



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

---

**Results for:  
Shacklette Elementary**

March 2-5, 2026

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Performance Standards Evaluation .....	2
Insights from the Review .....	3
<b>Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results</b> .....	<b>5</b>
eleot Narrative .....	8
<b>Improvement Priorities</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Improvement Priority 1 .....	11
Potential Leader Actions:.....	12
Improvement Priority 2 .....	13
Potential Leader Actions:.....	14
Your Next Steps .....	14
<b>Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Team Roster</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....	18
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	18
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....	20
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning .....	22
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning .....	24
Student Performance Data.....	27
Schedule .....	39



# Introduction

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

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

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

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

<b>Stakeholder Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>District-Level Administrators</b>	3
<b>Building-Level Administrators</b>	2
<b>Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)</b>	6
<b>Certified Staff</b>	28
<b>Noncertified Staff</b>	5
<b>Students</b>	38
<b>Parents</b>	4
<b>Total</b>	86

## 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:**

Shacklette Elementary demonstrates a strong foundation rooted in positive relationships, a welcoming environment and a shared commitment to supporting students and families. Students, families and educators report feeling welcomed and respected, signaling a culture of belonging. For example, 98% of families, 92% of educators and 81% of students agreed/absolutely agreed with survey statements indicating stakeholders "feel welcomed (1)." Additionally, 97% of families, 92% of educators and 83% of students agreed/absolutely agreed with statements about adults, learners and families being treated "with respect (2)." Safety was another shared strength, with all three groups affirming that adults make decisions that protect and support learners, as 95% of families, 86% of educators and 84% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that safety is considered "when making decisions (3)." These results indicate that the school has established a climate in which students and families feel supported and in which relationships foster a sense of belonging within the school community.

Interview data reinforced these perceptions of a welcoming and supportive environment. Parents described the school as inviting from the moment students arrive each morning, noting that staff members greet students by name, assist with arrival routines and create a positive start to the school day. Families also shared that the school consistently communicates in multiple languages through newsletters, social media, email, GroupMe and other outreach methods, which helps them remain informed and connected to school activities and initiatives. These communication practices contribute to strong family-school partnerships and further support the positive perceptions reflected in stakeholder survey data.

Classroom observational data and stakeholder interviews also highlighted supportive relationships between teachers and students. Observational data indicated that it was evident/very evident in 88% of classrooms that learners "demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)" and "are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." Students shared during interviews that teachers are approachable and willing to provide help when they struggle. Educators also described a collegial culture in which staff members support one another, and new teachers benefit from mentorship and collaboration. Structures such as weekly professional learning community (PLC) meetings and committees provide opportunities for teachers to work collaboratively, share strategies and contribute to ongoing school improvement efforts.

School leadership has established systems intended to support both behavioral expectations and instructional improvement. Administrators are visible throughout the building and engage staff in conversations to strengthen schoolwide practices. As part of these efforts, the school has implemented behavioral expectations: Work responsibly, Act safely, Value others and Engage respectfully (WAVE). This framework is intended to foster a shared understanding that reinforces respectful interactions and maintains learning environments.

Although the WAVE framework provides a clear structure for behavioral expectations, discipline and student behavior emerged as a concern during stakeholder interviews. Educators indicated that disruptions to instruction are often connected to inconsistent implementation of classroom-managed behavioral expectations across classrooms. While administrators were consistently described as responsive and proactive in addressing discipline issues and maintaining overall school order, teachers noted that the effectiveness of the school's behavioral systems depends on consistent reinforcement of expectations at the classroom level. Teachers also expressed a need for additional professional learning focused on effective classroom management strategies



(e.g., de-escalation techniques, routines) to address disruptive behaviors and support students experiencing trauma or other social-emotional challenges. Strengthening staff capacity in these areas and ensuring consistent implementation of classroom-managed behavioral expectations would help reinforce the WAVE framework and support the learning environment.

Also, leadership has established systems designed to support instructional decision-making and monitor student performance. The administrative team has implemented a centralized “Data Hub” to organize student performance data and provide educators with access to key academic and behavioral assessment results. Staff members reported that progress toward the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) goals is shared following formative assessment windows, increasing transparency around student performance trends and helping staff remain informed about progress toward school improvement goals.

While these systems provide an important foundation for improvement, evidence from interviews, observations and artifacts indicates that the school is in the early stages of developing a fully operational continuous improvement cycle. Although leadership monitors performance data and communicates trends to staff, the process for analyzing data and translating those findings into consistent instructional adjustments across classrooms is still developing. Teachers indicated that while student performance trends are shared, collaborative structures have not consistently resulted in instructional shifts that address identified learning gaps or ensure rigorous, differentiated learning experiences for all students.

Moving forward, the school is well-positioned to build on its strong culture of collaboration, supportive relationships and existing improvement structures. By strengthening the consistent implementation of WAVE behavioral expectations, expanding professional learning related to classroom management and trauma-informed practices and increasing opportunities for educators to collaboratively analyze student performance data and adjust instruction accordingly, the school can deepen its continuous improvement processes. These efforts will help ensure that both behavioral and instructional systems work together to protect instructional time, strengthen teaching and learning practices and ultimately improve student achievement outcomes.



# Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

Cognia’s Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool® (eleot®) is a learner-centric classroom observation tool that comprises 28 items organized in seven environments aligned with the Cognia Performance Standards. The tool provides useful, relevant, structured and quantifiable data to the extent to which students are engaged in activities and demonstrate knowledge, attitudes and dispositions that are conducive to effective learning. Classroom observations are conducted for a minimum of 20 minutes.

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 17 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	2.1	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	35%	35%	18%	12%
A2	2.6	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	41%	59%	0%
A3	3.0	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	12%	76%	12%
A4	2.4	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.	18%	35%	35%	12%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>2.5</b>				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.6	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	6%	35%	47%	12%
B2	2.5	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	6%	47%	41%	6%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	53%	47%	0%	0%
B4	2.2	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	18%	41%	41%	0%
B5	2.4	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	12%	53%	24%	12%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.2</b>			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.8	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	0%	29%	59%	12%
C2	2.5	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	18%	29%	35%	18%
C3	2.7	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	6%	35%	41%	18%
C4	3.2	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	12%	59%	29%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.8</b>			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.3	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	12%	59%	18%	12%
D2	2.2	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	24%	41%	29%	6%
D3	2.6	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	0%	47%	41%	12%
D4	2.1	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	29%	41%	24%	6%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.3</b>			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.8	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	47%	29%	18%	6%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	18%	41%	35%	6%
E3	2.4	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	12%	47%	35%	6%
E4	1.8	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	41%	41%	12%	6%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.1</b>			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.1	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	6%	82%	12%
F2	3.0	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	6%	6%	71%	18%
F3	2.6	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	18%	18%	47%	18%
F4	2.5	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	12%	35%	41%	12%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.8</b>			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.7	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	53%	29%	12%	6%
G2	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	88%	6%	0%	6%
G3	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	76%	12%	6%	6%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.5</b>			

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 17 formal classroom observations in core content classrooms and completed additional informal observations in special area classrooms and common areas throughout the building. Classroom observations provided insight into the instructional practices and learning conditions present across classrooms at Shacklette Elementary.

Overall averages on the 4-point scale ranged from 1.5 in the Digital Learning Environment to 2.8 in both the Supportive Learning Environment and the Well-Managed Learning Environment. Scores within the learning

environments varied, as they identified strengths around respectful interactions and treatment of students while also identifying opportunities to strengthen instructional rigor, differentiation and formative assessment practices.

A clear strength observed across classrooms was the respectful treatment of learners, as it was evident/very evident in 88% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” The observed fair treatment of learners fostered a mutually respectful learning environment, with positive interactions among learners and between learners and staff. For example, it was evident/very evident in 94% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” The team observed positive, respectful interactions among stakeholders throughout the building. Another strength identified was students’ application and understanding of classroom rules. The school has implemented expectations aligned with positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) practices, and observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 89% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).”

Although PBIS expectations were observed on posters throughout the school and in classrooms and students demonstrated knowledge of the rules, the team observed an opportunity for increased accountability around the implementation of established expectations to maximize instructional time. For example, it was evident/very evident in 65% of classrooms that “learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)”, and it was evident/very evident in 53% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).”

Active learning varied across classroom settings; some opportunities existed for students to engage in collaborative activities or participate in peer discussions. However, it was evident/very evident in 30% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, task and/or assignments (D4).” In relation, the team also observed that it was evident/very evident in 12% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” Providing opportunities for students to collaborate both with and without technology can support active participation and higher-level thinking as students talk through problems to work toward a mutual solution. In many instances, instruction remained primarily teacher-directed, with students completing assigned tasks rather than participating in sustained inquiry or student-driven problem-solving. For example, it was evident/very evident in 30% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1).”

Observational data also indicated variability in the level of academic rigor and differentiation present during instruction. It was evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” Similarly, it was evident/very evident in 53% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” Increasing opportunities for students to engage in rigorous tasks that challenge their thinking will increase cognitive engagement. Another area for growth relates to increasing differentiated instruction to more effectively address individual learner needs. For example, it was evident/very evident in 30% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” In addition, student survey results aligned with the need for increased differentiation, as 68% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).”

The team observed a need to strengthen both student progress tracking and the clarity of students’ learning goals. While learning targets were often posted and students were frequently able to describe the task they were completing, students were less able to explain how success would be measured or what steps were needed to improve their performance. Observational data revealed a critical link between clear assessment expectations and cognitive demand, as it was evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)” and evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4).” Increasing opportunities for students to understand the



expectations of how their work will be assessed through rubrics and success criteria will increase learners' ability to demonstrate and describe high-quality work.

Overall, observational data indicated that a positive and supportive learning environment characterized by respectful relationships and established behavioral expectations exists in the school. The team encourages the school to leverage these strengths to build greater consistency in rigorous Tier 1 instruction, differentiated learning opportunities and formative assessment practices, all of which are necessary to drive student ownership of their learning.



# Improvement Priorities

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

## Improvement Priority 1

Collaboratively strengthen, communicate, implement and monitor a systematic continuous improvement process that defines clear measures of success, uses data to inform instructional decisions and includes ongoing progress monitoring to strengthen instruction and enhance student learning.

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

### Findings:

Evidence from student performance assessment data, classroom observations, stakeholder perception surveys, leadership and stakeholder interviews and the review of artifacts indicates that Shacklette Elementary would benefit from strengthening systems that ensure a consistent, collaborative continuous improvement process focused on improving student learning outcomes.

Student performance data reveal the school performed significantly below state averages in all tested grades and content areas on the 2024-2025 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA). Additionally, grade-level scores decreased significantly in math. For example, 39% of 3rd-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024, compared to 16% in 2024-2025. Similarly, 19% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in 2023-2024, compared to 8% in 2024-2025. To monitor student performance formatively throughout the year, the school is currently using Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data. The principal shared MAP data from the winter assessment window with the team during her presentation. Current projections from that time frame indicated that 24.2% of 3rd- and 4th-grade students were predicted to perform at the Proficient/Distinguished level in reading and 12.4% in mathematics. For students with disabilities, projections indicate that 3.8% will be Proficient/Distinguished in reading and 0% in mathematics, highlighting substantial achievement gaps. These findings suggest that stronger systems are needed to ensure that student performance and formative assessment data are consistently analyzed and used to inform instructional decisions and accelerate student learning.

A review of artifacts and interview data indicate the school has established several structures intended to support improvement. Weekly PLC meetings occur; leadership teams engage in Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycles and multiple committees review student data related to school improvement efforts. The "Data Hub", shared with the team as evidence, reflects an extensive collection of student performance data but is inconsistently monitored. While these systems demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement, evidence suggests that data analysis and improvement cycles are occurring primarily at the leadership level and are inconsistently embedded to inform classroom instructional practices.

Classroom observations further support this finding. Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)." Interviews revealed that several instructional expectations have been communicated, including the posting and deconstruction of learning targets and the use of scaffolds and total participation techniques. Learning walks and instructional walkthroughs occur regularly, and professional learning opportunities are provided for staff. However, the team found little documentation linking walkthrough feedback to PLC analysis of formative data, resulting in instructional adjustments. Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 30% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs



(A1).” Variation in instructional practices across classrooms suggests that while expectations have been communicated, a feedback cycle that characterizes a strong, continuous improvement process is still developing.

Stakeholder perception data provide additional context. Evidence from the Teacher UpBeat Survey (Fall 2025) indicated high levels of teacher trust in school leadership and positive perceptions of teacher voice and appreciation. For example, 100% of educators agreed with the statements, “I trust my principal (11)” and “The principal at my school is an effective instructional leader (15)”, and 93% agreed that “there are opportunities for teachers to take on leadership roles at this school (39).” These results suggest a strong foundation of relational trust and leadership credibility within the school. However, responses related to instructional conditions suggest opportunities to further strengthen collaborative practices that support instructional improvement. For example, 71% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9).” Additionally, 82% agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “At my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)”, indicating an opportunity to strengthen collaborative structures that support instructional problem-solving and responsiveness to individual learner needs.

Stakeholder interviews further highlight the need to strengthen continuous improvement systems. Educators shared that they are frequently asked to provide feedback through surveys and forms, and that, generally, leadership considers this feedback. However, interviews also revealed that when concerns related to student learning are identified, structured processes for collaboratively determining instructional solutions are less consistent. The team found that instructional challenges are sometimes attributed to student behavior or trauma, suggesting the need to strengthen the school’s focus on collaborative problem-solving and academic urgency.

Taken together, the evidence indicates the school has established many of the foundational structures necessary to support continuous improvement, including strong relational trust, regular professional learning opportunities and systems for collecting student data. However, the systematic use of student performance and formative assessment data in PLCs to inform instructional planning and monitor instructional impact is not consistently embedded across classrooms.

To strengthen schoolwide outcomes, the team recommends that leadership prioritize building teacher capacity by refining the PLC protocol to ensure collaborative teams move beyond data collection to active data-informed instruction. This involves embedding the intellectual preparation cycle (e.g., unit internalization, lesson rehearsal, student work analysis) directly into the planning process to refine instructional routines. By narrowing the focus to specific formative assessments and MAP data, teams can more efficiently monitor student trends and identify learning gaps. This approach will allow leadership to provide targeted feedback that transforms data into actionable Tier 1 instructional shifts. Strengthening these systems will help ensure that the school’s existing structures for collaboration and data collection translate into consistent instructional practices, stronger teacher ownership of improvement efforts and measurable gains in student achievement and growth.

#### **Potential Leader Actions:**

- Strengthen implementation and monitoring of the intellectual preparation cycle to ensure all collaborative teams engage in unit/lesson internalization, identify learning gaps in student understanding and increase the level of rigor required for student mastery.
- Refine and monitor the PLC protocol across all collaborative teams to ensure a clear, consistent process for reviewing and analyzing student performance data to plan and modify instruction.
- Provide professional learning for certified and classified staff on analyzing formative and interim assessment data, identifying trends and gaps in student performance and using data to determine instructional next steps while modeling effective data-analysis conversations during PLC meetings.
- Build teacher capacity through professional learning and coaching on analyzing and interpreting assessment data results and using the data to plan for targeted tiered instruction.

## Improvement Priority 2

Clearly communicate and monitor high expectations for Tier 1 instruction, ensuring teachers implement evidence-based, high-yield instructional strategies, and prioritize learner-centered experiences that shift the focus from the teacher delivery to active student engagement, challenging all students to reach their potential.

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

### Findings:

The school has established instructional frameworks to support learning, such as clear instructional look-fors, defined non-negotiables (e.g., instructional expectations, WAVE expectations), consistent learning walks and implementation of district-approved high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs). Coaching logs reflect ongoing feedback cycles and regular data review. However, observational data indicated variability in the implementation of rigorous instructional practices. For example, it was evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms that “learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)”, and it was evident/very evident in 47% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2).”

These data indicate that the school is ready for the next phase of focus, ensuring that rigorous, standards-aligned and learner-centered instruction is implemented consistently and equitably in every classroom to strengthen and improve measurable student outcomes. As mentioned in Improvement Priority 1, student performance on the 2024-2025 KSA was below the state average for all grades and content areas. These trends underscore the urgency of strengthening daily core instruction aligned to grade-level standards.

Stakeholder perception data align with these trends. While 87% of families agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “In the last 30 days, my child received support based on their needs (21)”, student perception data reflect variability regarding the consistency of personalized learning. For example, 68% of students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “In the last 30 days, I had lessons changed to meet my needs (13)”, and 75% of students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “In the last 30 days, I had support when I needed it (18).” Although family responses reflect a generally supportive learning environment, students do not consistently experience instruction as differentiated and cognitively engaging.

The team observed classrooms that were mostly well managed, as it was evident/evident in 94% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1).” While behavioral systems are well-established, leadership must now shift focus from teacher delivery to active student engagement and academic urgency. The school needs to leverage every instructional minute to deliver high-impact, standards-aligned learning experiences that influence MAP growth, KSA outcomes and overall student academic growth.

Stakeholder interviews indicate that school leaders recognize the need to strengthen the consistency and rigor of Tier 1 instruction. Leaders described several initiatives implemented to address these needs, including the use of Expeditionary Learning Education, Illustrative Mathematics, Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling, University of Florida Literacy Institute Foundations and strengthened implementation of multi-tiered system of supports processes. Interviews and classroom observations further revealed pockets of strong instructional practice, alongside areas where Tier 1 instruction requires continued strengthening, particularly as newer teachers build capacity to use formative data to determine appropriate instructional adjustments.

The school’s culture, collaborative structures and leadership visibility position it well for acceleration. By strengthening collaborative data inquiry cycles, focusing on formative assessment trends, embedding the intellectual preparation cycle, increasing modeling of higher-order questioning and elevating academic urgency, the school can shift from pockets of strong practice to systemic instructional consistency. With focused attention on equitable Tier 1 implementation, the school is positioned to increase predicted proficiency rates, reduce subgroup disparities and ensure that every learner consistently experiences rigorous, standards-aligned instruction.



### **Potential Leader Actions:**

- Elevate instructional rigor by using higher-order thinking strategies (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) consistently across classrooms to challenge students and support academic growth while holding all learners to high expectations.
- Promote active learning through instructional strategies that foster student discussion, problem-solving, inquiry and other forms of meaningful engagement while encouraging collaboration with related services (e.g., Multilingual learner, exceptional education, speech/language) to strengthen Tier 1 instruction and provide cohesive learning experiences for students.
- Ensure differentiated instructional practices are consistently used to meet the diverse needs of all students, including high-needs subgroups, by providing training on how teachers can adjust what students learn, how they learn it and how they demonstrate their understanding based on student data.
- Use multiple data sources (e.g., formative, summative, attendance including chronic absenteeism) to monitor progress, identify gaps and adjust instruction while leveraging PLCs and coaching to provide consistent feedback aligned to student needs and academic standards.
- Strengthen implementation of existing Tier 1 instructional expectations through regular walkthroughs, timely feedback and monitoring of instructional practices to ensure fidelity, accountability and high-quality instruction for all students.

## **Your Next Steps**

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

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

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



# Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal has the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school.

The Diagnostic Review Team noted that the principal has actively guided the staff through developing a new mission and vision statement and intends to build on this momentum by leading the creation of instructional visions for both math and English language arts. Evidence shows the development of a robust "Data Hub" that compiles extensive student information from multiple sources. Since stepping into the role, the principal has begun laying the foundational systems needed to support and strengthen the school improvement process, and these early efforts reflect developing progress toward a data-driven approach to improvement.

The principal has launched a wide range of school improvement initiatives at Shacklette Elementary, demonstrating strategic thinking and a commitment to using continuous improvement cycles to analyze data. A few of the systems currently in place and in various stages of implementation include learning walks, PBIS, data collection and PLCs. While this reflects strong leadership and a desire to build coherent structures, the number of simultaneous initiatives has created an important opportunity to refine focus. Narrowing the school's improvement efforts to one or two high-leverage priorities will help ensure that both certified and non-certified staff can fully engage in professional learning and coaching aligned to the school's most urgent needs.

The principal has identified data-based decision making as a priority for the school year, and the administrative team demonstrates a strong understanding of the data and the instructional shifts needed to improve student outcomes. A meaningful area for growth is expanding the systems perspective so that all school personnel, including certified and classified staff, and stakeholder groups share a clear understanding of this work, including the school's purpose, priorities and expected outcomes. Intentional structures that promote collaboration among related services (e.g., multilingual learner, exceptional education, speech/language, Family Resource Center) and general education teachers would further strengthen the systems approach by ensuring that all instructional

teams are aligned in how they interpret data, plan instruction and monitor student progress. Broadening this shared clarity would deepen collective ownership of school-wide improvement efforts and strengthen coherence across initiatives. Building staff capacity to understand why data are collected and to better analyze student data will support more informed instructional adjustments and improve overall teacher effectiveness.

The principal's effective communication stands out as a key strength, complemented by the strong collegial support clearly visible throughout the building. Stakeholders consistently articulate the school's instructional expectations, PBIS commitments and the shared belief in doing what is best for students. She reinforces this clarity by regularly soliciting feedback through surveys, Google Forms, committees and other input tools, ensuring that stakeholder perspectives meaningfully inform decision making. Her commitment to being a lifelong learner models the growth mindset she expects from others and helps foster a culture of continuous improvement.



# Team Roster

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

Team Member Name	Brief Biography
<b>Lana Williams</b>	Lana E. Williams is a veteran educational leader with over 30 years of experience in teaching, school leadership and district administration. She currently serves as a Carolina Teacher Induction Program (TIP) coach at the University of South Carolina, supporting novice teachers through coaching, professional learning and leadership development. Also, Lana is the owner and operator of L&E Leadership Services, a consulting agency focused on executive coaching, human resource management and providing temporary professionals to meet diverse organizational needs. She has held senior leadership roles, including superintendent, chief instructional officer, executive director, principal and director of alternative education.
<b>Holly Linville</b>	Holly Linville has 25 years of experience in education, serving in both instructional and administrative roles. She currently serves as an Education Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). She spent three years as an assistant superintendent in a Kentucky public school district and previously held multiple district-level leadership positions, including director of curriculum and instruction, director of pupil personnel and district assessment coordinator. Earlier in her career, Holly taught intermediate mathematics for 13 years.
<b>Jaynae Boateng</b>	Jaynae Boateng is an experienced educator with 31 years of experience in various roles, including elementary teacher, assistant principal, middle and high school principal, and Title I consultant with KDE. She is currently serving in her fourth year as an ERL with KDE where she is assigned to a CSI middle school requiring more rigorous intervention (MRI) in Louisville, Kentucky. Her role is to empower and equip leaders and teachers by building sustainable systems using a continuous improvement approach focused on student learning to ensure that all students are prepared to pursue a successful future.
<b>Jennifer Robin Filiatreau Cochran</b>	Jennifer Robin Filiatreau Cochran has served as superintendent of Washington County Schools in Kentucky since 2009 and has more than 32 years of experience in public education. She previously served as a P-8 principal, instructional and behavioral consultant, literacy coordinator and regular and special education teacher. Her leadership experience also includes teaching as an adjunct professor at St. Catharine College and Midway University. Robin has been actively engaged in state and national professional organizations, including service as president of the Central Kentucky Education Cooperative and currently serves as a board member of the Kentucky Association of School Administrators, Kentucky Association of School Superintendents, National Association of School Superintendents, Kentucky School for the Deaf, Superintendents Advisory Council and Ephriam McDowell Haggin Hospital. She has served on legislative and advisory committees supporting education policy and innovation and has mentored new superintendents through statewide leadership initiatives.

# Appendix

## Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

### Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

## 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.	3
25. Leaders promote action research by professional staff members to improve their practice and advance learning.	Leaders rarely create a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution or learning environments. Professional staff members seldom engage in action research to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in few or no learning opportunities for professional staff members about action research.	Leaders occasionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, sometimes engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in some learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders regularly create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, routinely engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities for professional staff members to implement action research.	Leaders intentionally create and preserve a culture that invites inquiry, reflection, and dialogue about instructional problems and issues relevant to the institution and/or individual learning environments. Professional staff members, as a group or as individuals, consistently engage in action research using an inquiry-based process that includes identifying instructional areas of improvement, collecting data, and reporting results to make informed instructional changes. Leaders provide and engage in learning opportunities customized for professional staff members about action research.	2

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

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

# Student Performance Data

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

## Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	18	46	18	47	18	47
4th-Grade Reading	29	48	25	50	19	50
5th-Grade Reading	33	48	28	46	16	50
3rd-Grade Math	22	43	39	43	16	43
4th-Grade Math	20	42	18	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	21	41	19	41	8	43
4th-Grade Science	8	35	9	34	7	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	21	42	19	39	14	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	31	47	26	47	22	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	14	39	*	39	10	38

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA was below the state average in all grades and content areas from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

### Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	24	26	39	29	33	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	35	35	29	35	23	35
Percent Score of 100	30	24	23	23	24	22
Percent Score of 140	11	14	10	13	20	13

#### Plus

- The percentage of students receiving 100 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment was 24% compared to the state average of 22% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was 20% compared to the state average of 13% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment has been equal to or higher than the state average for three consecutive years.

#### Delta

- The percentage of students receiving 0 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment was 33% compared to the state average of 30% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	18	18	18
Female	18	19	*
Male	19	17	16
White	*	33	20
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	24
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	31
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	31
Economically Disadvantaged	14	*	24
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025.

**Delta**

- The percentage of 3rd-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 33% in 2023-2024 to 20% 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	22	39	16
Female	25	35	*
Male	19	43	24
White	29	*	*
African American	*	33	*
Hispanic or Latino	29	40	18
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	47	25
English Learners plus Monitored	*	44	25
Economically Disadvantaged	21	37	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA increased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 43% in 2023-2024.

**Delta**

- The percentages of 3rd-grade math students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA have declined for all subgroups from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 KSA in all reported categories.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	29	25	19
Female	*	29	21
Male	22	20	15
White	*	46	19
African American	25	*	20
Hispanic or Latino	*	24	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	17	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	16	*
Economically Disadvantaged	28	24	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

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

**Delta**

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading has decreased for all subgroups on the KSA from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 in all reported categories.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	20	18	*
Female	*	17	*
Male	23	18	*
White	54	31	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	18	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	11	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	11	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	20	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

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

**Delta**

- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA decreased from 23% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA decreased from 54% in 2022-2023 to 31% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	8	9	7
Female	7	*	*
Male	*	10	*
White	23	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	5	10	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentages of 4th-grade students in the all students group scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA decreased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 7% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	33	28	16
Female	47	29	*
Male	25	28	12
White	27	46	42
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	50	*	10
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	32	29	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

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

**Delta**

- The percentage of 5th-grade students who scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased in all subgroups from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 50% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	21	19	8
Female	*	18	*
Male	21	*	12
White	36	*	17
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	13	10
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	19	
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

**Plus**

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

**Delta**

- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on math decreased for all groups of students from the 2023-2024 KSA to the 2024-2025 KSA.

## 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	21	19	14
Female	*	21	*
Male	25	16	12
White	18	*	17
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	40	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	27	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	22	21	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased in all reported categories from 2023-2024 to 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	31	26	22
Female	43	15	29
Male	25	36	16
White	27	46	25
African American	*	*	14
Hispanic or Latino	*	27	30
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	18
English Learners plus Monitored	*	11	30
Economically Disadvantaged	33	27	22
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 15% in 2023-2024 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade English learners (ELs) plus monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 30% in 2024-2025.

### Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA decreased from 36% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA decreased from 46% in 2023-2024 to 25% 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	14	*	10
Female	*	*	13
Male	14	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	15
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	15
Economically Disadvantaged	14	*	9
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

### Plus

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

### Delta

- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA decreased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.

# Schedule

## Monday, March 2, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
4:45 p.m. – 6:15 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7 p.m. – 9 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Tuesday, March 3, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Wednesday, March 4, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9:15 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:15 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Thursday, March 5, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
10 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
10 a.m. – 3 p.m.	Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members