



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
Semple Elementary

Jan. 12-15, 2026

Table of Contents

- Introduction.....2**
 - Performance Standards Evaluation2
 - Insights from the Review3
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....5**
 - eleot Narrative8
- Improvement Priorities10**
 - Improvement Priority 110
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....11
 - Improvement Priority 212
 - Potential Leader Actions:.....12
 - Your Next Steps12
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review14**
- Team Roster16**
- Appendix17**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings17
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....17
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning19
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning21
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning23
 - Student Performance Data.....27
 - Schedule39

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	3
Building-Level Administrators	2
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	3
Certified Staff	29
Noncertified Staff	13
Students	40
Parents	10
Total	100

Performance Standards Evaluation

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



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

Insights from the Review

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

Strengths and Continuous Improvement:

The Diagnostic Review Team identified that climate and culture continue to be a strength of Semple Elementary. According to stakeholder survey data, when educators were asked "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (24)?", 91% chose "welcoming", 71% "safe", 68% "inspiring" and 61% "respectful." All students and staff were warm and welcoming to the team throughout the visit. Stakeholder survey data indicated that when families were asked "Which four words best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?", 90% selected "respectful," 86% "safe," 85% "welcoming" and 45% "warm." Eighty-three percent of students selected "safe," 79% "friendly," 70% "exciting" and 54% "polite" when asked, "Which four words best describe your school (20)?" Eighty-three percent of educators selected "collaborative", 73% "genuine" and "valuable", and 65% "personable" when asked, "Which four words do you think best describe, in general, the interactions you experience with your colleagues (26)?"

The data collected through stakeholder interviews supported the survey data, indicating that a positive climate and culture exist at the school. Educators shared that the school is a family-oriented environment with a strong sense of community, where staff support one another. Parent interviews echoed the same sentiments, speaking highly of the school and the resources it provides to support students, including helping families with home-related issues. Most stakeholders expressed positive perceptions of the school's climate and culture. Based on the principal's overview presentation, the staff has established collective commitments, which include "stay positive and share responsibility" and "reset and restart your shine." Honoring these staff commitments contributes to the school's positive climate and culture. In the principal's presentation, the house system was mentioned as a first-year initiative to promote teamwork, leadership and a sense of belonging within the school. Informal observations, documents and artifacts indicated that the house system is taking place and students are excited about it. Informal observations also revealed a schoolwide morning meeting is held each morning to build community within the school, contributing to the overall positive climate and culture.

The Diagnostic Review Team highlighted inclusivity as a significant strength. Stakeholder survey data indicated that 97% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)." According to the principal's presentation, the school serves 252 English learners (ELs), representing 19 different languages. Informal observations further highlighted inclusive practices, such as schoolwide morning announcements that begin with "good morning" in multiple languages. Additionally, the school has an EL teacher for each grade level who provides push-in support during instruction. Evidence of student progress is reflected in the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment results, with the percentage of students earning 140 points for growth increasing from 14% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025 and exceeding the state average of 13% in 2024-2025.

The Diagnostic Review Team reviewed the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP), which outlined a plan to increase students' academic achievement in reading and math by May of 2030, as measured by the state assessment. The plan also addresses the achievement gap for African American students in reading and math by 2030, as measured by the state assessment. According to the CSIP, the school intentionally built an Instructional



Leadership Team (ILT) with identified leadership in math, literacy and Journey to Success. The ILT has representation from all stakeholder groups.

The CSIP states objectives that by May of 2026, reading proficiency for all students will increase on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) from 25% to 27% Proficient/Distinguished and math proficiency will increase from 17% to 19% Proficient/Distinguished. One of the identified strategies for both goals is high-quality instruction aligned with seven activities to accomplish them. One of the identified activities in the CSIP is for “school leaders to support systems to build capacity and sustainability of implementation of high-quality instructional resources (HQIR) and best practices in literacy and math, including regular teacher observations, coaching and feedback cycles and HQIR professional learning.” This aligns with the information highlighted in the principal’s presentation when it was mentioned that coaching and feedback are a priority focus. The team determined that there was minimal evidence available to show an effective cycle for coaching that includes modeling, actionable feedback and next steps. Despite documentation of teachers’ needs being tiered, there was minimal evidence of effective coaching cycles occurring throughout the year. The principal’s presentation highlighted that 13 of the school’s 45 teachers have five or less years of experience, suggesting an opportunity to strengthen support for early-career educators. Stakeholder interview data revealed that some teachers have never been coached on how to manage their classrooms or collect data. In addition, some teachers reported that coaching was requested but had not been received. These data points indicate that coaching and feedback remain an area of continuous improvement. The team suggests developing and implementing a systematic process for coaching cycles.

Another identified strategy in the school’s CSIP is that “collaborative teams use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis and internalization of lessons and protocols.” This also aligns with the information highlighted in the principal’s presentation, where standards work and planning were identified as an additional priority focus. Evidence shows that the school has worked hard on deconstructing learning targets for core instruction, as they were consistently present in classroom observations; however, it is not clear whether the teachers are assessing the depth of students’ understanding and mastery of those learning targets. Interview data indicated that professional learning community (PLC) time focuses on discussions of what is not working and student needs and those topics are then shared with the administration. Interview data also revealed that PLC time is used to review standards to address upcoming lessons. Still, a limited assessment data review is underway, according to the documents and artifacts submitted as evidence for PLCs. The team suggests PLCs as an area for continuous improvement through restructuring to enable data tracking and ensure measurable gains in student learning.

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 24 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.	50%	25%	25%	0%
A2	2.6	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	4%	29%	67%	0%
A3	2.9	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	13%	83%	4%
A4	1.5	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.	63%	25%	13%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.2			



B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.0	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	25%	54%	21%	0%
B2	1.9	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	25%	58%	17%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	46%	54%	0%	0%
B4	1.8	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	33%	58%	8%	0%
B5	1.5	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	58%	33%	8%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.5	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	8%	38%	54%	0%
C2	2.5	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	8%	38%	54%	0%
C3	2.4	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	63%	38%	0%
C4	2.7	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	4%	21%	75%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.5			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.8	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	29%	58%	13%	0%
D2	1.5	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	67%	21%	13%	0%
D3	2.2	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	8%	63%	29%	0%
D4	1.4	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	67%	29%	4%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.3	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	75%	25%	0%	0%
E2	2.2	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	8%	63%	29%	0%
E3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	21%	75%	4%	0%
E4	1.3	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	71%	25%	4%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.7			

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%	17%	79%	4%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	25%	75%	0%
F3	2.4	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	8%	46%	46%	0%
F4	2.3	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	17%	38%	46%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.6			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	75%	13%	13%	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.	96%	4%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.1			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 24 formal observations in core content areas using the eleot tool and several informal observations in common areas across the school. The data from these observations provided the team with sufficient insight into instructional practices, progress monitoring, student expectations and learning environments. The school had a previous Diagnostic Review in 2022. All seven learning environments showed an overall average decrease in ratings from the previous review.

Classroom observational data identified positive student behavior and respectful treatment of students as an area of strength. It was evident/very evident in 83% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with



teacher(s) and each other (F1).” It was evident/very evident in 87% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” These findings are also supported by stakeholder survey data, as 90% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that the adults “treat us with respect (2).” Several adults checked in with students, and the team observed teachers at their classroom doors greeting students and giving them hugs as they entered. The principal was observed doing check-ins during the schoolwide morning meeting with students. It was evident/very evident in 75% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” The team noticed multiple teachers actively promoting positive student behavior. Another strength that supports the school's positive climate and culture was the relationships between students and teachers. It was evident/very evident in 75% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” Stakeholder survey data also support this finding, as 97% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that they “set aside time to build relationships with learners (4).” Student interviews described the staff as kind and caring, with students sharing that their mornings in the classroom start with a circle where they share how they are feeling.

The Diagnostic Review Team identified differentiation as a key area for growth, particularly in ensuring instruction meets the needs of all learners. It was evident/very evident in 25% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” In most classrooms, students were observed in whole-group instruction with limited differentiation. The team suggests differentiation is most effective when learners have a clear understanding of their current progress and the criteria by which their work will be assessed, allowing them to take ownership. It was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1).” It was evident/very evident in 4% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Each of these indicators decreased from the previous 2022 Diagnostic Review, indicating an area of concern and a need for growth and improvement.

Another opportunity for improvement found by the Diagnostic Review Team was the lack of academic rigor with clear expectations. It was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).” The team observed below grade-level core instruction. In 8% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B5).” The team observed minimal opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking activities. Additionally, the team observed a few questions being asked of students at a higher level of knowledge. In 0% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3).”

Additionally, the team identified the Active Learning Environment as an area for improvement, which received an overall rating of 1.7 on a 4-point scale. It was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/ dialogues/ exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)”, which decreased significantly from 70% during the previous Diagnostic Review in 2022. Many of the classroom observations were whole group with limited opportunities for students to turn and talk or collaborate with one another. It was evident/very evident in 29% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” These data were supported by stakeholder interviews, in which educators shared that increased student engagement is needed during Tier 1 instruction. In 4% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” It was also evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” In classrooms where small groups were meeting, students were observed working independently on laptops.

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

Implement a rigorous and systematic coaching cycle process with leaders conducting frequent classroom observations, providing teachers with immediate actionable feedback and monitoring implementation to track gains in instructional effectiveness and student learning.

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

Findings:

A review of student performance data suggests that support provided to teachers may not be sufficiently targeted or what they need to strengthen their professional practice. Data from the KSA shows that in 2024-2025, each grade level's proficiency was lower than the state average in reading and in third- and fourth-grade math. KSA performance results show that in 2023-2024, 21% of students in third grade scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading and that percentage stayed the same during 2024-2025, showing no increase in achievement. KSA data also show that in 2023-2024, 26% of fourth-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading, decreasing to 23% in 2024-2025. Additionally, the percentage of fifth-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA reading assessment in 2023-2024 was 26%, which decreased to 18% in 2024-2025. Based on the KSA, in the 2023-2024 school year, 16% of students scored Proficient/Distinguished in third-grade math, which decreased to 12% in the 2024-2025 school year.

Data provided to the Diagnostic Review Team from the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment, which is administered as a universal screener, shows several areas of decreased proficiency, as presented in the principal's presentation. In comparing math proficiency from the winter administration of 2024-2025 to the winter of 2025-2026, first grade decreased from 46% to 40%, second grade showed a decrease from 37% to 27%, third grade proficiency decreased from 36% to 26% and fourth grade moved from 39% to 28%. When comparing reading proficiency during the same time frame, first grade decreased from 35% to 22%, third grade moved from 36% to 30% and fifth grade decreased from 34% to 28%.

Classroom observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms that "learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)." These data suggest that teachers may need additional support to scaffold instruction, provide interventions or use varied resources. Stakeholder interviews revealed that many teachers receive little feedback on their performance after an observation. Although stakeholder survey data revealed that 97% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)", interview data revealed that teachers receive limited coaching support to improve their practice. Interview data indicated that teachers reported a lack of support in improving their professional practice, particularly in coaching on classroom management and data collection. Also, interview data indicated that the leadership team (i.e., principal, assistant principal, academic instructional coach) conducted periodic walk-throughs, but there was little follow-up about those visits. Both the principal's overview presentation and interview data revealed the need to elevate teacher coaching and feedback as an area for school growth.

A review of documents and artifacts revealed a "Walkthrough Schedule" and a "Walkthrough Form"; however, stakeholders reported that the principal set expectations for the length of the walkthroughs, outlined guidelines for what to look for and provided follow-up to support the data shared with teachers. Although there was evidence that some walkthroughs with feedback occurred, the team found limited evidence of follow-up or accountability to



ensure that teachers acted on the feedback to improve instruction. In the school's "Coach's Survey", teachers were able to request support, but there was limited use of the form (i.e., two responses). These data suggest the need for a clear and rigorous coaching and feedback system that includes follow-up and accountability to strengthen teachers' professional practice.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Leverage your instructional leadership team to accomplish the following:
- Schedule school-wide learning walks to calibrate which instructional strategies are currently in place and where deficits exist.
- Develop an instructional coaching system that includes a timeline for regular classroom observations, modeling, co-planning/lesson internalization and feedback to all teachers.
- Model monthly student engagement strategies to support classroom teachers in improving their instructional practices.

Improvement Priority 2

Develop an ongoing PLC schedule and identify/develop a robust PLC protocol focused on Tier 1 instruction and lesson planning to increase student mastery. Fully implement and monitor the fidelity of implementation and track implementation data to ensure measurable gains in student learning.

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

Findings:

As previously cited in Improvement Priority 1, the student performance data indicated a need for instruction to be consistently monitored and adjusted to ensure students are learning and promote student achievement. Student performance data indicated the need for a structured weekly PLC that focused on analyzing academic progress and refining instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

Classroom observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 25% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." A structured, fully implemented process for PLCs will help teachers design instruction that meets the needs of all learners based on data. It was evident/very evident in 17% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities that are challenging but attainable (B2)." In 8% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)." The team suggests that PLCs will also contribute to teachers' professional growth by building collective expertise in differentiation and in planning rigorous instructional opportunities.

During stakeholder interviews, inconsistencies emerged about who should facilitate PLCs. Some stated that the academic instructional coach (AIC) leads PLCs, while others said that teachers lead the PLCs. Educators shared that PLC time is used to review the standards to address upcoming lessons, but limited assessment data review is taking place. It was also revealed that the administrators are not often actively engaged in the PLC work.

Stakeholder survey data showed that 77% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." While 88% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)." During stakeholder interviews, the team learned that resource teachers are not currently included in PLC work. Given the number of staff members providing small-group instruction, the team recommends that resource teachers be included in PLC progress-monitoring discussions. A review of documents and artifacts included "PLC Slides" from one grade level, which provided evidence that meetings were being held; however, the evidence suggests that PLC time is primarily focused on logistics and planning rather than on analyzing student data.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Create a schedule for at least one administrator to be actively engaged in the PLC work.
- Establish expectations for teachers to bring weekly assessment data to monitor students' academic progress (e.g., exit tickets, unit assessments, cool downs).
- Use lesson internalization to identify gaps and differentiation needs, and plan common assessments that measure student mastery.

Your Next Steps

The results of the Diagnostic Review provide the next step for guiding the improvement journey of the institution with their efforts to improve the quality of educational opportunities for all learners. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness. The feedback



provided in the Diagnostic Review Report will assist the institution in reflecting on current improvement efforts and adapting and adjusting their plans to continuously strive for improvement.

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

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

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

The principal at Semple Elementary has been the leader for the last 15 years. The school was designated for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) in the fall of 2025. The principal has created a culture that is described by stakeholders as safe, welcoming, respectful and collaborative. This was further supported through interviews held with students, teachers, staff and families along with the informal and formal observations conducted by the review team. With the large population of EL students, there are various strong support structures in place that assist with improving the mental, social and emotional well-being of students. Two examples of these support structures are daily Morning Meetings and the newly implemented house system as modeled by the Ron Clark Academy.

The coaching and feedback system has some pieces in place. A feedback tool and a needs assessment from teachers exist; however, the principal recognizes it is not a fully formed system. Consistency in its implementation should be strengthened by developing a system that includes timelines and ensures modeling, feedback and one to one coaching to ensure all teachers receive individualized support to improve instructional delivery. Evidence from stakeholder interviews and documentation provided by the school indicates that the principal has not consistently implemented an effective walkthrough system to strengthen instruction and improve student learning. The principal acknowledged this continues to be an area of need for growth during her presentation to the Diagnostic Review Team. The team found little evidence of a formal process to provide a coaching and feedback system for teachers. Walkthrough and assessment data further indicate a lack of instructional rigor in classrooms as well as a lack of utilization of high-yield instructional strategies.

While the principal exhibits the ability to motivate stakeholders to meet or exceed expectations, concerns were expressed regarding the consistency of attending PLC meetings as well as the progress monitoring of the implementation of school initiatives. School staff strongly support the principal, but there is a lack of evidence to support her as the instructional leader. This was evident from the stakeholder interviews and observations made



by the Diagnostic Review Team members, as well as the lack of implementation of the previously created Sustainability Plan or use of a monitoring tool (e.g., 30-60-90 day plans). PLC meetings are held weekly; however, there is a lack of a structured data analysis protocol.

The principal demonstrates the needed drive for continuous improvement at Semple Elementary. In turn the students, teachers and staff support the leadership and are invested in the improvement of Semple Elementary.

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
David Copeland Jr.	David Copeland Jr. has been serving in education for 18 years. He began his career teaching fourth-grade math and science, where he also served as chair of the school improvement council and the faculty advisory committee. After teaching in the classroom, he became an assistant principal. David has received an endorsement for having completed the South Carolina Department of Education's (SDE) Transformational Leadership Academy (SCTLA), which uses a uniquely designed preparation program to equip individuals who aspire to be transformational school principals with a highly specialized skill set and intensive practice in honing those skills in real school settings. He currently serves as a principal of an elementary school in South Carolina.
Donna Bumps	Donna Bumps is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), where she supports turnaround schools across the state in developing and implementing sustainable systems of continuous improvement. She has 26 years of experience as an educator, having served as a middle and high school teacher, assistant principal and high school principal. Donna is trained in Jim Shipley Systems and the National Institute for School and Systems Leadership (NISL). Also, she has served on multiple Diagnostic Review teams over several years as both a team member and an associate-lead evaluator.
Ashley Burd	Ashley Burd currently serves as an ERL for KDE. Ashley has 26 years of educational experience in Kentucky, having served 11 years in the classroom and 13 years in a leadership role as a principal. This is her third year as an ERL with KDE. Ashley has experience working in high school, middle school and elementary school settings, along with completing NISL.
Janet Throgmorton	Janet Throgmorton has 30 years of professional experience in education. She has served as principal of a high school in western Kentucky for the past four years. Her prior experience includes 14 years as an elementary teacher in grades 1-6 and 12 years as principal of a preschool through 6th-grade elementary school. Janet has presented at the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) National Conference and at multiple regional events. Janet has had the distinction of serving in a National Blue Ribbon School.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
3. Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.	Leaders establish conditions that rarely result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders seldom collaborate with stakeholders. Institutions choose areas of focus that are rarely based on data about learners.	Leaders establish conditions that occasionally result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus that are sometimes based on data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that regularly result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders routinely collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that consistently result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders consistently collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions implement a formal process to choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	2
5. Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners.	The institution's operating practices rarely cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members may or may not interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, or consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members rarely work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's operating practices somewhat cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members generally interact with respect and cooperation, periodically learn from one another, and somewhat consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members sometimes work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members regularly interact with respect and cooperation, often learn from one another, and routinely consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members often work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration and are monitored for fidelity of implementation. Professional staff members consistently interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, and consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members intentionally and consistently work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	3
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.	2
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	2

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
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.	2
31. Learners demonstrate growth in their academic performance based on valid and reliable assessments.	The institution rarely sustains high levels of learner performance over time or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution inconsistently monitors or uses results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution seldom communicates results or plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution occasionally sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution sometimes monitors results from multiple required and/or selected assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution occasionally communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution routinely sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution regularly monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements plans to address areas of low performance. The institution routinely communicates results and plans for improving learner performance with stakeholders.	The institution consistently sustains high levels of learner performance over time and/or shows consistent trends of improvement in low-performing areas. The institution continually monitors and uses results from multiple required and/or selected valid and reliable assessments of student learning and implements formal plans to address areas of low performance. The institution consistently communicates results and plans for improving	1



Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
				learner performance with stakeholders.	

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	27	46	21	47	21	47
4th-Grade Reading	25	48	26	50	23	50
5th-Grade Reading	22	48	26	46	18	50
3rd-Grade Math	18	43	16	43	12	43
4th-Grade Math	18	42	19	43	20	44
5th-Grade Math	12	41	*	41	*	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	9	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	19	42	12	39	*	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	19	47	19	47	11	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	21	39	29	39	15	38



Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of students in all grades and content areas scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 on the KSA was below the state averages, except in 4th-grade science, where data were suppressed for public reporting.

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)
Score of 0	23	26	29	29	28	30
Score of 60-80	35	35	37	35	35	35
Score of 100	28	24	23	23	20	22
Score of 140	14	14	11	13	17	13

Plus

- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025 and was above the state average of 13% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of students receiving zero points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 28% in 2022-2023 to 20% 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	27	21	21
Female	30	22	13
Male	25	19	28
White	38	29	*
African American	21	*	21
Hispanic or Latino	*	20	20
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	27	*
English Learners	22	17	16
English Learners plus Monitored	22	19	18
Economically Disadvantaged	26	18	21
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 28% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 30% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2024-2024.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade ELs students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading the KSA decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 26% in 2022-2023 to 21% 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	18	16	12
Female	*	*	*
Male	23	16	19
White	25	*	17
African American	*	12	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	10
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	15	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	15	*	11
Economically Disadvantaged	17	14	10
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 10% 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	25	26	23
Female	28	16	24
Male	22	35	21
White	42	55	20
African American	20	15	24
Hispanic or Latino	24	*	22
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	26	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	26	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	26	26	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 20% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 28% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 42% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 26% in 2022-2023 to 20% 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	18	19	20
Female	11	11	20
Male	24	26	21
White	32	25	*
African American	*	15	18
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	17
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	14	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	14	15
Economically Disadvantaged	19	19	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 24% 2022-2023 to 21% 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 32% in 2022-2023 to 25% 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2024-2025.



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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	*	9	*
Female	*	5	*
Male	*	12	*
White	*	25	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	8	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting.

Delta

- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting.



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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	22	26	18
Female	15	23	12
Male	27	29	23
White	31	59	29
African American	13	24	*
Hispanic or Latino	33	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	24	*
Economically Disadvantaged	21	28	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 16% 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	12	*	*
Female	9	*	*
Male	15	*	*
White	19	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	22	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting.

Delta

- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting.

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	19	12	*
Female	12	*	*
Male	23	14	*
White	31	29	*
African American	*	16	*
Hispanic or Latino	33	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	9	*
Economically Disadvantaged	17	14	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 31% in 2022-2023 to 29% in 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting 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	19	19	11
Female	15	20	10
Male	21	18	11
White	19	29	18
African American	13	*	9
Hispanic or Latino	*	11	13
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	18	8
Economically Disadvantaged	17	21	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 13% 2024-2025. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2022-2023.

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade ELs plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 18% in 2023-2024 to 8% 2024-2025. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA decreased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 9% 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	21	29	15
Female	24	38	17
Male	19	27	*
White	25	29	*
African American	*	38	12
Hispanic or Latino	22	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	21	31	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentages do not qualify for a plus.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA increased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 27% in 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA increased from 25% in 2022-2023 to 29% in 2023-2024. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA decreased from 38% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025. Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing on the KSA decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.



Schedule

Monday, January 12, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3 p.m.-4:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team
5:15 p.m.-6:30 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team
6:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1 (continued)	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team
9:15 a.m.-5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
5:15 p.m.-8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

Wednesday, January 14, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team
9:15 a.m.-5 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
5:10 p.m.-8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

Thursday, January 15, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.-Noon	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team

