



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:  
Rangeland Elementary**

Jan. 20-23, 2026

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results</b> .....	<b>6</b>
eleot Narrative .....	9
<b>Improvement Priorities</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	11
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Improvement Priority 2 .....	13
Potential Leader Actions:.....	14
Your Next Steps .....	14
<b>Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....	18
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	18
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....	20
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning .....	22
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....	24
Student Performance Data.....	27
Schedule .....	39

# 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.

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	9
<b>Certified Staff</b>	29
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	12
<b>Students</b>	35
<b>Parents</b>	10
<b>Total</b>	101

## Performance Standards Evaluation

Diagnostic Reviews are based primarily on the evaluation of evidence that reflects an institution’s ability to meet the expectations as defined by the essential Diagnostic Review Standards, which are a subset of the Cognia Performance Standards. These standards define the elements of quality that research indicates are present in an institution that is continuously improving. The standards provide the guideposts to becoming a better institution. The Diagnostic Review Team applies a four-level rubric to determine the degree to which the institution

demonstrates effective practices that reflect the expectations of each standard. The rubric scale is designed to indicate the current performance of the institution. The Diagnostic Review Team's findings and the rubric for each standard are in this report's appendix.

## Insights from the Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the processes, programs and practices within the institution to arrive at the findings of the team. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

### **Strengths and Continuous Improvement:**

The principal has held this position since the 2024-2025 school year. This is the current principal's first principalship after serving for 16 years as an assistant principal in other comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) schools. Many members of the leadership team, including the principal, two assistant principals, a counselor, a family resource center (FRC) coordinator, an academic instructional coach (AIC), two interventionists, a school administrative manager (SAM) and an exceptional child education (ECE) instructional coach are new to their roles and have one to three years of experience.

District interviews indicated that the principal faced a major challenge in staff retention during her first year. She began the 2024-2025 school year tasked with filling 32 vacancies. This district-supported focus was a strategic necessity designed to stabilize the environment and improve staff recruitment and retention. With 14 of the 21 homeroom teachers in their first year of practice and three possessing more than six years of experience, the principal's initial tenure prioritized school culture and climate. The administrative team provided critical context and documents (e.g., "Staff Handbook", the school's "Internal Site") about expectations, procedures and protocols established to address culture and climate. In 2025-2026, 83% of the staff returned.

The Diagnostic Review Team observed that the "Rangeland Non-negotiables" were often visible. These non-negotiables include the following: "Everyone will use kind words and a friendly tone toward staff and students at all times.", "Expectations will be explicitly taught, practiced with feedback and reinforced throughout the day.", "Adults will maintain professionalism at all times, refraining from engaging in power struggles, arguing with students or yelling.", "Staff will work to de-escalate students and return them to their learning environment as soon as peacefully possible." and "We will support each other as a team and work collaboratively, encourage, assume value and show grace."

Survey results indicated that 66% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)." However, family and educator perceptions were higher, as 92% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that the adults "make us feel welcomed (1)" and "treat us with respect (2)." Eighty-two percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)", and 90% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)."

The principal's overview presentation indicated that work on the mission and vision was completed during the 2024-2025 school year. Evidence of this work was further supported by stakeholder interviews and documented through the "Mission Vision-SOY 2024" and "Developing Mission Vision BOY 24-25." The principal stated that the school's improvement priorities from 2018 helped inform the mission and vision work. The school motto, provided in both English and Spanish, due to 62% of the student body being Spanish speakers, is "Construyendo un Mundo Mas Amable", which translates to "Building a Kinder World." The school provided evidence, such as behavioral resources, counseling support, social and emotional learning resources, common area multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) and the "Start of A Year Walkthrough Tool," that focused on the culture of learning. Additionally, an "Equity Plan" focused on hiring more diverse staff to reflect the student population.



Throughout the visit, the Diagnostic Review Team observed behavioral protocols in practice. The MTSS process for addressing discipline was observed to be functional in many classrooms. Interview data and a review of student behavioral data provided insight into how student behavior is tracked. The school's approach to discipline is proactive, strategic and visible in many classrooms. Observational data revealed that learners who "speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)" were evident/very evident in 88% of classrooms. Additionally, learners who "demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)" were evident/very evident in 72% of classrooms, and learners who "transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)" were evident/very evident in 60% of classrooms, suggesting there is still some work to be done in maximizing instructional opportunities.

In support of the school's attendance goal of 95%, data are displayed in the hallways above each classroom door, highlighting the school/student attendance. Based on the evidence provided, student attendance for the 2024-2025 school year ranged between 92% to 93% each month. In the first four months of the current school year, the school has maintained a monthly student attendance rate above 94%. The school has several staff members who are charged with addressing social-emotional learning needs and behavior goals, including a counselor, two mental health practitioners and at least two interventionists. The school provided artifacts demonstrating the data used to track behavior concerns and the master schedule that revealed the time dedicated each day for classrooms to complete "Character Strong," which is the social-emotional learning program adopted by the school.

The leadership team provided a 2024-2025 30-60-90 day plan that outlined school leadership's monitoring of the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP), budgets, turnaround plan and MTSS plan to ensure alignment to priority systems and structures. The 30-60-90 day plan suggested the use of Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) reviews for assessing improvement plans, monitoring and guiding adjustments and clearly identifying and communicating roles and responsibilities for all staff. Evidence did not substantiate that the plan had been implemented with fidelity or updated for the 2025-2026 school year.

The Diagnostic Review Team observed that some aspects of continuous improvement work were underway, but the team found little evidence that the school's CSIP is driving the work. Minimal evidence was found of the leadership team's intentional process for developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring and adjusting processes and practices for continuous improvement. The principal reported that full integration of a continuous improvement process has been slow, due to her efforts to build the capacity of her inexperienced leadership team.

A review of artifacts and the principal's overview presentation indicated that the school uses a data wall for data reviews. However, stakeholder interviews revealed that the school inconsistently conducts systematic analyses of individual student data and trend data about learners' academic needs and the school's organizational effectiveness. Stakeholders reported that although there is a data wall, the school lacks a consistent process for analyzing data or using success metrics to adjust instruction based on the data analysis and feedback.

When asked how data inform instruction, most stakeholders cited Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) as their primary data source. Stakeholder interviews, a review of artifacts and classroom observations revealed limited use of formative assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction for students or to implement a fully functioning MTSS program to support academic intervention (e.g., screening, progress monitoring, a multi-level intervention system, data-based decision-making). During classroom observations, it was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)."

The school shared multiple artifacts (e.g., "Walkthrough Form Start of Year," "SOY Walkthrough Results," "Walkthrough Schedule," "Walkthrough Docs," "ELA Collab Walkthroughs") to provide evidence of walkthrough observations. The walkthrough observational instrument emphasized compliance and classroom management rather than instructional effectiveness. Additionally, stakeholder interviews revealed that walkthrough observations are infrequent and inconsistent, and teachers rarely receive actionable feedback that drives improvement.

The administrative team reported that a coaching schedule has been created and launched. Copies of coaching protocols and coaching logs were provided to the Diagnostic Review Team as artifacts. According to these artifacts, the principal, assistant principals and instructional coaches are responsible for supporting teachers through ongoing coaching and feedback cycles; however, stakeholder interviews revealed that coaching has not occurred in most classrooms and feedback has been minimal. Interviews suggested that a system for tracking coaching frequency is in place and revealed inconsistencies in coaching implementation. Interview data also indicate that the 30-second feedback protocol is used in coaching, but the team found little evidence that coaching conversations include a formal process for applying walkthrough observational data to address teacher learning gaps or identify action steps for improvement.

The Diagnostic Review Team observed teachers using Expeditionary Learning (EL) Education for English language arts (ELA) and Illustrative Math (IM) for math, both of which are high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs). Stakeholder interviews revealed that although many staff members experience difficulties with implementing the HQIRs, they have begun collaborating regularly with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) literacy coach. Additionally, the Educational Recovery (ER) staff provide support to the teachers to guide them through the internalization of instructional practices.

To exit CSI status, the school must improve and perform above the bottom 5% of Kentucky schools. Establishing strong, continuous improvement systems focused on the goals outlined in the school's CSIP will provide a much-needed roadmap to achieve them. Members of the administrative team should serve as lead learners by facilitating a consistent, effective professional learning community (PLC) meeting framework. This work, when paired with intentional coaching and feedback cycles, can support instructional decisions that address students' individual educational needs, helping the school work towards the required student progress scores to satisfy the current exit criteria.

# 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 25 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	1.2	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	76%	24%	0%	0%
A2	2.9	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	4%	20%	60%	16%
A3	3.0	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	4%	12%	64%	20%
A4	1.8	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.	56%	16%	24%	4%

**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	1.8	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	28%	60%	12%	0%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	16%	72%	12%	0%
B3	1.3	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	68%	32%	0%	0%
B4	1.6	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	48%	40%	12%	0%
B5	1.8	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	36%	48%	16%	0%

**Overall rating on a 4-point scale: 1.7**

## C. Supportive Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.3	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	20%	36%	40%	4%
C2	2.1	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	16%	56%	28%	0%
C3	2.2	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	16%	48%	36%	0%
C4	2.6	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	12%	28%	52%	8%

**Overall rating on a 4-point scale: 2.3**



### D. Active Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.8	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	28%	60%	12%	0%
D2	1.6	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	52%	32%	16%	0%
D3	2.0	Learners are actively engaged in learning activities.	16%	68%	16%	0%
D4	1.4	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	64%	28%	8%	0%

**Overall rating on a 4-point scale: 1.7**

### E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.3	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	72%	24%	4%	0%
E2	1.7	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	44%	44%	12%	0%
E3	1.7	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	40%	48%	12%	0%
E4	1.2	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	80%	16%	4%	0%

**Overall rating on a 4-point scale: 1.5**



## F. Well-Managed Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.0	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	12%	72%	16%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	28%	60%	12%
F3	2.6	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	4%	36%	56%	4%
F4	2.4	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	8%	48%	40%	4%

**Overall rating on a 4-point scale: 2.7**

## G. Digital Learning Environment

Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	76%	24%	0%	0%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	92%	8%	0%	0%
G3	2.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	96%	4%	0%	0%

**Overall rating on a 4-point scale: 1.4**

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team identified strengths during observations of classrooms and common areas. Overall, the interactions observed between students and teachers were respectful and positive. Classroom observational



data, for example, showed it was evident/very evident in 84% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” Additionally, 67% of students surveyed agreed/absolutely agreed that “adults treat us with respect (2).” Stakeholder interviews revealed positive changes in the school’s climate and culture; however, staff and students were inconsistently observed engaging in positive interactions. Observational data also suggest there is more work to do, as it was evident/very evident in 60% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” Further, it was evident/very evident in 88% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).”

Survey data revealed that 87% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that their child “had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)”, however, 54% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “lessons were changed to meet my needs (13).” Instruction was most often observed as whole-group and teacher-led, as it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” The team observed few instances of student collaboration, either with or without technology, as it was evident/very evident in 8% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)”, and evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).”

Evidence from observations revealed students were often engaged in tasks with low levels of rigor. Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)”, and it was also evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” This reveals a gap in rigor, as most students are not consistently exposed to cognitively demanding tasks.

The Diagnostic Review Team observed that students in many classrooms complied with behavioral expectations. It was evident/very evident in 72% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” Conversely, it was evident/very evident in 44% of classrooms that students “use class time with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).” Classroom observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 44% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1).” This observational data indicates more work is needed to build a sense of community in classrooms and maximize instructional opportunities.

Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that “learners actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” Survey data was higher than observational data, as 64% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the last 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12)”, 79% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we uphold high expectations for learning (12)”, and 65% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1).” This observational and survey data identify a need for professional learning and coaching to support educators in providing an engaging learning environment where all learners thrive.

Students were seldom observed completing meaningful tasks with digital devices. The Digital Learning Environment received the lowest overall average rating of 1.4 on a 4-point scale. In 0% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that learners use digital tools/technology to “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)” and “gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).”

# 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 continuous improvement systems (e.g., walkthroughs, feedback, coaching, PLCs, MTSS) to use data effectively, support teachers, strengthen instructional practices and raise rigor and engagement.

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

### Findings:

While the school has established a robust Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), comprised of grade-level leaders, assistant principals, the Academic Instructional Coach (AIC), a resource teacher, the MTSS implementation coach and the Family Resource Center (FRC) coordinator, as well as various walkthrough tools, these components have not been integrated into a functional continuous improvement cycle. The inconsistent application of monitoring tools has led to a lack of clarity around instructional expectations, as the current walkthrough tool is largely compliance focused. Because this data collection lacks specific instructional coaching cues, it fails to provide the targeted feedback needed to improve classroom practice. This disconnect in the improvement cycle is further evidenced by the "30-Second Feedback" coaching strategy, which, despite its positive intent, lacks the systematic tracking required to document and sustain instructional growth. This disconnect was also reflected in the level of classroom rigor the Diagnostic Review Team observed, as it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)."

Furthermore, this disconnect between the school's strategic goals identified in its CSIP and the daily execution of these goals highlights a breakdown in the implementation and monitoring phase of the continuous improvement process. To bridge the gap between these planned goals and daily classroom execution, it is essential for the principal to be a visible presence, guiding the implementation of the continuous improvement process. Although the CSIP commits to an individualized data system and stakeholder interviews revealed that a physical data wall exists, these artifacts are not currently driving a cyclical approach to differentiated instruction. This absence of a formal, explicit protocol is reflected in observational data, as it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." While survey data indicated strong educator and family buy-in, as 79% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", and 90% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults are committed to trying new things to improve the school (6)." The lack of a consistent, data-driven PLC process prevents the school from using findings to address student needs in real time. This systematic gap is critical given that 2024-2025 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) student achievement data showed that the percentage of students performing at the Proficient/Distinguished level was below the state average across all grade and subject areas. For example, in 2024-2025, 15% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, compared to the state average of 47%, 10% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, compared to the state average of 50% and 13% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, compared to the state average of 50%. To raise rigor and engagement, the school must transition from isolated activities to a documented, continuous-improvement system in which walkthroughs and PLCs function as a unified loop of monitoring and support.



**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Develop a PLC protocol that includes expectations for data analysis to identify the unique needs of individual learners.
- Analyze formative and summative performance data and use findings about the individual learning needs of students to plan for Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.
- Refine and align the school's walkthrough observation and coaching systems to ensure current and trend data are collected to identify and support the unique needs of each teacher.
- Demonstrate leadership as a "lead learner" by being accessible and visible throughout the building and holding all members of the staff accountable for implementation and monitoring of the school's continuous improvement efforts.
- Engage stakeholders in professional learning that builds the capacity of school leadership team members to provide feedback and coaching that addresses the individual needs of each teacher.



## Improvement Priority 2

Continue to implement and monitor a system to support professional staff in reviewing and adjusting the adopted HQIRs to ensure alignment with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) so that rigorous instruction assures alignment, relevancy and inclusiveness for all learners.

**Standard 12:** Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy, inclusion and effectiveness.

### Findings:

The Two-Day Review conducted in the 2024-2025 school year indicated that the district adopted HQIRs for reading and math and provided pacing guides for implementation. While PLC time is dedicated to deconstructing learning targets, stakeholder interviews revealed that teachers continue to struggle to align HQIRs with the KAS and fully grasp the required depth and rigor of grade-level expectations. The Diagnostic Review Team observed that teachers lack clarity and need to prioritize Improvement Priority 2.

The administrative team outlined in the CSIP that the ILT regularly reviews the curriculum implementation framework to assess and reflect on the current status of implementation of district-adopted HQIRs. The school leadership team reported that since the 2024-2025 Two-Day Review, the team began developing a process to support continuous improvement (e.g., a master schedule with built-in collaboration time). They also reported that the school leadership team has been engaged in the instructional process to drive continuous improvement (e.g., classroom walkthroughs and a coaching schedule). However, feedback on walkthroughs primarily focused on positive comments (e.g., 30-second feedback protocol) or compliance with expectations. The team recommends that teachers receive constructive feedback on the use of high-yield instructional practices, differentiation and student engagement in all classrooms. The Diagnostic Review Team found that the school lacked a fully implemented continuous improvement system to ensure effective instruction and improve student outcomes. Although the 30-60-90 day plan was started during the 2024-2025 school year to guide the work outlined in the CSIP, there was little evidence of the continuation of this process in the 2025-2026 school year.

According to stakeholder survey data, 75% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8)”, and 87% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15).” Conversely, 54% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” Moreover, observational data revealed instruction was mostly whole-group and teacher-led, as it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Classroom observations and stakeholder interviews indicate a need to support teachers in this work. Observational data showed a lack of strong Tier 1 instruction, underscoring the need to deepen teachers' clarity on HQIRs and high-yield instructional practices that drive student engagement and raise expectations for all students.

A review of artifacts demonstrates a documented PLC protocol and schedule. Some stakeholders said PLCs currently use the Dufour questions, with the current focus on “What do we want students to know and be able to do?” Interview data suggested that some teachers respond to this question by deconstructing learning targets into student-friendly language that frames the lesson's expectations. However, some agendas reviewed by the team indicated that most PLCs are informational meetings rather than time to plan instruction or analyze student work and data. Classroom observational data revealed that learners who “strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” were evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms. This data supports the need to reestablish the PLC's purpose and shift to a systematic analysis of student data, which in turn drives instructional decisions and adjustments to support student progress.

The Diagnostic Review Team was provided with a coaching plan; however, interviews revealed that the coaching process was not consistently implemented as planned. Tiered and tailored coaching to meet teachers' needs occurs inconsistently. Furthermore, interviews revealed a need to revise the coaching process to include guided



planning to support teachers' efficacy in internalizing the adopted HQIRs, ensuring alignment among HQIRs, KAS and modeling strategies that promote student engagement.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Ensure a guided planning process is in place to support HQIR implementation, unit/lesson internalization and standards alignment to ensure that all students are receiving high-quality instruction.
- Develop and implement PDSA cycles to monitor the effectiveness of curriculum implementation and identify the needed adjustments to instruction.
- Refine the current professional learning plan to address both the individual and collective needs of all certified staff members to build capacity and maximize instructional effectiveness.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of core instruction based on the analysis of formative and summative assessment data to ensure individual learners' needs are being met.

## 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 requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

The principal has worked diligently to develop and document a variety of systems (i.e., walkthrough, MTSS behavior, tiered attendance, PLCs) within the school. Additionally, the principal has developed an administrative team consisting of the two assistant principals, the guidance counselor, academic improvement coach (AIC), the exceptional child education implementation coach and student administrative manager. Further, she has established an instructional leadership team consisting of grade-level leaders, the assistant principals, AIC, a resource teacher, the MTSS implementation coach and the family resource center coordinator. These teams meet regularly to review data, disseminate information and develop plans to address needed issues and areas of concern within the school.

The principal has communicated an expectation for leadership members to monitor many systems within the school and has established protected time to allow the administration opportunities to fulfill those expectations. The leadership has utilized numerous plus/deltas to gather input regarding activities and initiatives occurring at the school. The principal has successfully implemented a tiered attendance system and an MTSS behavior system as evident by improved student behavior and attendance in her short tenure. The school uses digital technology for a data wall (to document student assessment data on the KSA and the MAP benchmark assessment), coaching logs, classroom management plans.

While the principal has developed many systems to address school needs and continuous improvement, the review team observed a lack of coherence among systems to guide school improvement and little evidence to support the existence of a coherent, well-monitored MTSS structure to support student academic needs. Although many systems have been developed, leadership should receive support to establish a clear protocol and a continuous improvement approach to all systems. The team noted the walkthrough system captures some



instructional elements and expectations, but additional support is needed to develop a process to document individual teachers' needs and opportunities to build capacity with the staff.

The principal has established a PLC system to support curriculum planning and data analysis; however, many stakeholder interviews and a review of the evidence revealed most of the PLC meetings focused on the internalization process and dissemination of information. Moreover, the analysis of student performance data lacks depth and rarely results in adjustments to instructional practices or improved student academic achievement.

Stakeholder and principal interviews and a review of the artifacts suggest most systems lack implementation and accountability by those responsible for monitoring and adjusting those systems. Lastly, the team recognizes the principal has a strong desire to learn and grow as an instructional leader; however, evidence suggests the principal should seek support in developing processes to ensure all systems are fully implemented, all staff members are held accountable for systems implementation and the coaching and feedback system is utilized to build capacity of all certified staff members.

# 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
<b>Lateshia Woodley</b>	Lateshia Woodley has over 20 years of experience in education. She was an alternative school student and has dedicated her life to working with promise students and school transformation initiatives. Lateshia has been a teacher, school counselor, school improvement specialist, assistant principal, principal and assistant superintendent. Since 2008, she has worked as a turnaround leader, driving positive changes in some of the lowest-performing schools. She is an international presenter, award-winning author, Technology, Entertainment, Design (TEDX) featured presenter, an Education Week Leader to Learn From and a self-proclaimed lead dream builder.
<b>Tim Huddleston</b>	Tim Huddleston is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the KDE, assisting targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools. He also has experience supervising university students. With 33 years in education across elementary to collegiate levels, Tim has held roles as a classroom teacher, assistant principal, principal, university supervisor and school improvement specialist. For the past decade, he has coached school improvement efforts at both the school and district levels, bringing extensive expertise in data analysis, curriculum, instruction, assessment and school turnaround systems.
<b>Juett Wells</b>	Juett Wells has over 10 years of experience as a Continuous Improvement Coach for KDE. This position provides continuous improvement support within the Key Core Work Processes to multiple districts and schools across the state. She has 24 years of experience as an educator and was formerly an elementary school teacher.
<b>Sara Woodford</b>	Sarah Woodford has over 23 years of experience as an elementary school educator. She has served as a classroom teacher, a gifted/talented teacher, a curriculum coach and a principal. She is in year 14 as head principal.

# Appendix

## Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

### Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
3. Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.	Leaders establish conditions that rarely result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders seldom collaborate with stakeholders. Institutions choose areas of focus that are rarely based on data about learners.	Leaders establish conditions that occasionally result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus that are sometimes based on data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that regularly result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders routinely collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that consistently result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders consistently collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions implement a formal process to choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	1
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.	2

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

## Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

A good institution ensures that learners are engaged in the learning environment. Learners who are engaged in the learning environment participate with confidence and display agency over their own learning. A good institution adopts policies and engages in practices that support all learners being included in the learning process.

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
17. Learners have the support and opportunities to realize their learning potential.	Professional staff members give little or no consideration to individual learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Academic and non-academic opportunities are limited and standardized according to grade levels or a predetermined sequencing of courses. Learners frequently encounter a variety of barriers when accessing academic and non-academic offerings that would be well-suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are rarely challenged to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members consider varying learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access to some variety in academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners may encounter barriers when accessing some academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are sometimes challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members know their learners well-enough to develop and provide a variety of academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access and choice in most academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners rarely encounter barriers when accessing academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members develop relationships with and understand the needs and well-being of individual learners. Academic and non-academic experiences are tailored to the needs and well-being of individual learners. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards maximal levels of achievement and self-efficacy without barriers or hindrances by schedules or access to academic and non-academic offerings.	1
18. Learners are immersed in an environment that fosters lifelong skills including creativity, curiosity, risk taking, collaboration, and design thinking.	Learners engage in environments that focus primarily on academic learning objectives only. Little or no emphasis is placed on non-academic skills important for next steps in learning and for future success. Learning experiences rarely build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration or design-thinking.	Conditions within some aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in some experiences that develop non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Some learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions within most aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Collectively, the learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions across all aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in ongoing experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. A formal structure ensures that learning experiences collectively build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	2

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
21. Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices.	Instructional activities are primarily designed around curriculum objectives with little or no focus on learner needs and interests. Professional staff members rarely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their individual potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on needs and interests typical of most students. Professional staff members infrequently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Most learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members routinely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members consistently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	1
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	1

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
26. Leaders regularly evaluate instructional programs and organizational conditions to improve instruction and advance learning.	Leaders rarely implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders seldom use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders occasionally implement a process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders sometimes use data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders routinely implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use analyzed current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	Leaders consistently implement a documented process to determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum and instruction, including staffing and resources. Leaders use a formal, systematic process for analyzing current and trend data and stakeholder input to make decisions about retaining, changing, or replacing programs and practices.	2
27. Learners' academic and non-academic needs are identified and effectively addressed through appropriate interventions.	The Institution rarely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are seldom planned and implemented based on information, data, or instructional best practices.	The Institution sometimes addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are occasionally planned and implemented based on information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution routinely addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are regularly planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	The Institution consistently addresses the range of developmental, physical, emotional, and intellectual needs to support learners' ability to learn. Strategies and interventions for these needs are formally and systematically planned and implemented based on analyzed information, data, and instructional best practices to ensure learners' success.	2
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	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.	2
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	2
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	1

# Student Performance Data

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

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	25	46	20	47	15	47
4th-Grade Reading	17	48	24	50	10	50
5th-Grade Reading	13	48	*	46	13	50
3rd-Grade Math	28	43	12	43	11	43
4th-Grade Math	10	42	18	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	*	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	15	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	9	42	*	39	10	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	*	47	7	47	*	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	9	39	*	39	*	38

### Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in mathematics increased from 10% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.

### Delta

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 in 3rd- and 4th-grade reading and in 3rd-grade math.
- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 3rd- and 4th-grade reading and 3rd-grade math was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 5th-grade reading and social studies was below the state average in 2022-2023 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 4th-grade math was below the state average in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.

## Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	35	26	31	29	43	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	28	35	44	35	35	35
Percent Score of 100	26	24	16	23	16	22
Percent Score of 140	11	14	9	13	6	13

### Plus

- The percentage of EL students who received 100 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment was above the state average in 2022-2023.

### Delta

- The percentage of EL students who received 0 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was above the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 100 points for progress was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of EL students who received 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was below the state average in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	25	20	15
Female	21	18	18
Male	27	22	12
White	*	40	45
African American	29	*	9
Hispanic or Latino	22	21	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	25	21	*
English Learners plus Monitored	25	21	7
Economically Disadvantaged	23	17	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- The percentage of 3rd-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 40% in 2023-2024 to 45% in 2024-2025.

**Delta**

- The percentage of 3rd-grade female, male, African American, economically disadvantaged, ELs and ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	28	12	11
Female	*	15	*
Male	32	*	12
White	*	*	*
African American	26	*	7
Hispanic or Latino	*	13	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	15	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	15	*
Economically Disadvantaged		10	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

#### Plus

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

#### Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male, African American and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined in math from the 2022-2023 to the 2024-2025 school year on the KSA.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	17	24	10
Female	*	14	13
Male	21	30	*
White	29	*	*
African American	21	24	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	23	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	7
English Learners plus Monitored	*	23	9
Economically Disadvantaged	14	22	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade male, African American, economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

### Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female and ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.



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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	10	18	*
Female	*	7	*
Male	12	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	18	15	*
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	*	27	*
Economically Disadvantaged	8	17	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged and all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024 on the KSA.

**Delta**

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

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	15	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	15	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	18	*
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	*	17	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	14	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade African American and EL plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished was higher than the percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring in science in 2023-2024 on the KSA.

### Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 14% in 2023-2024 on the KSA.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	13	*	13
Female	12	*	*
Male	15	*	15
White	*	*	*
African American	10	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	13
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	11
Economically Disadvantaged	11	*	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 13% in 2022-2023 and 2024-2025 on the KSA.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 on the KSA.

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

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

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	9	*	10
Female	8	*	*
Male	*	*	13
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	7	*	11
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of economically disadvantaged and all students in grade 5 scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

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

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	*	7	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	7	*
White	*	15	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 7% in 2023-2024 on the KSA.
- The percentage of male 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 7% in 2023-2024 on the KSA.

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

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	9	*	*
Female	12	*	*
Male	*	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	9	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 9% in 2022-2023 on the KSA.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 9% in 2022-2023 on the KSA.

# Schedule

## Tuesday, January 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
4:45 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, January 21, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:40 a.m. – 5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, January 22, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:45 a.m. – 4:20 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 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, January 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9:30 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

