



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:  
Rutherford Elementary**

Feb. 17-20, 2026

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....</b>	<b>5</b>
eleot Narrative.....	8
<b>Improvement Priorities .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	10
Potential Leader Actions:.....	11
Improvement Priority 2.....	12
Potential Leader Actions:.....	14
<b>Your Next Steps .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Team Roster.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings.....	18
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning .....	18
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning.....	20
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning .....	22
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....	24
Student Performance Data.....	27
Schedule.....	40

# Introduction

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

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

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

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

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	2
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	2
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	2
<b>Certified Staff</b>	56
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	2
<b>Students</b>	57
<b>Parents</b>	5
<b>Total</b>	126

## 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:**

Rutherford Elementary exhibits a culture of care, safety and belonging that is consistently experienced by students, families and educators. At Rutherford Elementary, students and families represent diverse cultures, rich lived experiences and a variety of home languages. Survey data revealed trust across most stakeholder groups. Seventy-three percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", 80% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)", and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel safe (3)." Family responses mirrored these perceptions, as 94% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 93% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Educator responses were similarly aligned, with 91% who agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we make learners, families and staff feel welcomed (1)." Interview data frequently included descriptors such as safe, welcoming, family-oriented and supportive when participants discussed the school community. These aligned perceptions indicate that the school has established a relational foundation that supports emotional safety and trust.

Classroom observations showed a positive climate in most classrooms. Across most classrooms, routines were evident and interactions between students and adults were respectful. It was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)", and in 65% of classrooms that "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 77% of classrooms that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." It was evident/very evident that "learners demonstrate congenial and supportive relationships with teachers" in 53% of classrooms (C4). The Well-Managed Learning Environment averaged 2.6 and the Supportive Learning Environment averaged 2.5 on a 4-point scale, reflecting that relational and behavioral systems are implemented in most classrooms.

The school has developed multiple structures intended to support continuous improvement and learner support. Professional learning community (PLC) meetings occur regularly, data are entered into Data Hub, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data are reviewed and a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) program is in place to support students academically and behaviorally. The comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) outlines initiatives designed to improve student outcomes. These artifacts demonstrate stages of organizational commitment and the presence of structures designed to guide improvement.

Although systems and structures are in place, evidence indicates they are not consistently implemented to ensure coherent Tier 1 classroom instruction or sustained within a disciplined continuous improvement process. Classroom observational data revealed variability in rigor, differentiation and learner ownership. Additional data showed it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Instances of learners who "engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)" were evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms. Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 53% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)" and evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." The Progress Monitoring & Feedback Learning



Environment average rating was 2.0 and the High Expectations Learning Environment average rating was 2.1, indicating emerging implementation of learner ownership and rigorous instructional practices.

Student perception data align with these observations. While 87% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “adults make sure we have what we need to learn (8)”, 68% agreed/absolutely agreed that they had “lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)”, and 58% agreed/absolutely agreed that “adults ask me what I think about my lessons (14).” This contrast suggests that while students feel supported and cared for, instructional responsiveness and personalization are inconsistently experienced across classrooms. PLC artifacts reinforce this finding, as meeting agendas reference MAP discussions and pacing considerations; however, documentation inconsistently reflects deep analysis of assessment data, clearly articulated instructional adjustments or follow-up progress monitoring. Evidence of full Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycles, including planning, implementation, analysis and instructional response, was inconsistently present in reviewed documentation. Interview data support this pattern, as educators described data reviews occurring; however, findings have not significantly translated into improved instructional redesigns. Interview data indicated that although assessment data were discussed in PLCs, structured and systematic analysis leading to clearly defined instructional next steps was not consistently embedded. Educators described data as informing instruction to some extent; however, it was not consistently used to guide comprehensive instructional planning or to drive schoolwide decision-making.

Communication and coherence also emerged as areas for growth. Although multiple initiatives and systems exist, staff expressed uncertainty regarding how these efforts align within a unified improvement framework. Interview data suggested that monitoring systems and follow-through practices were inconsistent. Educators described a lack of structured check-ins and clear, consistently reinforced expectations, indicating that accountability measures were not systematically implemented across the school. PLC meeting agendas and notes were often incomplete or lacked sufficient detail to document structured analysis, clear next steps or monitoring of implementation. While the mission and vision are present in institutional documents and communication platforms (e.g., Rutherford Mountaintop), evidence suggests that these statements are not consistently operationalized through clearly aligned expectations and systematic monitoring processes.

Student performance data, detailed in the appendix of this report, reflect the instructional variability observed during the review. Proficiency rates in reading and mathematics remain below desired levels, indicating that students do not yet experience rigorous, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction in most classrooms. When triangulated with classroom observational data, stakeholder interviews indicated fragmented monitoring systems, showing a need for a structured, systemic continuous improvement framework.

In summary, the school demonstrated elements of safety and relational connection; however, evidence suggested that these strengths were not consistently experienced across all stakeholder groups. While systems and structures intended to support improvement were in place, implementation lacked coherence and consistency. Instructional alignment, systematic data analysis and disciplined progress monitoring were inconsistently embedded across classrooms or leadership structures. As a result, students lacked rigorous, engaging and standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction. Establishing a clearly articulated, consistently monitored continuous improvement framework with defined expectations and accountability measures will be necessary to ensure more consistent implementation and improved learner outcomes across 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 17 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.8	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	29%	59%	12%	0%
A2	2.8	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	6%	29%	47%	18%
A3	3.0	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	24%	53%	24%
A4	2.2	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.	29%	24%	47%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.4</b>				

<b>B. High Expectations Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
B1	2.1	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	6%	82%	12%	0%
B2	2.2	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	24%	47%	18%	12%
B3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	29%	47%	18%	6%
B4	2.1	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	29%	35%	29%	6%
B5	2.2	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	12%	59%	29%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.1</b>			

<b>C. Supportive Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
C1	2.6	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	12%	24%	59%	6%
C2	2.2	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	18%	47%	29%	6%
C3	2.5	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	12%	35%	47%	6%
C4	2.6	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	47%	41%	12%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.5</b>			



D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.1	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	35%	35%	18%	12%
D2	2.1	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	29%	35%	29%	6%
D3	2.6	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	0%	53%	29%	18%
D4	1.9	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	41%	29%	24%	6%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.2</b>			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.5	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	53%	41%	6%	0%
E2	2.2	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	12%	65%	12%	12%
E3	2.3	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	18%	47%	24%	12%
E4	1.8	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	29%	59%	12%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.0</b>			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.9	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	24%	65%	12%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	35%	47%	18%
F3	2.4	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	12%	53%	24%	12%
F4	2.4	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	12%	53%	24%	12%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.6</b>			

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.	88%	6%	6%	0%
G2	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.1</b>			

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 17 observations in core content classrooms using the eleot and several informal observations in non-core classrooms and common areas. Overall, the school demonstrated a respectful and well-managed learning environment in most classrooms. The highest-rated domain was the Well-Managed Learning Environment, which earned an overall rating of 2.6. It was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)”, and in 65% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” Respectful interactions were consistently observed not only in classrooms, but also in hallways and common areas. Students were welcoming and courteous to team members, often expressing appreciation for

their presence. Survey data aligned with these observations, as most students reported feeling respected by adults. Additionally, learners who “demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)” were evident/very evident in 53% of classrooms, reinforcing a positive and caring school climate. The team encourages the school to deepen the instructional rigor and student engagement.

While classroom management and relationships are present in many classrooms, the team identified opportunities for growth in the instructional learning environment. In the High Expectations Learning Environment, classroom observations revealed it was evident/very evident in 35% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing (B4).” Furthermore, in 24% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).” Students were frequently observed completing compliant tasks at lower levels of cognitive demand. In 47% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” Increasing the rigor of instructional tasks would likely strengthen authentic engagement and intellectual ownership of learning. Instruction was most often teacher-directed, with limited evidence of differentiation or collaborative learning. Classroom observations revealed that learners engaging in “differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs” (A1) were evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms. Classroom observations revealed that it was evident/very evident in 30% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” These findings suggest a need for focused professional learning and instructional coaching to strengthen differentiation, student collaboration and purposeful integration of technology to meet diverse learner needs.

Student ownership and progress monitoring also emerged as areas for improvement. According to observational data, learners who “monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” were evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms. Learners who “receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)” were evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms. Similarly, in 12% of classrooms it was evident/very evident that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Strengthening curriculum internalization practices, implementing intentional feedback cycles and consistently using rubrics can help students understand expectations and take greater responsibility for their learning.

Finally, it was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” Also, it was evident/very evident in 36% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).” The team encourages the school to build on its equitable and respectful culture to enhance classroom efficiency, maximize learning time and ensure that students remain actively engaged throughout each lesson. The school is well-positioned to increase rigor, engagement, differentiation and student ownership of learning.

# 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

Establish a systemic continuous improvement framework where leaders purposely engage teachers in using a structured analysis of performance and perception data and routinely monitor progress of organizational effectiveness.

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

### Findings:

A review of PLC meeting agendas and notes revealed discussions of data, particularly related to MAP. However, documentation did not consistently reflect a deep analysis of student performance data, clearly defined action steps or follow-up progress monitoring. Evidence of full PDSA cycles, including explicit planning, implementation, analysis of results and instructional adjustments, was not consistently present in reviewed artifacts. Although the CSIP outlined activities and initiatives, there was little documentation demonstrating structured monitoring of those activities to determine fidelity of implementation or impact on student engagement and Proficient/Distinguished outcomes. Stakeholder interview data corroborated these findings.

The team learned during stakeholder interviews that data systems existed and that MAP data were reviewed; however, structured analysis leading to instructional adjustment was inconsistent. Some participants indicated that assessment data were not routinely analyzed in PLCs to develop next steps. Others noted that while data informed instruction to some degree, it did not consistently drive comprehensive instructional planning. Although some staff referenced use of Data Hub and PDSA processes, responses suggested that structured data collection and implementation practices were recently initiated and not yet embedded. Stakeholders also described pacing constraints that limited opportunities for reteaching and instructional adjustment. These responses indicated that, although data were collected, a disciplined continuous improvement cycle linked to learner needs does not consistently guide instructional decisions.

Classroom observational data reinforced the need for stronger progress monitoring systems. It was evident/very evident in 6% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)." To further support this analysis, it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." These findings aligned with stakeholder interview data describing limited follow-through and monitoring systems that were inconsistent or fragmented. Without clear mechanisms for monitoring and feedback, the continuous improvement process remained incomplete at the classroom level.

Stakeholder perception data also reflected inconsistency in systematic improvement processes. While educators demonstrated commitment to learner needs, 82% agreed/absolutely agreed, "In the past 30 days, I followed a process where I tried and assessed different strategies to improve my practice (23)", indicating variability in implementation of a shared improvement cycle. Similarly, 75% agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", suggesting that structured improvement practices were inconsistently embedded across the institution.

Stakeholder interviews and artifact data further indicated challenges related to streamlined communication and coherence. Multiple initiatives and systems were in place, including MTSS structures, behavior plans and various



meeting formats; however, surveys and interviews revealed uncertainty regarding how these structures integrated into a unified improvement framework. Participants described limited follow-up, inconsistent expectations and irregular meeting cadence. PLC agendas were frequently incomplete or lacked sufficient detail to document structured data analysis, instructional adjustments or next steps. Additionally, staff described communication as inconsistent and not always aligned across administrative and stakeholder groups. Although the mission and vision were listed in institutional documents and the “Rutherford Mountaintop” platform functioned as a communication hub, evidence indicated that these statements were not consistently operationalized through clearly aligned expectations and monitoring protocols.

The team noted short-cycle planning was present but lacked coherence and disciplined implementation. Numerous plans and initiatives existed; however, interview data suggested that follow-through was inconsistent and that prioritization was needed. Participants indicated that focusing on a limited number of high-leverage goals with clear timelines and monitoring checkpoints would strengthen implementation.

In summary, Rutherford Elementary uses PLCs, data systems and initiative plans to support a culture of continuous improvement. However, evidence from student performance data, classroom observations, stakeholder interviews, perception surveys and a review of documents indicate that these structures are not consistently integrated into a disciplined, monitored and coherent improvement cycle focused on learners’ experiences and needs.

**Potential Leader Actions:**

- Prioritize and streamline schoolwide initiatives that support continuous improvement.
- Establish and communicate actionable organizational goals monitored through a recurring short-cycle continuous improvement process.
- Develop and implement a standardized data analysis protocol to track continuous improvement of organizational systems and initiatives.
- Adjust goals as needed based on data analysis and organizational needs.

## Improvement Priority 2

Establish coherence among district-supported curriculum, instructional resources, assessments and interventions by designing and executing a system to elevate Tier 1 instructional delivery.

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

### Findings:

A review of the CSIP, principal's presentation, PLC meeting agendas, instructional leadership team meeting agendas and lesson plan feedback indicated the school lacked a coherent system to ensure that curriculum and instruction were aligned for relevance, inclusion and effectiveness. While professional staff demonstrated commitment to students and described a collaborative culture, interviews and observational data indicated that instructional resources were implemented with varying degrees of depth and clarity. Student performance trends, classroom observations, interviews and artifacts collectively indicated teachers were working diligently to meet pacing expectations; however, stakeholders lacked a shared understanding of how standards, lessons and assessments connected across a unit of study. As a result, students did not consistently experience grade-level instruction aligned to the intent of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS), limiting the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.

Overall Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) performance remained below the state average in all tested grades and content areas from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. Student performance data reflected instructional variability across grade levels. During the 2022-2023 school year, 18% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, decreasing to 12% in 2024-2025. The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 15% in both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025. In 2022-2023, 21% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics, but in subsequent years they were below the state average. Fifth-grade social studies results showed that students scoring Proficient/Distinguished decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2024-2025.

In mathematics, 10% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024, increasing to 13% in 2024-2025. Fourth-grade mathematics performance decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025. Fifth-grade editing and mechanics scores showed that students scoring Proficient/Distinguished increased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025. These data indicated variability in performance trends and underscored the need for consistent, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction.

Rutherford Elementary demonstrated pockets of a relationship-centered culture grounded in safety and belonging. Seventy-three percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults make us feel welcomed (1)", 80% agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults treat us with respect (2)", and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults make us feel safe (3)." Also, 81% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults help us believe we can do things (5)" and 87% agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults make sure we have what we need to learn (8)."

Family responses aligned with these findings. Ninety-four percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", 93% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)", and 93% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." Educator responses were similarly aligned, as 91% agreed/absolutely agreed, "At my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)", and 78% agreed/absolutely agreed that "we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)."

Instructionally, students and families reported positive academic support. Eighty-two percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults know and do their work well (9)", and 91% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that staff "know and do their work well (11)." Student and family survey data aligned as 84% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that they have "chances to use digital tools to help me learn (17)", and 86% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that children "used digital tools that helped to improve their learning (20)." Educators affirmed instructional commitment, as 97% agreed/absolutely agreed, "In the past 30 days I provided



opportunities to help learners acquire skills needed for their future (15)” and 91% agreed/absolutely agreed, “In the past 30 days, I used a variety of information to determine learners’ progress (20).”

Across classrooms, students were compliant, respectful and followed established procedures. Observational data indicated that learning environments were orderly and emotionally safe; however, instructional rigor was inconsistent. This convergence of student, family and educator survey results and observational data demonstrated that the school had established a climate of care that provided a foundation for instructional growth.

Data revealed a lack of instructional coherence and inconsistent differentiation. While 68% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)”, 58% agreed/absolutely agreed that “adults ask me what I think about my lessons (14)”, indicating variability in student voice. Conversely, 82% of families agreed/absolutely agreed, “In the past 30 days, my child had learning experiences that were unique to their needs (17).” Yet, when asked, “Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?”, 46% of students selected “complete worksheets”, 62% chose “listen to teachers talk” and 55% selected “do the same work as everyone else.” The prevalence of compliance-oriented descriptors suggest inconsistency in rigor and engagement. This aligned with educator perception data showing that 81% agreed/absolutely agreed, “At my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8)”, indicating variability in differentiation practices.

Teacher interview data provided additional context. Participants indicated that high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs), including Expeditionary Learning Education for literacy and Illustrative Mathematics for math were available; however, implementation lacked coherence and consistent monitoring. Educators described variability in fidelity and reported feeling overwhelmed by multiple resources and tools. Interview data also suggested that Tier 1 instruction was not consistently strong enough to reduce reliance on intervention services. Teachers described pacing structures that limited opportunities for reteaching and instructional adjustment. Interviews further indicated that schoolwide instructional expectations were not clearly articulated. Participants expressed uncertainty regarding common non-negotiables and shared expectations. These perceptions aligned with PLC artifacts and walkthrough documents, which demonstrated collaboration but showed limited evidence of a shared instructional framework ensuring standards alignment and differentiation across classrooms.

Data practices reflected similar inconsistency. Teachers described regularly reviewing MAP data; however, analysis of classroom-level formative assessment data appeared less systematically embedded. While data were entered into the Data Hub and supplemental supports such as the Breakfast Club and IXL were implemented, interviews suggested limited clarity regarding how these data were used to adjust Tier 1 instruction. Student responses regarding monitoring of progress included checking goals, using checklists and rubrics and having one-on-one conversations; however, responses also included receiving grades and exams, suggesting that formative feedback practices were not consistently embedded within a coherent instructional improvement cycle.

Student performance data indicate that strengthening the rigor of Tier 1 instruction and providing differentiated instruction are essential for increasing the percentage of students performing at Proficient/Distinguished levels. Although intervention structures and MTSS supports are in place, the team found a lack of consistent, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction across classrooms.

When synthesized, student performance data, classroom observation data, stakeholder interviews, stakeholder perception data and a review of documents and artifacts revealed that most classrooms have a safe and trusting environment. The school possessed relational capital, leadership commitment and collaborative structures. However, instructional clarity, fidelity of HQIR implementation, differentiation and systematic use of data to adjust Tier 1 instruction varied across classrooms, limiting consistent access to rigorous, standards-aligned learning experiences.

### **Potential Leader Actions:**

- Establish and articulate shared commitments for the teaching, learning and continuous improvement systems.
- Establish and clearly communicate actionable instructional delivery goals grounded in the adopted HQIRs that are monitored through a short-cycle continuous improvement process.
- Develop a school-wide formative assessment process centered on student work analysis.
- Redesign the professional learning plan to align with the shared commitments and goals.
- Monitor systems to ensure a deep analysis of student performance data that supports rigor and high expectations of differentiated learner-centered experiences.

### **Your Next Steps**

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

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

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.
- Develop plans to address the Improvement Priorities identified by the Diagnostic Review Team.
- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.
- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.



# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

The principal of Rutherford Elementary is in her 20th year as leader of the school and credits her staff for fostering a safe, welcoming environment for students and families. Leadership and staff embrace the diversity of the student body and take pride in the support provided to students. The principal openly acknowledges the recent decline in KSA data and recognizes the need to strengthen continuous improvement processes to drive student success.

During the principal's presentation and interview, it was evident that the need for a systems-based approach to continuous improvement had been identified; however, many of these systems are still in the early stages of development. While plans have been communicated, the team found limited evidence that these plans are fully implemented, monitored or embedded into daily practice. A clearly defined continuous improvement model has not been established to guide the development, evaluation and refinement of these systems. Intensive support is needed to help the principal prioritize high-leverage systems that will directly impact student achievement.

Coaching in strategic thinking and systems development would strengthen the principal's ability to create structures grounded in a continuous improvement cycle. Effective systems require clear expectations, documentation, communication, ongoing monitoring and evaluation of impact. Consistency of implementation is critical to ensure fidelity. The use of short-cycle progress monitoring would allow for timely adjustments and ensure that initiatives remain focused on measurable outcomes.

Stakeholder interviews indicate that, although communication efforts are present, clarity and consistency remain areas for growth. The creation of the "Rutherford Mountaintop" as an information hub demonstrates an effort to

centralize communication; however, the purpose and vision of key initiatives are not consistently understood across stakeholder groups. Stakeholder perceptions vary; some see communication as inconsistent, while others value the principal's open-door approach. To strengthen trust, the school should develop a clear communication strategy that articulates priorities and defines how feedback influences policy. A more cohesive plan will ensure that all stakeholders feel informed and included in the decision-making process.

The principal has partnered with retired administrators and external resources to build teacher capacity and strengthen leadership practices. While these partnerships demonstrate initiative, there is limited evidence of a focused, sustainable plan outlining roles, responsibilities, goals and accountability measures. Greater clarity and formalization of PLC and coaching structures would promote cohesion and ensure that professional learning efforts are aligned with student data and school improvement goals.

Overall, the principal has demonstrated foundational awareness of the school's needs; however, targeted district support is required to move from initial steps to sustained progress. Implementing a formal coaching plan will strengthen the principal's leadership, ensuring she is equipped to drive a full school turnaround and improve student achievement.



# Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Nelson Render</b>	Nelson L. Render has dedicated more than 28 years to educational leadership, consistently advancing students' learning outcomes. He has held several leadership positions in public education, beginning as director of bands and assistant principal in DeKalb County Schools. His career also includes service as an assistant principal and implementation specialist for 9-12 college and career readiness in Atlanta Public Schools, principal in Clayton County Schools and chief of secondary schools and associate superintendent of high schools in the Madison Metropolitan School District in Wisconsin. He currently serves as an executive officer in the Bibb County School District, where he supports, serves and supervises 13 principals.
<b>Charlotte L. Jones</b>	Charlotte L. Jones has over 28 years of experience in education, including 12 years with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL), supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching high school social studies and serving as a gifted/talented coordinator, a building assessment coordinator and a vice chair of the school-based decision-making council. She is a certified facilitator for the Jim Shipley Systems and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL). Charlotte has presented at state and national conferences on successful continuous improvement practices in schools.
<b>Chris Murray</b>	Chris Murray is a seasoned educational leader with over 15 years of experience spanning classroom teaching, school leadership, district administration and state-level systems support. He has served as a high school assistant principal, middle school principal and director of secondary schools, leading instructional improvement, team development and strategic planning to support student success. He is also in his third year as an ERL with KDE, guiding schools through targeted improvement and recovery initiatives. In addition to his K-12 leadership, Chris teaches graduate and doctoral students as an adjunct professor, helping prepare the next generation of educators and leaders.
<b>Stephanie Harmon</b>	Stephanie Harmon has 20 years of experience in education. Currently, she serves as the director of state and federal programs for Paris City Schools. She is also the director of special education, preschool, Section 504, human resources, curriculum, instruction and assessment for the district. Her past experiences include serving as a middle school special education teacher and team leader, an elementary school assistant principal, a middle school principal and a district curriculum and MTSS coach.

# 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.	2

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
11. Leaders create and maintain institutional structures and processes that support learners and staff members in both stable and changing environments.	Leaders seldom demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability. The institution's structure and processes are not well documented or communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes may not include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are occasionally documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans to respond to change.	Leaders regularly demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented and communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support responses to both incremental and sudden change.	Leaders consistently demonstrate awareness of potential influences on institution stability and engage stakeholders in planning and implementing strategies to maintain stability and respond to change. The institution's structure and processes are documented, monitored, and thoroughly communicated so that learners and staff members know what to do and expect in everyday circumstances. The institution's structure and processes include emergency and contingency plans that support agile and effective responses to both incremental and sudden change.	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.	2
18. Learners are immersed in an environment that fosters lifelong skills including creativity, curiosity, risk taking, collaboration, and design thinking.	Learners engage in environments that focus primarily on academic learning objectives only. Little or no emphasis is placed on non-academic skills important for next steps in learning and for future success. Learning experiences rarely build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration or design-thinking.	Conditions within some aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in some experiences that develop non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Some learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions within most aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Collectively, the learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions across all aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in ongoing experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. A formal structure ensures that learning experiences collectively build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	2

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

## Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

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

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

# Student Performance Data

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

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	18	46	18	47	12	47
4th-Grade Reading	15	48	*	50	15	50
5th-Grade Reading	*	48	*	46	17	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	10	43	13	43
4th-Grade Math	14	42	*	43	12	44
5th-Grade Math	21	41	*	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	6	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	18	42	*	39	6	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	21	47	24	47	14	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	5	38

### Plus

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

### Delta

- Fifth-grade social studies scores on the KSA revealed that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 18% in 2022-2023 to 6% in 2024-2025.
- Fourth-grade reading scores on the KSA revealed that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished remained stagnant at 15% in 2022-2023 and 2024-2025.
- Fifth-grade editing and mechanics scores on the KSA revealed that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 21% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.

- Third-grade reading scores on the KSA revealed that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 18% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- Fourth-grade math scores on the KSA revealed that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished declined from 14% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.

## 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	32	26	39	29	45	30
Percent Score of 60-80	38	35	33	35	33	35
Percent Score of 100	19	24	19	23	15	22
Percent Score of 140	12	14	9	13	8	13

### Plus

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

### Delta

- Data from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 for English learners (ELs) progress show that the percentage of students scoring 0 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment was 32% in 2022-2023, 39% in 2023-2024 and 45% in 2024-2025.
- Data from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 for EL progress show that the percentage of students scoring 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment has steadily declined from 12% in 2022-2023, to 9% in 2023-24 and 8% in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	18	18	12
Female	*	25	6
Male	17	14	16
White	*	21	*
African American	19	*	6
Hispanic or Latino	*	18	13
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	10
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	14
Economically Disadvantaged	*	19	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- According to the 2024-2025 KSA, 3rd-grade students scored below the state average in every assessed category over the three-year period reported.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 18% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading declined from 19% in 2023-2024 to 10% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	10	13
Female	*	*	13
Male	*	14	13
White	*	14	*
African American	*	*	6
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	13
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	12
Economically Disadvantaged	*	9	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased from 10% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.

**Delta**

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math declined from 14% in 2023-2024 to 13% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	15	*	15
Female	17	*	12
Male	*	*	17
White	*	*	31
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	36	*	9
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	18	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	18	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	*	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading remained stagnant at 15% from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 4th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased significantly from 36% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 12% 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	14	*	12
Female	10	*	*
Male	*	*	15
White	*	*	15
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	14	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	18	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	18	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	12	*	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math remained stagnant from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	6
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	5
White	*	*	15
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of all 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science was 5% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged 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	*	*	17
Female	*	*	14
Male	*	*	21
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	19
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	8
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 17% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade EL plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 8% 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	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	30	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	23	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	19	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	24	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	19	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 21% in 2022-2023.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math was 19% in 2022-2023.

## 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	18	*	6
Female	*	*	5
Male	16	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	23	*	10
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	16	*	4
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased from 16% in 2022-2023 to 4% 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	21	24	14
Female	18	24	16
Male	24	24	12
White	13	33	*
African American	11	10	14
Hispanic or Latino	31	*	10
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	16	23	9
English Learners plus Monitored	18	24	12
Economically Disadvantaged	21	22	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that for all reported 5th-grade student groups, the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025, except for African American students.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased significantly from 31% in 2022-2023 to 10% 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	*	*	5
Female	*	*	5
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	*	*	3
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- KSA data indicated that the percentage of 5th-grade students in the all students and female groups scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing was 5% in 2024-2025.

# Schedule

## Tuesday, Feb. 17, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
2:45 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Initial Team Meeting/ Introductions/ Review of Schedule	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, Feb. 18, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:50 a.m. – 5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6:15 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, Feb. 19, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:50 a.m. – 5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
6:30 p.m. – 9:15 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Friday, Feb. 20, 2026

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

