cognitive engagement and rigorous learning experiences. For example, instances in which “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher-order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)” were evident/very evident in 42% of classrooms. Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 47% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).”

Learner engagement patterns reflected a similar level of inconsistency, where it was evident/very evident in 48% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in learning activities (D3).” While learners were generally compliant and attentive, observations frequently reflected instructional structures that emphasized whole-group delivery, with fewer opportunities for learner discourse or collaborative problem-solving. For example, it was evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Moreover, it was evident/very evident in 37% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate (D1).” Survey data supported observational data. For instance, when students were asked, “Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?”, 55% chose “listen to teachers talk.” These findings identify opportunities for professional learning and coaching to support educators in providing an engaging learning environment and rigorous coursework.

Observations revealed that instructional tasks were frequently designed for whole-group delivery, with few visible adjustments based on learner readiness, interests and individual learning needs. Instances where “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” were evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms. While 81% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8)”, 53% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12).”

Progress-monitoring and formative practices reflected a similar pattern of inconsistency. For example, opportunities where “learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” were evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms. Also, instances in which “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work

(E2)” were evident/very evident in 58% of classrooms. However, teacher interviews indicated that feedback cycles and progress-monitoring mechanisms were not consistently embedded in daily instruction. Teachers and administrators reported that formal progress-monitoring structures and systematic processes for using data to guide instructional adjustments are areas for improvement.

The Digital Learning Environment reflected the lowest levels of implementation. Learners were observed using digital learning for research in some classrooms, but others primarily used it for word-processing. In 5% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and/or work collaboratively for learning (G3).” These data suggest that, when present, technology often functions as a passive resource rather than as a mechanism for deeper learning experiences.

Overall, the team observed variability in instructional quality. While effective instructional practices were evident in some classrooms, these practices were inconsistently implemented as shared institutional expectations. As a result, learners experienced varying levels of cognitive engagement, differentiation and progress-monitoring opportunities across classroom settings.

Collectively, observational data indicated relational and organizational foundations. Classrooms reflected positive climates and well-managed environments supportive of learning. At the same time, the data revealed opportunities to strengthen instructional coherence, rigor, differentiated learning practices, progress-monitoring systems and the systematic use of data to ensure consistent, high-quality learning experiences for all learners.

Improvement Priorities

Improvement priorities are developed to enhance the capacity of the institution to reach a higher level of performance and reflect the areas identified by the Diagnostic Review Team to have the greatest impact on improving student performance and organizational effectiveness.

Improvement Priority 1

Refine, implement and monitor the established PLC process to ensure it guides instructional conversations around curriculum, assessment and instructional expectations aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS).

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

Findings:

Student performance data from the KSA indicate a slight increase in scores in all content areas except writing; however, the school still falls significantly below state averages in all areas. For example, in 2024-2025, 26% of 7th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading compared to the state average of 48%, and 21% of 6th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math compared to the state average of 41%. The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in writing decreased from 32% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025, indicating a gap compared to the state average of 49% in both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Stakeholder survey data indicated variability in perceptions related to instructional practices and institutional expectations. For example, 57% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “adults are committed to trying new things to improve the school (6).” This aligned with student perceptions where 61% agreed/absolutely agreed that “adults try new things to improve our school (6).” Educator survey results reflected that 67% agreed/absolutely agreed that the school “provides an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).” Families also reported positive perceptions regarding adult expectations; however, survey results, when triangulated with observational and interview findings, suggest an opportunity to strengthen alignment between instructional intentions and learner experiences.

Although the team identified the emergence of a continuous improvement process, little evidence was found showing the systematic implementation necessary to support it. This finding suggests that processes such as PLCs, data presentations, walkthroughs and feedback are currently emerging; however, there was minimal evidence that these initiatives have been implemented with fidelity. The team also found a lack of data showing the effectiveness of these practices. Interviews indicated that PLCs have occurred, but often lacked the intentionality required to improve instruction. A review of artifacts (e.g., “Professional Learning Community Schedule/Focus”, “PLC/Program Evaluation [SWOAT]”) indicated that PLC processes have been operational, but they lack alignment with instructional outcomes, feedback linked to student achievement and an instructional focus connected to the HQIRs. School leaders and educators described PLCs as evolving but not yet consistently structured or focused. Additionally, most stakeholders reported that while data discussions occur, the connection between data analysis and instructional decision-making varies across teams.

Educators further indicated that while HQIR programs include embedded assessments, prior training related to assessment interpretation, progress monitoring and instructional responsiveness has been limited. Teachers described emerging data-use practices that suggested an opportunity to strengthen the connection between using assessment results to inform classroom-level instructional decision-making. These findings indicate an opportunity to establish systematic PLC structures that emphasize instructional coherence, learner needs, progress monitoring and evidence-based instructional adjustments.



Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish structures, non-negotiables and outcomes that include stakeholder input for PLCs.
- Monitor and adjust PLCs based on stakeholder feedback and relevant performance data.
- Use stakeholder feedback to implement a structured PLC protocol focused on HQIR implementation.
- Build professional efficacy through the PLC process, including ongoing opportunities and support for teacher leadership.



Improvement Priority 2

Develop, implement and monitor a process for the design and delivery of evidence-based instructional practices, including differentiation and student engagement strategies, to meet the needs of all students and build professional capacity.

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

Findings:

Evidence from multiple data sources indicated that the school had not collaborated to develop and implement clear instructional expectations and non-negotiables. KSA student performance data demonstrate the need to increase the instructional focus and accountability across all grade levels, highlighting the importance of a schoolwide commitment to high expectations for learners and learner-centered instructional practices. As noted in the findings for Improvement Priority 1, the school performed below the state average in all tested academic areas on the KSA. The data further revealed that various subgroups performed even lower than the school. The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of economically disadvantaged 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 30%, which was six percentage points lower than the all students group's score of 36% in 2024-2025. This trend holds true for math as well. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in 6th-grade math was 14%, which was seven percentage points lower than the 21% of all students in 2024-2025. The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 21% in 2024-2025, which was six percentage points lower than the 27% of all students. Furthermore, 20% of 6th-grade students with disabilities with IEP scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading and 7% scored Proficient/Distinguished in math in 2024-2025, while the all students group scored 36% and 21%, respectively. Additionally, 19% of 7th-grade female students scored Proficient/Distinguished in math, compared with 27% in the all students group in 2024-2025.

Observational and interview data revealed a lack of high academic expectations along with limited opportunities for differentiation and student engagement. The evidence revealed that some instructional staff have an emerging sense of urgency to improve instructional practices to increase student learning. In most classrooms, the team observed students completing worksheets or packets and teacher-directed instruction. Although the team observed some students working collaboratively, their assignments typically lacked rigor and were often below the KAS for that grade.

These patterns were noteworthy when considered alongside stakeholder feedback, particularly student survey responses indicating lower levels of agreement for engaging in instruction to meet individual needs. For example, when students were asked, "Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?", 58% chose "do the same work as everyone else" and 25% selected "work on what I need." While 91% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I provided opportunities for learners that align to their needs (18)", 51% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)."

Classroom observational data reinforced this pattern. Instances in which "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high-quality work (B3)" were evident/very evident in 26% of classrooms. Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 11% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." These findings suggest that in most classrooms, learners are seldom given consistently aligned expectations for quality work, assignments aligned with the rigor of the KAS or differentiated learning tasks. In multiple classrooms, bell ringers and an overview of daily procedures were consuming significant time.

Survey and interview data suggested variability in the consistency of instructional and behavioral expectations. Educators reported that clearly defined instructional and behavioral non-negotiables remain under development, contributing to differing classroom structures and learner experiences. Teachers also described challenges related to behavioral systems, including the implementation fidelity of the positive behavioral interventions and



supports (PBIS) program, consistency of consequences and the balance between corrective and positive reinforcement practices. Interview data further indicated that learners desire greater consistency of structures across classroom settings.

Walkthrough documentation was limited and reflected greater emphasis on compliance-oriented indicators rather than high-yield instructional practices. While documentation showed evidence of stakeholder engagement activities and emerging student voice structures, the team found limited supporting documents demonstrating systematic program evaluation or monitoring of initiative impact.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Provide ongoing professional learning and establish support for staff on the implementation of HQIRs, including unit studies that intentionally connect HQIR expectations to instruction and student achievement.
- Identify and adopt a set of evidence-based instructional strategies aligned to the district's adopted curriculum (e.g., explicit instruction, formative assessment, cooperative learning, differentiation strategies) that clearly define what these practices look like in classrooms.
- Facilitate collaborative sessions with school and district leadership to define instructional non-negotiables and ensure all teachers understand expectations.
- Promote and monitor the use of high-yield instructional strategies and expectations by developing a system to implement and monitor them.

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 at Powell County Middle School.

The principal assumed the leadership of Powell County Middle School in January of the 2023 school year. Two weeks after assuming the principalship at the middle school, the assistant principal resigned. The principal faced a fragmented culture and divided staff. This was evident by the results from the 2022-2023 Kentucky Impact Conditions Survey (KICS) showing that 54% of school staff rated school leadership as positive. Additionally, positive ratings for staff leadership relationships and managing student behavior were rated 76% and 48%, respectively. Since that time, the school leader has worked to build positive relationships and improve the school's culture. This was addressed by modeling expectations, listening to staff and exhibiting servant leadership. The 2025-2026 (KICS) results revealed a shift in positive ratings from school staff. The 2025 survey results in school leadership increased from 54% in 2023 to 81% in 2025, staff leadership relationships improved from 76% in 2023 to 93% in 2025 and managing student behavior increased from 48% in 2023 to 69% in 2025. The school leader seeks to make the school more effective for each student, teacher and staff families and the community.

The school leaders initiated a PBIS system to replace the previous level system that focused on punishment rather than restorative behaviors. The leader employs situationally appropriate strategies for improvement. School behavior data revealed a reduction in behavior incidents from 358 in 2023-2024 to 263 in 2024-2025.

The administration has led in the development of PLCs; however, this process is currently functioning primarily as operational. Interviews revealed that the school's schedule has been adjusted to allow PLCs to meet every week. School leadership monitors these meetings to cultivate teachers' competence in the development of an authentic PLC process. The use of data as a tool to guide and modify instructional practices is occurring inconsistently. The administration provides positive feedback for teachers as they conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs and

monitor PLC meetings. “The school leader assesses and develops the capacity of staff to assess the value and apply appropriate emerging educational trends.”

The principal expressed self-awareness in the need to enhance her ability to coach her instructional staff. This area is the greatest opportunity for growth as she continues to develop the skills and characteristics of the school’s instructional leader. Perhaps the most notable attributes of the school leader are self-reflection, accepting responsibility and her commitment to grow. The school leader displays a level of humility and ownership that does not make excuses or assign blame on others; rather, the school leader models the characteristics necessary to implement systems for continuous improvement, consciously exhibiting a growth mindset, “The school leader intentionally manages changes with positivity, transparency and tenacity.”



Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
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 (ELA) instructor and reading specialist. Over the last two decades, she has served as a principal, primarily in Title 1 schools, focusing on school transformation. She has taught college courses in communication, human resources, finance and instruction. Rachael provides consultation to schools and systems in data analysis, instructional improvement, mentorship, finance and school culture.
Chris Mueller	Chris Mueller has over 38 years of experience as a teacher, administrator and Educational Recovery Leader (ERL). Chris has taught at the middle, high school and collegiate levels. While serving as an ERL, Chris worked with administrative teams and school leadership teams to facilitate turnaround efforts in Kentucky's central region. Additionally, he has been an associate lead in multiple diagnostic reviews. He has also led monitoring reviews in CSI schools for KDE. He is a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) for the Lead-KY initiative. This 12-unit program provides school and district administrators with research-based strategies in strategic thinking, instructional leadership, elements of standards-aligned instructional systems, effective coaching for high-quality teaching and driving and sustaining change. Chris also has experience as an adjunct instructor in political science.
Phillip Guthrie	Phillip Guthrie has 19 years of experience in education. Currently, he serves as an ERL with KDE. In this position, he assists schools in building sustainable systems by developing leaders who will drive a continuous improvement approach focused on student learning. His experience includes serving as a teacher, assistant principal and principal in a small school district in Kentucky.
Ketsy Fields	Ketsy Fields currently works for Cognia as a senior director in the northeast region, including Kentucky. She is retired from public education after 31 years of service. During that time, she worked as an elementary and middle school teacher for 15 years in different counties, serving diverse populations in Eastern and Northern Kentucky. She has also worked as an elementary principal, middle school assistant principal and middle school principal. She has served at the district level as a director of school improvement and Innovation.

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.	3
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.	3

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
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.	1
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	1

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	1
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.	1
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	1

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	1
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.	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
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	1

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Reading	33	48	26	49	36	52
7th-Grade Reading	22	45	24	47	26	48
8th-Grade Reading	31	44	16	41	20	42
6th-Grade Math	19	38	20	42	21	41
7th-Grade Math	16	37	18	39	27	43
8th-Grade Math	17	36	14	37	16	40
7th-Grade Science	5	23	6	22	16	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	19	35	20	35	19	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	34	49	35	47	37	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	24	45	32	49	20	49

Plus

- The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 26% in 2023-2024 to 36% in 2024-2025.
- The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.
- The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science increased from 6% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math remained stagnant from 17% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies showed little change from 19% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The 2024-2025 KSA results revealed that the percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased from 32% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.

Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	33	26	36
Female	31	27	33
Male	34	25	38
White	35	27	37
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	25	24	30
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	20

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 26% in 2023-2024 to 36% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 33% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 38% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 27% in 2023-2024 to 37% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 30% in 2024-2025.

Delta

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

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	19	20	21
Female	10	20	17
Male	27	21	25
White	20	21	22
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	16	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	7

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 21% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished increased from 21% in 2023-2024 to 22% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 20% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 16% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students with disabilities with IEP scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 7%.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	22	24	26
Female	23	23	25
Male	20	25	27
White	22	25	25
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	15	22	24
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 7th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 26% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 23% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 25% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 22 % 2023-2024 to 24% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The 2024-2025 KSA student performance data showed no improvement in the percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading, with 25% in 2023-2024 and 25% in 2024-2025.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th-Grade Math

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	16	18	27
Female	12	*	19
Male	19	24	34
White	15	18	27
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	11	21
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 7th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 24% in 2023-2024 to 34% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 27% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was only 19%, while the percentage of male students was 34%.



Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th-Grade Science

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	5	6	16
Female	*	*	*
Male	10	12	19
White	5	6	16
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	5	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 7th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science increased from 5% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science increased from 10% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science increased from 5% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.

Delta

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	31	16	20
Female	35	15	*
Male	27	18	21
White	31	16	22
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	27	10	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	17	14	16
Female	16	*	*
Male	17	18	20
White	17	14	17
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	12	8	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 17% in 2022.23 to 18% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 17% in 2022.23 to 14% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math has been stagnant from 17% in 2022.23 to 14% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	19	20	19
Female	21	*	14
Male	18	21	23
White	19	19	20
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	17	*	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies has increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies remained flat from 19% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies declined from 21% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies has remained flat from 19% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies declined from 17% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	34	35	37
Female	44	36	37
Male	28	34	38
White	34	35	39
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	26	28	32
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 34% in 2022-2023 to 35% in 2023-2024 to 37% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 28% in 2022-2023 to 34% in 2023-2024 to 38% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 34% in 2022-2023 to 35% in 2023-2024 to 39% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 26% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2023-2024 to 32% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 44% in 2022-2023 to 36% in 2023-2024 to 37% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	24	32	20
Female	34	36	25
Male	*	29	15
White	24	32	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	22	18	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished for on-demand writing decreased from 32% in 2023-2024 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished for on-demand writing decreased from 36% in 2023-2024 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished for on-demand writing decreased from 29% in 2023-2024 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished for on-demand writing decreased from 32% in 2023-2024 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished for on-demand writing decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024 to 11% in 2024-2025.



Schedule

Tuesday, Feb. 17, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
2 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, Feb. 18, 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.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 19, 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

Friday, Feb. 20, 2026

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

