



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Shelby Academy**

Feb. 23-26, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Performance Standards Evaluation	2
Insights from the Review	3
Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results	5
eleot Narrative	8
Improvement Priorities	11
Improvement Priority 1	11
Potential Leader Actions:	12
Improvement Priority 2	13
Potential Leader Actions:	14
Your Next Steps	15
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	16
Team Roster	18
Appendix	19
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	21
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	23
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	25
Student Performance Data	28
Schedule	41

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	2
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Instructional Coach, Educational Resource)	6
Certified Staff	16
Noncertified Staff	3
Students	11
Parents	7
Total	48

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 process, practices, and structures within the institution to arrive at the findings of the team. Guided by evidence, the team arrived at findings that will inform your institution's continuous improvement efforts. The findings are aligned to research-based criteria designed to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.

Strengths and Continuous Improvement

The Diagnostic Review Team identified strengths in creating a safe learning culture and implementing foundational infrastructures to improve instructional practices while recognizing opportunities for continuous improvement in Tier 1 instruction. In addition, the school is in the initial stage of adopting a shared leadership approach to strengthen stakeholder relationships. The school's mission and vision are visible in various documents provided by the principal in the "Shelby Academy 2025-2026 Evidence Organizational Chart," as well as displayed in classrooms and hallways. These items reflect setting high expectations, maintaining a growth mindset and learning by doing. Interview data indicated a commitment to learners. For example, when asked what they liked best about their school, stakeholders resoundingly answered the students, which indicates that the school has built a supportive environment that makes students feel safe and trusted.

Across families, students and educators, survey data reflect strong perceptions of safety, care, respect and support. Families and students reported feeling safe and experiencing genuine care and respect from staff. Survey results showed that 91% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)" and "the adults think about children's safety when making decisions (3)." Similarly, 82% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel safe (3)." Interview data from students and families further support these findings, indicating that the school creates and maintains institutional structures that support learners. Educator survey results also reflected a positive culture as 82% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)."

In response to the question, "What four words best describe, in general, your child's school (22)?", 75% of families selected "safe", 84% chose "respectful" and 81% selected "welcoming." Interview data aligned with the family survey results. When asked how parents know that their child is learning and their academic needs are being met, all participants expressed that the staff genuinely cared for their students and that they received good communication from classroom teachers and support staff. However, elementary students reported different perceptions about their experiences. For example, when asked, "Which four words best describe your school? (20)", 73% of elementary students chose "safe", 59% selected "friendly", 46% chose "boring" and 44% selected "exciting." These results show that the school experience is not the same for everyone. Instead, it is divided, with some students feeling safe and welcome and others needing more engagement in instruction.

Big Rock 2 is anchored in "an intentional focus on deeper learning and personalized learning", with the stated goals to "support teacher efficacy in creating and facilitating rigorous, engaging, standards-based learning experiences that are multicultural and promote student voice and choice, cultivating students who are independent learners and take charge of their own learning and perform at such a level of excellence that every product/outcome produced by our students is Backpack Quality Work." While acceleration plans with progress monitoring and similar Tier 2 and Tier 3 efforts are identified as action steps and tasks, classroom observations revealed it was evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, task and/or assignments (D4)." Additionally, survey data revealed 80% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs,



interests and potential (8).” Conversely, 69% of students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “In the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” This is further supported by observational data where it was evident/very evident in 37% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Although the school has developed a professional learning community (PLC) structure, ongoing efforts are needed to refine practices that enhance and build upon individual learners’ comprehension and mastery of the subject matter.



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 on 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 22 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.9	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	55%	9%	32%	5%
A2	2.9	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	5%	14%	68%	14%
A3	3.2	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	9%	59%	32%
A4	1.6	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.	50%	36%	14%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.4				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.3	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	9%	64%	14%	14%
B2	2.7	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	0%	41%	50%	9%
B3	1.9	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	32%	45%	23%	0%
B4	2.4	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	5%	55%	41%	0%
B5	2.1	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	14%	64%	18%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.3			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.6	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	14%	18%	64%	5%
C2	2.6	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	18%	18%	50%	14%
C3	3.0	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	5%	18%	50%	27%
C4	3.0	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	5%	14%	59%	23%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.8			



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.	18%	41%	36%	5%
D2	2.0	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	36%	41%	9%	14%
D3	2.7	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	0%	45%	36%	18%
D4	1.6	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	55%	27%	18%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.2			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.5	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	55%	36%	9%	0%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	14%	45%	41%	0%
E3	2.4	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	9%	50%	36%	5%
E4	1.6	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	50%	41%	9%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.9			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.2	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	9%	59%	32%
F2	3.1	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	5%	9%	59%	27%
F3	2.5	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	23%	18%	41%	18%
F4	2.7	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	5%	41%	36%	18%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.9			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	73%	23%	0%	5%
G2	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	91%	9%	0%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	95%	5%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.2			

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 22 observations in core content classrooms and several informal observations in common areas and non-core content classrooms. Observations of students in their learning environments revealed both strengths and areas for improvement.

In many classrooms, the team observed orderly learning environments anchored in routines and respectful interactions. Most educators were consistent and concerned in their interactions, while students generally understood behavioral expectations. These conditions provide a foundation for learning in most classrooms.

The Well-Managed, Supportive and Equitable Learning Environments yielded the highest overall ratings of 2.9, 2.8 and 2.4 on a 4-point scale, respectively. The team observed mostly well-organized learning environments that were founded on established routines that promote respect, order, fairness and access. Notably, it was evident/very evident in 91% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)”, and in 86% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2).” The team recognized respectful interactions among students and teachers. Respectful, caring relationships and academic supports were consistently observed, as it was evident/very evident in 82% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)”, and in 77% of classrooms that “learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3).” Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 91% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” Instances in which “learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2)” were evident/very evident in 82% of classrooms. These results demonstrate that students generally experience classroom environments where expectations and predictable resources are available to all. However, it was evident/very evident in 14% of classrooms that “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 (A4).”

Observational data also revealed a lack of or inconsistent use of several student-centered practices across all seven learning environments. The team observed less consistency in student risk-taking, pacing, productive learning time and transitions. For example, it was evident/very evident in 69% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged and purposeful (C1)” and evident/very evident in 64% of classrooms that “learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback) (C2).” Some classroom management indicators were also observed with less consistency, as it was evident/very evident in 59% of classrooms that “learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)” and evident/very evident in 54% of classrooms that “learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4).”

Instructional tasks were frequently designed for whole-group delivery, with few visible adjustments based on individual learning needs. While 80% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners’ needs, interests and potential (8)”, 69% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” Further, instances where “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)” were evident/very evident in 37% of classrooms.

The team identified a chance to strengthen students’ opportunities to demonstrate or describe high-quality work to improve student achievement. It was evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work, (E2)” and “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3).” Stakeholder survey results confirmed the lack of student-centered practices, as 54% of students chose “complete worksheets” and 53% selected “listen to teachers talk” when asked, “Which four phrases best describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?” Together, these patterns signal the importance of implementing purposeful strategies that deepen personalization, clarify assessment expectations and empower students to take ownership of their learning.

The team observed limited opportunities for students to actively engage in their learning through collaboration, discourse and connection to real-world problem solving. For example, it was evident/very evident in 54% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” Instances where “Learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)” were evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms. Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)” and in 18% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).”

The Diagnostic Review Team found low academic expectations in several classrooms with learners who “strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)” evident/very evident in 28% of classrooms. Additionally, the team seldom observed students using exemplars or rubrics to guide their learning or employing mechanisms to monitor their own learning. In 9% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” and that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” These findings indicate that students lack a clear means to monitor their progress toward meeting the established learning targets in their lessons, thereby inhibiting their ability to advocate for themselves (e.g., asking for additional support or acceleration).

It was evident/very evident in 23% of classrooms that learners “demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)” and “take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5).” Furthermore, it was evident/very evident in 59% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” 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).” These findings provide the school with an opportunity to increase the complexity and rigor in instructional practices, integrate those expectations into teaching and learning and clearly communicate those high expectations to students to improve their achievement.

The Digital Learning Environment had the lowest overall average rating of 1.2. While students have access to technology in their classroom, it was evident/very evident in 5% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).” Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that learners use technology to “conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2)” or “communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3).” These findings suggest that, when present, technology was typically used passively rather than as a tool for higher-order reasoning, collaboration or inquiry.

Overall, the observational data highlight several noteworthy patterns in current instructional practices. Notable emerging strengths include areas such as fair and consistent interactions with students, positive relational dynamics and effective classroom management routines. However, opportunities remain to enhance differentiation, academic rigor and collaboration to ensure all learners experience engaging and high-quality learning opportunities.

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

Improve school climate and culture by intentionally and consistently collaborating with teachers, families and students to strengthen instructional capacity, enhance student learning and promote stakeholder engagement.

Standard 3: Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priority and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.

Findings:

The school has created structures to support collaboration and stakeholder engagement; however, implementation lacks consistency, transparency and meaningful inclusion of diverse stakeholder voices. While incremental academic gains are evident, persistent achievement gaps between the school and the state underscore the importance of strengthening the educational climate and culture and leveraging authentic collaboration for improving instructional capacity and student outcomes.

Student performance data reveal modest improvements in proficiency rates over the past three years across several grade levels and content areas. For example, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 25% in 2024-2025, and 3rd-grade math scores increased from 9% Proficient/Distinguished in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025. Scores in 4th- and 5th-grade reading and math also show upward trends. Despite these gains, performance remains substantially below state averages in nearly every reported content area. For instance, in 2024–2025, the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading was 25% compared to the state average of 47%, and in math, 14% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished compared to 43% statewide. These persistent gaps suggest that while improvement efforts are underway, they have not produced outcomes commensurate with state performance levels. Closing these gaps will require instructional refinement and cohesive stakeholder engagement aligned to shared priorities for student success.

Survey data reveal a contrast between students' and adults' perceptions. While 95% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I followed a process where I tried and assessed different strategies to improve my practice (23)”, 67% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “the adults try new things to make our school better (6).” This discrepancy suggests that while adults believe they are engaging in improvement efforts responsive to student needs, students inconsistently experience or recognize those efforts as meaningful or impactful. Such perceptual gaps can influence school climate and culture, trust and overall engagement within the school community.

Results from the Teach Upbeat Teacher Perception Survey further illuminate the role of leadership in shaping professional culture. From spring 2025 to fall 2025, staff perceptions of teacher voice and leadership improved, with the percentage of staff reporting that “administrators at my school actively seek input from teachers when making important decisions (38)” increasing from 79% to 83% and the percentage reporting that “there are opportunities for teachers to take on leadership roles at this school (39)” increasing from 82% to 83%. Additionally, the percentage of staff reporting that “I trust my principal (11)” increased from 89% to 96%, and the percentage reporting that “the principal at my school looks out for the wellbeing of teachers (10)” and “my principal backs me up when I need support (12)” increased from 93% to 96%. These findings indicate that while

leadership practices are improving, opportunities exist to grow stakeholder voice and involvement in leadership roles across the school.

Interview data indicate challenges related to authentic stakeholder collaboration. Although stakeholders reported being able to share ideas, several indicated that implemented initiatives typically originate from leadership. This perception has led some stakeholders to feel cautious or hesitant about sharing genuine feedback, suggesting that engagement structures may be more procedural than empowering. Additionally, interviews revealed limited formal opportunities for family engagement. The school does not have a parent teacher association, and parent engagement events are often limited to Open House and Literacy Night. Both interviews and an artifact review yielded little evidence of systematic mechanisms for families to provide feedback, raise concerns or participate in decision-making processes. These findings suggest that while communication may occur, authentic partnership and shared leadership opportunities are limited.

Artifacts demonstrate that the school has established multiple committees, including a literacy committee, Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), PLCs and a social-emotional learning committee. These structures reflect an intent to involve stakeholders in schoolwide initiatives. PLCs, in particular, are embedded within the school's organizational framework and have the potential to strengthen instructional capacity. When considered alongside interview and survey data, the evidence suggests that while structures for engagement exist, the impact of these structures on stakeholder voice, shared decision-making and school climate and culture are growth opportunities.

The school demonstrates a foundational commitment to improvement, as evidenced by some incremental academic gains and the establishment of collaborative structures. However, persistent achievement gaps, perceptual discrepancies among stakeholder groups and limited evidence of authentic family and student voice indicate that stakeholder engagement efforts are not fully realized. While leaders have created opportunities for participation, stakeholders inconsistently perceive their input as influential in shaping school priorities and initiatives.

To fully meet Improvement Priority 1 and align with Standard 3, the school should move beyond providing passive opportunities for involvement to cultivating authentic, reciprocal engagement. This includes establishing clear feedback mechanisms for educators, families and students, ensuring transparency in decision-making processes, strengthening two-way communication and leveraging collaborative structures to build instructional capacity. Strengthening trust, voice and shared ownership will be critical to improving school climate and culture and accelerating student academic growth.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish a structured and predictable stakeholder feedback system to gather input, identify needs and strengthen trust across the school community.
- Create a transparent feedback-to-action process that clearly communicates how stakeholder input informs decisions, using consistent messaging to build trust and establish shared ownership of improvement efforts.
- Elevate student voice by establishing a student advisory group, ensuring learners play an active role in shaping school improvement.
- Expand and formalize family engagement structures by offering accessible, recurring opportunities for partnership (e.g., coffee with the principal, curriculum-focused events, advisory groups) that move beyond isolated and inconsistent event-based participation.
- Integrate academic, walkthrough and climate data into regular leadership and PLC review cycles to align school climate efforts with instructional improvement and ensure decisions are responsive to stakeholder needs.

Improvement Priority 2

Collaboratively leverage the current PLC process to develop and monitor Tier 1 instruction. Use formative assessment data to design differentiated lessons and adjust instruction in real time to meet learners' diverse academic needs.

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

Findings:

The school has structures that reference formative assessment and PLC collaboration; however, these structures are not implemented with coherence, consistency or clarity in many classrooms. While adults express a belief that instructional adjustments are occurring, observational and artifact evidence indicate that formative assessment is not systematically used to guide real-time instructional decision-making or to deepen Tier 1 instruction for all learners.

Detailed student performance data, highlighted as an addendum to this report, provide important context for this priority. As detailed earlier in this report, students continue to perform below the state average on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA), reflecting a persistent achievement gap. These results underscore the need for a clearly defined and consistently monitored formative assessment process that enables teachers to identify misconceptions early, differentiate Tier 1 instruction and respond immediately to student learning needs. Without a responsive system embedded in daily instruction, summative outcomes are unlikely to shift in a sustained manner.

Classroom observational data provide further context regarding current instructional practices. Learners were largely observed participating in whole-group activities that were not personalized to individual needs, as it was evident/very evident in 37% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 9% of classrooms that learners “monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” and “understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)”, indicating limited student ownership of learning. Although it was evident/very evident in 41% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)”, this feedback was not consistently tied to observable instructional adjustments. The team noted a lack of systematic use of formative assessment to determine whether students were meeting learning objectives and limited real-time instructional adjustments for students who required additional support or acceleration. Lessons generally proceeded as planned regardless of evidence of student understanding. Additionally, formative assessment at the conclusion of lessons to inform subsequent instruction was inconsistently implemented. Collectively, these findings indicate that instruction is not routinely monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' understanding, as required by Cognia Performance Standard 22.

Survey data reveals a perception gap between stakeholder groups. While 80% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that “at my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests and potential (8)”, 69% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” These findings show that although many students responded positively, the variance between educator and student responses suggests that instructional adjustments may not be consistently visible, meaningful or experienced by learners. This discrepancy aligns with observational evidence indicating limited real-time differentiation.

Interview data provides additional insight into the implementation of formative assessments. It was unclear when or how these assessments are administered, as they were rarely observed during classroom instruction. This raises questions about whether common formative assessments are functioning as tools for ongoing instructional adjustment or as periodic checkpoints disconnected from daily teaching practice. Interviews consistently reveal a



shared lack of understanding about how formative data should be used within PLCs to refine Tier 1 instruction in real time.

The school has designed processes to support formative assessment and instructional monitoring. The “PLC Process Questions and Process Map” explicitly references analyzing student learning data and determining instructional next steps, particularly PLC Questions 2 and 3. However, this documented process aligns minimally with classroom observations, suggesting a gap between design and implementation. Similarly, the “Feedback and Coaching Tools” artifact includes prompts for teachers to describe how they will assess learning during instruction and define next steps; however, walkthrough evidence inconsistently reflects these expectations in practice.

The Shelby Academy Coaching and Feedback Dashboard indicates that formative assessment implementation is monitored during classroom walkthroughs, with 73.5% noted as “aligned”, 22.5% marked as “no formative assessment” and 3.9% marked as “no” without clarification. The lack of clarity around these categories raises questions regarding the criteria used to determine alignment and the reliability of monitoring processes. Additionally, the “Data Collection and Progress Monitoring Flow Chart” shows that common formative assessments are administered every 4.5 weeks, with a minimum proficiency score of 80%. While this reflects an established assessment cadence, administering assessments at this interval does not constitute real-time formative assessment and may suggest a misunderstanding of formative assessment as a periodic event rather than a continuous instructional practice embedded within daily lessons.

In synthesis, the school has developed structures including PLC protocols, coaching tools, dashboards and assessment calendars, that reference formative assessment and instructional monitoring. However, these structures are not consistently operationalized in classrooms in ways that result in real-time instructional adjustments or differentiated Tier 1 instruction. Observational data, survey discrepancies and artifact misalignment collectively indicate that formative assessment practices are more procedural than instructional and more periodic than continuous.

To fully realize Improvement Priority 2 and meet the expectations of Cognia Performance Standard 22, the school should move from documenting processes to ensuring consistent implementation, building a shared understanding of formative assessment, embedding daily checks for understanding in instruction, using PLC time to collaboratively analyze evidence of learning and monitoring the impact of instructional adjustments on student outcomes. Without this coherence between process and practice, instructional monitoring will remain limited in its impact on advancing and deepening individual learners’ knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish clear, non-negotiable expectations for the consistent use of formative assessment within daily instruction, including how data should inform instructional decisions and differentiation.
- Build teacher capacity through targeted professional development, modeling and coaching focused on designing and implementing high-quality formative assessments aligned to learning targets.
- Embed formative assessment use into instructional planning and PLCs by requiring teachers to analyze formative data and plan differentiated instructional responses based on student needs.
- Monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs and feedback to observe formative assessment practices and provide actionable coaching to improve instruction.
- Align the coaching system to use data gathered from walkthroughs and classroom observations to support teachers in growing their use of formative assessment to adjust instruction.

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 principal at Shelby Academy has been the school leader since July 2020. The school was designated as a CSI school in 2019. The school remained in the bottom 5% and was identified for more rigorous intervention (MRI) in 2023. Upon arrival at the school, the principal began leading the school through the turnaround process. Through a focus on vision and mission, along with the "3 Big Rocks" of the school, Shelby Academy exited CSI status in 2024. Even though the school showed incremental academic growth in all content areas, it was reidentified as a CSI school in fall 2025.

The principal of Shelby Academy has demonstrated leadership and a commitment focused on improving the effectiveness of the school for students, staff, families and the community. Evidence indicated a focus on choosing relevant and timely information and interpreting data to determine next steps to support the needs of each student. Artifacts include multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) tracking sheets, data analysis protocol, a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) protocol, acceleration plans and literacy and math tiering guidelines. The master schedule has prioritized the reading and math workshop intervention rotations to support gap closures.

The principal also used continuous improvement methods to advance the school's vision and mission. The principal utilized her strong knowledge of systems and curriculum to develop and implement structures, processes and practices to support teacher efficacy. Artifacts include 30-60-90 day plans, "Big Rock #1 and Big Rock #2", PLCs, lesson/unit planning protocols, fidelity checks and lesson studies to improve staff capacity. The principal has used multiple data sources to guide and monitor improvement efforts. These sources included state and district assessment data and classroom assessments.

The primary area for improvement identified by the team is related to strengthening collaboration and stakeholder engagement. There seems to be an inconsistency between some artifacts and stakeholder interviews, indicating



minimal effort to collaborate with stakeholders throughout the continuous improvement cycle. The artifact “Teach Upbeat Teacher Perception Survey” from spring 2025 to fall 2025 indicated staff perceptions of teacher voice and leadership have improved. However, a review of data, observations, interviews and evidence indicates a lack of collaboration and teacher voice.

Finally, the principal would benefit from using strategies to develop an open communication process for all stakeholders to demonstrate voice and inclusion in improvement efforts. This would allow the principal to strengthen trust and shared leadership across all stakeholder groups.



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
Yamilette Williams	Yamilette Williams has served in various positions in education during her 27-year career. She has been a department chair, district training analyst, a director of instructional technology in two urban districts, state school improvement partner, project implementation manager and chief of curriculum, instruction and assessment. Presently, Yamilette serves as the owner and operator of Synergy Solutions Partners, LLC, where she directly supports educational technology companies with program implementation and school districts with leadership professional development and coaching for principals in their first three years.
Angela Hickey	Angela Hickey is an educational leader with more than 23 years of experience serving Kentucky public schools. She currently represents the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL), where she has spent the last seven years supporting schools and districts in building sustainable systems that empower and equip leaders and teachers to improve student learning. Throughout her career as an exceptional education teacher, elementary and middle school counselor and district support leader, Angela has focused on fostering strong relationships, strengthening leadership practices and maintaining a relentless focus on students.
Teresa Miller-Ruiz	Teresa Miller-Ruiz has over 29 years of experience in education, including 12 years with KDE supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching elementary school and serving as a district curriculum coach. She is a certified facilitator for Jim Shipley & Associates in School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence and Classroom Continuous Improvement. The primary focus of her current role is to improve student achievement by building leadership capacity, strengthening instructional practices in the classroom and creating sustainable systems to ensure future student success.
Alisha Ferry	Alisha Ferry has over 22 years of experience as an educator and currently serves as the principal of instruction at Owensboro Middle School. She has previously served as a middle school math teacher, instructional coach and digital curriculum developer, building expertise in curriculum design, instructional leadership and professional learning. Throughout her career, Alisha has supported school and district initiatives focused on strengthening Tier 1 instruction, improving student achievement and aligning professional development to standards and continuous improvement. Her experience across classroom instruction, coaching and leadership provides her with both practical insight and a systems-level perspective.

Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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



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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
21. Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices.	Instructional activities are primarily designed around curriculum objectives with little or no focus on learner needs and interests. Professional staff members rarely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their individual potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on needs and interests typical of most students. Professional staff members infrequently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Most learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members routinely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members consistently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	2
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	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.	3
28. Learners pursue individual goals including the acquisition of academic and non-academic skills important for their educational futures and careers.	Professional staff members rarely engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners do not choose activities or monitor their own progress toward goals.	Professional staff members sometimes engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners occasionally choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members regularly engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners routinely choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	Professional staff members consistently engage with learners to help them recognize their talents and potential, and to identify meaningful, attainable goals that support academic, career, personal, and social skills. Learners consistently choose activities and monitor their own progress, demonstrating active ownership of their stated goals.	1

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

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	21	46	21	47	25	47
4th-Grade Reading	11	48	20	50	20	50
5th-Grade Reading	*	48	13	46	23	50
3rd-Grade Math	9	43	*	43	23	43
4th-Grade Math	*	42	13	43	17	44
5th-Grade Math	6	41	9	41	14	43
4th-Grade Science	*	35	*	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	9	42	6	39	11	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	4	47	10	47	*	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	*	38

Plus

- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.

- The percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 6% in 2022-2023 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 4% in 2022-2023 to 10% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA for all content areas for 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 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	35	26	45	29	*	30
Percent Score of 60-80	28	35	34	35	*	35
Percent Score of 100	22	24	13	23	*	22
Percent Score of 140	15	14	8	13	*	13

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of students receiving 0 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 35% in 2022-2023 to 45% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of students receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 22% in 2022-2023 to 13% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	21	21	25
Female	24	23	29
Male	18	19	18
White	29	*	47
African American	16	13	16
Hispanic or Latino	25	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	24	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	28	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	17	19	24
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 3rd grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 25% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 29% 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 29% in 2022-2023 to 47% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 16% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 17% in 2022-2023 to 24% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 3rd-grade reading for 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	9	*	23
Female	*	*	26
Male	11	*	*
White	*	*	41
African American	5	*	19
Hispanic or Latino	25	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	24	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	28	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	7	*	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 3rd grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 5% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 7% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 3rd-grade math for 2022-2023 and 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	11	20	20
Female	8	18	*
Male	14	22	29
White	*	32	*
African American	*	14	17
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	*	14	*
Economically Disadvantaged	11	17	21
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 4th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 8% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 29% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 14% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 11% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 4th-grade reading for 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	13	17
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	17	24
White	*	*	*
African American	*	4	9
Hispanic or Latino	*	20	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	21	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	11	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 4th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 17% in 2023-2024 to 24% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade African American students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 4% in 2023-2024 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 11% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 4th-grade math for 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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

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

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	*	13	23
Female	*	16	*
Male	*	10	23
White	*	*	25
African American	*	6	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	23	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	10	23
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 5th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 13% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 10% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 10% in 2023-2024 to 23% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 5th-grade reading for 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	9	14
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	7	17
White	*	*	25
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 5th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 9% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 7% in 2023-2024 to 17% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 5th-grade math for 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	9	6	11
Female	*	5	*
Male	15	7	14
White	*	*	*
African American	7	*	*
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	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	8	4	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 5th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on KSA increased from 9% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 7% in 2023-2024 to 14% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA increased from 8% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 5th-grade social studies for 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 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	4	10	*
Female	*	5	*
Male	*	15	*
White	17	*	*
African American	*	6	*
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	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	9	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students in 5th grade scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 4% in 2022-2023 to 10% 2023-2024.

Delta

- The school performed below the state average on KSA in 5th-grade editing and mechanics for 2022-2023 and 2023-2024.

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

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
3 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Initial Team Meeting/ Introductions/ Review of Schedule	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6 p.m. – 9 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, Feb. 24, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m. – 4:15 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		Diagnostic Review Team Members
5:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, Feb. 25, 2026

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

Thursday, Feb. 26, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
9 a.m. – 3 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

