



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Russell Cave Elementary School**

Jan. 20-23, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	6
eleot Narrative	9
Improvement Priorities	11
Improvement Priority 1	11
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Improvement Priority 2	13
Potential Leader Actions:.....	14
Your Next Steps	14
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	16
Team Roster	18
Appendix	19
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	21
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	23
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	25
Student Performance Data.....	29
Schedule	41

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	2
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	6
Certified Staff	22
Noncertified Staff	3
Students	7
Parents	5
Total	46

Performance Standards Evaluation

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

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

Insights from the Review

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

Strengths and Continuous Improvement:

The Diagnostic Review Team identified strengths at Russell Cave Elementary School through the review of multiple data points, including stakeholder surveys and interviews, classroom observations and a review of documents and artifacts provided by the school. Based on a thorough review of these data, the Diagnostic Review Team found that the school has made significant improvements in organizational culture over the past two years. This theme was consistently confirmed throughout stakeholder interviews.

The team noted stakeholders attributed the implementation of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) to the decrease in office referrals, as highlighted in the principal overview presentation. The number of Tier 1 classroom Level 3 behavior referrals decreased from 133 in 2023-2024 to 56 in 2024-2025. Further evidence of the positive trend appears in the "Quality of School Climate and Safety" survey, which showed the school's index improved from 67.9 in 2024 to 73.3 in 2025. This increase moved the school from an Orange rating to a Yellow rating. According to the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) data, the school's index was 76 in 2023-2024 (Orange) and decreased to 75.6 in 2024-2025 (Yellow), indicating that the index decreased even though the rating color improved.

Interview and stakeholder survey data revealed that parents and staff members believe the institutional culture has improved significantly over the past two years. For example, survey data indicated when educators were asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?", 78% selected "welcoming", 80% selected "respectful", 71% selected "safe" and 78% selected "warm." Family surveys echoed these top descriptors. When families were asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?", 81% selected "welcoming", 91% selected "respectful" and 81% selected "safe." Similarly, when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?", 76% of students selected "safe" and 72% selected "friendly."

Many staff members commented that prior to these changes, student behavior had been so unruly that teaching and learning took a back seat to classroom management. Now that classes are organized and the culture drives the experience, the school is prepared to take the next step in improving teaching and learning.

Another identified strength and evidence of improved culture involved leadership opportunities for staff. Many staff referenced the "Guiding Coalition" (i.e., administration, instructional leaders, counselors, instructional coaches, support staff) and its impact on problem-solving across the organization as a factor in the improved culture. Many members were interviewed and expressed that opportunities to make an impact on the school contributed to their professional growth and confidence in the school's capacity to improve. Interview feedback indicated the team is still determining data points and how to gauge where the school needs to go based on those decisions. Several interviews suggested that the Guiding Coalition has yet to harness its full potential, but stakeholders expressed hopefulness about the future of the school and the Guiding Coalition's involvement in creating a positive future experience.

Administrators, instructional coaches and educators reported that multiple data sets are shared in meetings with both administration and instructional staff. The school provided the Diagnostic Review Team with many data sets and several meeting agendas and minutes, demonstrating that the school leadership and grade-level teams



review multiple data points during professional learning team (PLT) and leadership meetings, including meetings with the principal, assistant principal and instructional coaches. While multiple data sources were shared, consistent analysis and use of data to inform program evaluation and instructional decision-making to meet individual student needs remain areas for growth.

The team found that the district delivered resources equally, as the school has the same resources as all other district schools. However, several stakeholder groups noted that the support provided to the school is not aligned with the needs of this school's student population.

Each homeroom teacher received a "Benchmark Advanced" teacher manual and one set of "Benchmark Express!" student texts. Interview data revealed that educators recognized the need for additional student text copies and "Benchmark Express!" teacher manuals and training for using these specific resources to adequately meet the needs of a student population, including 70% English learners (ELs) in small groups.

Through interviews with school and district staff, the team determined that the district had many resources and additional support available and provided these upon request. However, interview data revealed that many educators and administrators may not be aware of the resources or the processes to request what is needed to meet the unique needs of students and educators within this context.

Given that the principal leads a school with a diverse student population, the Diagnostic Review Team identified a growth opportunity for the principal to seek assistance from the district to understand what materials are available, how to properly request available resources and methods to pursue additional professional learning on advocating for the school to receive support as appropriate. Additionally, the Diagnostic Review Team recognized an opportunity for the district to develop processes to provide guidance and proactively support the school to ensure resources are differentiated and effectively allocated to meet the school's unique needs.

In relation to the school's continuous improvement journey, the school has not fully addressed the previous improvement priorities listed in the 2024 Two-Day Review Report. From the 2024 Two-Day Review, the previous team determined for Improvement Priority (IP) 1 that the school should refine the current coaching and feedback system to provide immediate feedback to teachers and analyze and use individual teacher trend data to provide professional learning to increase instructional rigor, student collaboration and engagement and overall teacher efficacy.

While professional learning is occurring at the school, the Diagnostic Review Team found little evidence from teacher interviews that teacher trend data are used to inform appropriate professional learning opportunities. The team examined examples provided in teacher feedback and PLT meeting agendas that illustrated a firm grasp on engagement and student collaboration, as seen in the 2024 School IP 2, which suggested the school develop, implement and monitor instructional strategies that engage students in rigorous and collaborative learning experiences. IP 2 from 2024 also suggested these experiences should engage students in speaking, listening, reading and writing in all content areas.

While the school created a system of meeting the basics of the 2024 IP 2, those efforts were inconsistently aligned with student academic outcomes and teachers' professional learning implementation.

From the "Comprehensive School Improvement Plan 2025-2026," the school identified creating a school-wide vocabulary as an activity aligned with the strategy of refining the current coaching and feedback system to provide immediate feedback for teachers. Additionally, they identified implementation of a new coaching and feedback system as a method to develop, implement and monitor instructional strategies that engage students in rigorous and collaborative learning experiences. Although the "25-26 Coaching Cohort Plan (Tiered Coaching)" and "RCE (Russell Cave Elementary) Walkthrough Tool" revealed that teachers were identified for levels of coaching support, few teachers and administrators could describe how coaching support had been provided and differentiated.



Despite numerous defined priorities, ranging from state and district mandates to internal goals, the school lacks a cohesive framework. These goals are not aligned, resulting in initiatives that operate in silos rather than supporting cross-functional student outcomes.

According to “Instructional Priorities 25-26,” multiple strategies were listed for implementation in reading, math and EL initiatives, including “Restate Answer Cite Evidence (R.A.C.E.)”, “sentence frames”, “accountable talk stem”, “Lesson internalization”, “i-Ready Assessment Suite Discourse Cards” (i.e., academic vocabulary), “Doctor Dickey’s strategies” and “ELlevation Strategies.” Additionally, the “Russell Cave Elementary 2025-2026 Acceleration Plan” listed the creation of a “Learning Behavior Disabilities (LBD) Implementation and Fidelity Plan” as a commitment between November and December. The school’s “Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) for 2025-2026” cited sending teachers to conferences to learn new high-yield instructional strategies. Across these plans, numerous strategies have been identified with a few goals established, but the team found little evidence showing purposeful alignment of these plans within the school.

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

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.5	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	61%	32%	3%	3%
A2	3.0	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	3%	19%	48%	29%
A3	3.2	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	3%	13%	48%	35%
A4	1.7	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.	55%	26%	16%	3%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.3				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.5	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	3%	45%	45%	6%
B2	2.7	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	3%	29%	58%	10%
B3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	39%	45%	16%	0%
B4	2.4	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	13%	42%	35%	10%
B5	2.4	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	10%	52%	32%	6%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.4			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.9	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	0%	32%	42%	26%
C2	2.8	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	0%	42%	35%	23%
C3	3.0	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	23%	58%	19%
C4	3.0	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	23%	52%	26%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.9			



D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.8	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	0%	32%	55%	13%
D2	2.0	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	26%	52%	19%	3%
D3	2.7	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	0%	39%	48%	13%
D4	2.3	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	19%	32%	45%	3%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.6	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	52%	39%	10%	0%
E2	2.8	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	0%	39%	45%	16%
E3	2.5	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	6%	52%	32%	10%
E4	1.7	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	52%	32%	13%	3%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.1			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.2	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	13%	55%	32%
F2	3.1	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	13%	68%	19%
F3	3.0	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	6%	16%	52%	26%
F4	3.0	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	0%	26%	45%	29%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			3.1			

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.	81%	19%	0%	0%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	94%	0%	6%	0%
G3	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	87%	10%	3%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 31 formal observations in core content classrooms and additional informal observations of small groups, such as ELs in classes with 10 or more students. The school had a Two-day Review on Jan. 30 – Feb. 1, 2024. Observational data from the Jan. 20-23, 2026, Diagnostic Review reflected growth in 20 of the 28 indicators across all seven learning environments compared to the previous Two-day Review.

Indicators with the greatest improvement were in High Expectations, Active and Well-Managed learning environments. For example, instances in which “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but

attainable (B2)” were evident/very evident in 33% of classrooms in 2024 and evident/very evident in 68% of classrooms in 2026. Additionally, instances in which “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and the teacher predominate (D1)” were evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms in 2024 and in 68% of classrooms in 2026. The team noted a gain where “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)” grew from evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms at the Two-day Review to 48% during the current Diagnostic Review. Instances in which “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)” expanded from evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms in 2024 to 74% in 2026.

Current observational data revealed several strengths. The Diagnostic Review Team observed that classroom management and relational climate remain strong and consistent, establishing a safe, respectful and well-managed learning environment. Observations revealed that a solid foundation for learning exists as evidenced by classrooms with respectful interactions, efficient transitions and positive teacher-student relationships. For example, it was evident/very evident in 87% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)” and “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 83% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” Interview data aligned with observations, as teachers with more than three years of service at the school indicated that students’ behavior has improved. Educators attributed behavioral improvements to the consistent implementation of strategies included in the updated “PBIS Handbook 25-26.” This is further supported by the survey data, as 76% of educators selected “follow directions” and 98% selected “be engaged” when responding to the prompt, “What words or phrases best describe, in general, what educators in your institution consider to be the most important for learners (27)?” The student interview data support this idea, as students described teachers expecting them to be safe and to treat others with kindness.

Although the Diagnostic Review Team identified improvements in organizational culture, observational data suggested that instructional and academic culture stagnated and, in some areas, declined during the same period. While the team noted that the school mostly supported students, they are not consistently empowered to take ownership of their learning, rarely track their own progress, seldom understand the success criteria or infrequently use teacher feedback to improve learning. Students also have few opportunities to make real-world connections. For example, it was evident/very evident in 10% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” Also, it was evident/very evident in 16% of classrooms that “learners are able to describe high quality work (B3)” and “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Interview data revealed that students were seldom able to describe how they knew they were doing a good job on their assignments or determined how they could measure their own learning. Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 22% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)”, down from 58% in 2024. Many staff members reported that the required district curriculum was rigid and offered few opportunities to incorporate as many real-world connections as in previous years.

Finally, a concern for the Diagnostic Review Team was the use of data to design instruction that meets the needs of individual students or specific groups. For instance, it was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)”, dropping from 33% based on the 2024 observational data. Interview and observational data indicated inconsistent use of differentiation.

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

Empower teachers and build their capacity to analyze data from multiple sources and tailor instruction to address students' needs.

Standard 22: Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge of the curriculum.

Findings:

The school regularly collects and reviews data from multiple sources. Evidence of this practice can be found in "PLT meeting agendas" and notes, "Guiding Coalition meeting agendas" and interviews with school stakeholders. Data walls, charts and graphs throughout the school further demonstrate this focus. During interviews, students were able to articulate their recent assessment scores, including those from the i-Ready Assessment Suite.

The principal overview presentation highlighted a variety of data sets and demonstrated that the leadership team consistently reviewed assessment data from multiple academic sources, as well as school culture and safety data, to inform the development of action steps.

For instance, the principal overview presentation showed that the school needed to improve trend data, especially the number of students attaining Proficient/Distinguished in all content areas. The team found little evidence of trend analysis to identify emerging patterns and inform instructional decisions to meet students' needs.

There was little evidence of alignment between classroom strategies and identified areas of need in assessment data. Teacher interviews indicated that some PLTs review data at this level, but the practice is inconsistent across grade levels and content areas. The EL teachers provide strategies as part of the planning process, but teachers reported a disconnect between learners' needs identified in the data and the chosen instructional strategies. Additionally, interviews showed that some stakeholders report that the What I Need (WIN) schedule onsite was so rigid that teachers lacked flexibility and did not feel empowered to effectively reteach standards during this time.

Through staff interviews, the Diagnostic Review Team determined that interventionists support classroom teachers primarily by reviewing data to identify skills for teachers to address with students and, in some instances, for use by the instructional coaches in determining small group needs for each classroom. Many staff members expressed a need for additional support in effective EL practices and improved instructional strategies. While many teachers expressed gratitude to the interventionists and instructional coaches for their help, some requested more frequent, active coaching rather than support limited to small-group design.

Many examples of the data shared revealed a cursory review of the formative and summative assessment data, but the team found few instances of multiple data sets being synthesized in the same discussion. Interview data showed that some teachers recognized the need to incorporate achievement data from multiple sources and synthesize it to guide course mapping and instructional adjustments. Observational data support this, as it was evident/very evident in 45% of classrooms that "learners engaged in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)."

The data streams reviewed by staff indicated a segmented, siloed approach by the school leadership team. The school team reviews a data point, talks about it briefly in a meeting and then moves on to the next topic. No artifacts were provided that demonstrated a comprehensive view where staff synthesized assessment data from



multiple sources into a single location. The interview data showed some teachers or teams reviewed multiple sources together, but it was not a systemic practice across the school.

Interview data with staff demonstrated that the instructional model and integration of evaluation instruments are not consistently aligned with improvement priorities or instructional practice. The school's professional development did not consistently support staff in understanding how to effectively use data analysis to drive instructional change. The observational data support this, as it was evident/very evident in 6% of classes that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).”

The Diagnostic Review Team noted that staff members demonstrate a strong commitment to supporting students and delivering effective teaching and learning. Survey data show 78% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “we base our improvement efforts on learners’ needs (5)”, 85% agreed/absolutely agreed that “we use learner information to make decisions about distributing resources (7)”, 78% agreed/absolutely agreed that “we deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8)” and 86% agreed/absolutely agreed that “we follow a process to determine the support that learners need (10).” Finally, 66% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).”

The Diagnostic Review Team identified a strong foundational culture and staff commitment to supporting students, as school leadership continues to build teacher capacity to make instructional adjustments informed by triangulated data and research-based instructional strategies aligned to each student's specific needs.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Disaggregate data by subgroup to analyze trends and patterns that emerge for ELs and students with disabilities.
- Refine the data analysis protocol to include multiple data sources (e.g., student work, observations, formative data, subgroup trends) to help teachers identify and examine trends and patterns in students' needs across subgroups.
- Create and implement a process for teachers to determine how to adjust instruction based on student needs, supporting the prioritization of instructional strategies and the adjustment of schedules to meet students' needs.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional adjustments and develop next steps for teacher learning and coaching.

Improvement Priority 2

Establish and implement a professional learning system that equips staff and leaders with the skills and knowledge to meet the specific needs of students.

Standard 29: Understanding learners' needs and interests drives the design, delivery, application and evaluation of professional learning.

Findings:

IP 1, identified during the 2024 Two-day Review, was partially implemented through the professional learning enhancements, but the school's efforts have not fully demonstrated a measurable impact through a systemic approach to professional learning for all staff. While the school's leadership has improved the professional learning opportunities since the 2024 Two-Day Review, the team suggests that the school incorporate additional components related to instructional practices and academic outcomes.

The "Russell Cave PL Plan Template 2025-2026 (Professional Learning Plan)" continues to be an area for improvement for the school leadership team. The school lacks a meaningful and cohesive structure to assess and address the needs of the instructional staff.

Additionally, the Diagnostic Review Team found little evidence of a professional learning system or process to track the effectiveness of professional learning against student outcomes. The team was unable to confirm that school leadership had created a plan for professional learning based on the needs of the current instructional staff. Interview data with teachers and professional staff indicate that if a teacher finds professional learning opportunities that they believe they need, they are almost always provided with the funding and opportunity to attend. Furthermore, neither interview data nor artifact review demonstrated a thoughtful professional learning plan aligned to the needs of the school or the improvement priorities. Interview data indicated a lack of ongoing reviews or assessments regarding the effectiveness of professional development in improving professional practice.

Some staff referenced the need to restructure PLT meetings to review and implement more background knowledge on how EL students develop language skills. Interviews also showed a need for teachers to review the Accessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) data and connect their instruction with EL supports as designated in the high-quality instructional resources (HQIR). Interview data revealed EL teachers are comfortable with and viewed as effectively using the ELlevation platform; however, interviews also showed many staff members' desire more foundational literacy instruction delivered through small-group instruction on the ELlevation platform. Many staff members expressed willingness to participate in additional training and support related to EL instructional strategies and expressed a strong commitment to meeting the needs of this student population.

Additionally, core content teachers would benefit from a structured plan and process to meet the needs of their students. Staff interviews indicated the school lacked adequate EL classroom resources, as the EL material packages provided were designed for schools that enroll an average number of EL students. However, with a large number of EL learners at the school, teachers indicated they need additional EL materials to better support classroom instruction.

Furthermore, many parents stated a need for more communication from the school about how they can help their child learn. Parents also reported that they lacked the resources and support from the school regarding the instructional methods and processes. Finally, many parents expressed a desire for teachers to receive training in supporting parental learning.

The Diagnostic Review Team determined a disconnect between observational and interview data where "learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2)" was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms, but interview data suggested differently. Interview data indicated that while



educators have access to all of the same programs and tools as every other school in the district, Russell Cave Elementary School lacks the specific tools and support it needs to serve its unique population. Interview data indicated that, historically, all schools have received the same materials and support, with little internal differentiation. However, in many interviews, the team heard that when a school requests additional support from the district, it generally receives it. In addition, interview data indicated that the Fayette County Public Schools district provided a one-size-fits-all solution for schools, with minimal training in the first year as it was offered as a resource in the first year and as a requirement in the second year. Interview data indicated that content area certified staff members serving as classroom instructors generally agreed that the training was ineffective at helping them fully implement the instructional resource with fidelity. This was true for both the first year and the second year.

This is further evidenced by educator survey data where 78% agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “In the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22).” The difference between staff professional learning as it currently exists and the school needs described in IP 1 lies in the desire to align staff learning experiences and coaching sessions with the school's unique student needs, specifically by providing additional EL instructional strategies for all staff.

The team determined that while the principal and assistant principal have made effective changes to the organizational structure, additional training is needed to better support their instructional teams and align classroom instruction with learners' needs. The opportunity exists to include professional learning that is collaborative, problem-based and relevant to the needs of the students and staff.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Collaboratively create a profile of the knowledge and skills needed to serve the student population demographic.
- Evaluate all staff members' current background knowledge and skills for both analyzing multiple data sources and meeting instructional needs to determine areas for growth.
- Revise the professional learning plan based on areas for growth and define clear success indicators for a coherent professional learning series. This professional learning plan should include all relevant data sources (e.g., ACCESS, KSA, i-Ready Assessment Suite, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)).
- Ensure professional learning sessions include plans to support implementation of learning in the classroom through ongoing coaching, follow-up and support. Align professional learning, coaching and evaluation processes.
- Regularly monitor relevant data to demonstrate implementation of professional learning and collaboratively determine next steps for improvement.
- Learn to use data to support educators to review and adjust instruction for academic improvement.

Your Next Steps

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

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

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.
- Develop plans to address the Improvement Priorities identified by the Diagnostic Review Team.



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

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

- The team has chosen not to reflect on the principal's capacity to lead the school's turnaround efforts.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal requires intensive support in order to successfully lead the turnaround of the CSI school.
- It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school and should be reassigned to a comparable position in the district.

The principal has held the leadership position at Russell Cave Elementary School for two years. During his tenure, the principal has established a positive school climate and organizational culture. Most stakeholders expressed that the school felt welcoming and a place where students and staff want to be. Many stakeholders credit the principal for establishing the House system to promote school community and belonging as well as to foster positive relationships amongst students and staff.

One strength exhibited by the principal includes his work to establish structures to document clear behavior expectations for students and staff as documented in the "PBIS Handbook 2025-2026." It was very evident that students and staff adhere to these expectations as the "Conversation Help Activity Participation Success (CHAMPS)" protocol for classroom management was present in most classrooms. Most staff interacted with students in positive ways, set standards for classroom behavior and applied them fairly and consistently. While a guiding coalition has been established, a process for continuous improvement has not been implemented, monitored and evaluated for impact.

For the school to be successful, the principal needs support in meeting the academic needs of the school's unique population. The team saw evidence of the EL teachers supporting planning, co-teaching, leading professional learning and providing analyzed data. However, stakeholder interview data revealed a need for professional learning for all staff around instructional decision-making to meet the needs of students. A review of documentation revealed limited triangulation of data and interviews revealed the need for leadership to support teachers in data analysis. Additionally, the principal requires intensive support on how to lead data analysis with multiple sources of data including ACCESS data, i-Ready Assessment Suite data and MAP data to identify trends within subgroups of the student population (e.g., EL and students with disabilities).

Furthermore, the district should guide the principal with the development and implementation of a process for continuous improvement, including specific data sources to monitor implementation and impact. The team learned



that few stakeholders could speak to an ongoing, cyclical process the school utilized to identify needs, set clear focus, plan strategically, implement with fidelity, monitor to collect evidence, study results, reflect and adjust for improvement to support growth in student achievement. While multiple plans were created, there was a lack of evidence to show alignment amongst the plans. The principal requires support in aligning plans for improvement, as well as support and resources to ensure the needs of the student population at Russell Cave Elementary School are consistently met.

Finally, stakeholder interviews revealed limited opportunities for parents to participate in the school and a lack of communication around parents' needs and interests for supporting student learning. The principal should seek support and guidance from parents, teachers, support staff and the district on how to create a plan to re-engage families in supporting student learning and embed the plan into the continuous improvement process.



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
Chase Eskelsen	Chase Eskelsen began his educational career as an administrator at full-time online schools in Texas, where he supported the growth efforts of campuses serving grades 3-12 and helped create a strong operational foundation. Chase later worked on policy and public affairs for a national organization supporting online and blended schools. He went on to lead an education non-profit that launched hybrid school models. He currently owns a K-12 education firm, has launched two innovative campuses and currently serves as the Chairman of the Board.
Kanna Edison	Kanna Edison has 19 years of experience as an educator. She is currently in year nine as an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS) for the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). She taught high school math for seven years. Following her classroom experience, she served as a district instructional coach for three years, supporting Jefferson County middle and high schools with curriculum design, implementation and instructional coaching. In her current position, she supports schools by assisting with strategic planning, building sustainable systems and providing coaching for leaders.
Brandon Garrett	Brandon Garrett has over 30 years of experience in education and currently serves as the special education department chair and principal designee. Throughout his career in Letcher County, he has held a wide range of roles, including substitute teacher, high school teacher, ACT proctor, college professor, special education teacher, PLC team coordinator, special education due process auditor, special education department lead, principal designee and school principal. His professional experience includes curriculum design and implementation, special education due process and instructional coaching.
Shannon Gullett	Shannon L. Gullett is in year 29 as an educational leader, currently serving as the Educational Recovery Director (ERD) of the central region for KDE. She collaboratively supports CSI schools, including those CSI schools requiring more rigorous intervention (MRI), specifically district and school leaders, by developing the capacity to build sustainable systems that will drive a continuous improvement approach that focuses on student learning and achievement. In addition to her 11 years at KDE, Shannon's educational experience in Scott County has been as a middle school principal, curriculum coordinator, elementary teacher and school technology coordinator. During her 11 years as principal, the school was rated as Distinguished, named a National Middle School to Watch and was among the Top 20 middle schools in Kentucky. Shannon is an agency trainer for The Thinking Collaborative in Cognitive Coaching and Adaptive Schools cohorts in central Kentucky, as well as a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL), School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence (SIPPE) and Continuous Classroom Improvement (CCI).
Amy Stevens	Amy Stevens is in year 22 in education and year 11 serving as an Education Recovery Leader (ERL) for KDE, collaborating with federally identified schools in developing effective plans and curriculum based professional learning processes. She provides targeted support in curriculum implementation and literacy assessment. In addition to teaching high school English, Amy supported educators as a literacy coach, district writing resource teacher and high school reading specialist for KDE. Amy is also a certified Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) for Educators facilitator.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
17. Learners have the support and opportunities to realize their learning potential.	Professional staff members give little or no consideration to individual learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Academic and non-academic opportunities are limited and standardized according to grade levels or a predetermined sequencing of courses. Learners frequently encounter a variety of barriers when accessing academic and non-academic offerings that would be well-suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are rarely challenged to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members consider varying learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access to some variety in academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners may encounter barriers when accessing some academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are sometimes challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members know their learners well enough to develop and provide a variety of academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access and choice in most academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners rarely encounter barriers when accessing academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members develop relationships with and understand the needs and well-being of individual learners. Academic and non-academic experiences are tailored to the needs and well-being of individual learners. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards maximal levels of achievement and self-efficacy without barriers or hindrances by schedules or access to academic and non-academic offerings.	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.	1
25. Leaders promote action research by professional staff members to improve their practice and advance learning.	Leaders rarely create a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution or learning environments. Professional staff members seldom engage in action research to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in few or no learning opportunities for professional staff members about action research.	Leaders occasionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, sometimes engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in some learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders regularly create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, routinely engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders intentionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, consistently engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities customized for professional staff members about action research.	1

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

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

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	19	46	20	47	28	47
4th-Grade Reading	33	48	10	50	19	50
5th-Grade Reading	24	48	*	46	19	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	*	43	24	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	10	43	17	44
5th-Grade Math	21	41	17	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	7	34	14	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	*	42	*	39	4	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	*	47	*	47	8	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	10	38

Plus

- The percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus.

Delta

- The percentage of students in all grades and content areas scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 was below the state averages.

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	20	26	25	29	37	30
Percent Score of 60-80	31	35	27	35	34	35
Percent Score of 100	33	24	24	23	16	22
Percent Score of 140	16	14	23	13	13	13

Plus

- The school performed at the state average for ELs who received 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment in 2024-2025.
- The school exceeded the state average performance for ELs who received 140 points for progress on ACCESS assessment from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

Delta

- Thirty-seven percent of ELs received 0 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment in 2024-2025, compared to 30% of ELs at the state level.
- The percentage of ELs who received 0 points for progress increased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- Sixteen percent of ELs received 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment in 2024-2025, compared to 22% of ELs at the State level.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	19	20	28
Female	*	18	30
Male	23	25	26
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	27
Hispanic or Latino	*	23	24
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	18
English Learners plus Monitored	*	21	22
Economically Disadvantaged	*	25	27
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentages were not high enough to qualify for a plus.

Delta

- The percentage of students in 4th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 was below the state averages on the KSA reading assessment.
- The percentage of male students in 4th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 was below the state averages on the KSA reading assessment.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	24
Female	*	*	22
Male	*	*	26
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	21
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	15
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	19
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	23
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentages were not high enough to qualify for a plus.

Delta

- The percentage of all student subgroups in 3rd grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2024-2025 was below the state averages on the KSA reading assessment.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	33	10	19
Female	31	*	14
Male	*	12	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	43	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	40	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	31	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 33% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of Female 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	10	17
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	12	29
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	*	*	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math rose from 10% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of economically disadvantaged 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 13% in 2024-2025.

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

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

Plus

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science rose from 7% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of male 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science rose from 9% in 2023-2024 to 24% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade EL students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 7% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	24	*	19
Female	31	*	29
Male	18	*	15
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	17
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	15
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	19
Students with Disabilities with IEP	17	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	21	17	*
Female	*	13	*
Male	24	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	21	21	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	19	*
Economically Disadvantaged	18	17	*
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 math decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.

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	*	*	4
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	6
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	6
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	5
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 4% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 6% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of Hispanic or Latino 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies was 6% in 2024-2025.

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	*	*	8
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	12
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	6
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
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 editing and mechanics was 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of Hispanic or Latino 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics was 6% in 2024-2025.

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	*	*	10
Female	*	*	21
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	*	*	12
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 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 12% in 2024-2025.

Schedule

Tuesday, January 20, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, January 21, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:40 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3:30 p.m.-4 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, January 22, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3:30 p.m.-4 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4 p.m.-8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Friday, January 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m.-12 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members