



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:
The Academy @ Shawnee (Middle School)

Jan. 12-15, 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	14
Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention (MRI) Schools	15
Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review	17
Team Roster	18
Appendix	19
Cognia Performance Standards Ratings	19
Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....	19
Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning	21
Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning	23
Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning	25
Student Performance Data.....	29
Schedule	39

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	1
Building-Level Administrators	5
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	6
Certified Staff	13
Noncertified Staff	5
Students	32
Parents	1
Total	63

Performance Standards Evaluation

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

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

Insights from the Review

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

Strengths and Continuous Improvement:

The Diagnostic Review Team found several positive attributes at The Academy @ Shawnee. Parent interviews showed that faculty and staff are responsive to emails and phone calls regarding their children. Parent interview data aligned with parent survey data about the school overall. When parents were asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your child's school (F22)?", the word "welcoming" was selected by 81% of parents. A common trend in student interviews indicated that The Academy @ Shawnee's greatest strengths include the Aviation Academy, Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC), mentor groups, such as Black Male Equity Network (B-MEN), Peace Education Program (PeacEd), Girls in Aviation and Just Between Teens and opportunities to explore career pathways before entering high school. Additionally, stakeholder interviews revealed that in-house and external mental health services for students and staff have nurtured a positive culture and climate through foundational wellness and behavioral support.

According to stakeholder interviews, some protocols have been established to support professional learning community (PLC) meetings and student interventions during regularly scheduled embedded times, such as PLC and embedded professional development (EPD) days for teachers and literacy intervention classes for students. Prior to the current administration's appointment, stakeholder interviews revealed that the school lacked these structures. Stakeholders also confirmed the implementation of emerging school-wide non-negotiables for instruction and behavior, including the whiteboard protocol and positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS), which align with the school's instructional and behavioral frameworks in the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP).

Stakeholders also reported benefitting from instructional supports and resources, including the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), high-quality instructional resources (HQIR), common assessments, the "SchoolKit" instructional resource, the "Vital Signs" survey, "Meta Coaching Cycles" and unit and lesson internalizations. These tools have supported the emerging alignment and streamlining of instructional practices and data analysis and can be leveraged to further improve instruction, behavior and data-driven decision making.

The Diagnostic Review Team reviewed expectations for the development and monitoring of the CSIP to assess the school's progress toward its goals. Stakeholders verified that the instructional vision and instructional non-negotiables meet minimum district requirements for periodic review. Although the school has defined instructional expectations through its instructional non-negotiables and the "Three Big Rocks of 25-26" that state: (1) teaching every day with no exceptions, (2) intentional execution of HQIR and (3) bell-to-bell instruction, many stakeholder interviews revealed a lack of involvement in planning, providing feedback or participating in decision making in the school's continuous improvement efforts. The team noted that while the CSIP, instructional non-negotiables and whiteboard protocol are emerging, communication with stakeholders remains a critical concern. The school has an opportunity to leverage these current compliance-driven actions by embedding them (e.g., whiteboard protocol, HQIR, MAP, common assessment data analysis) within instructional non-negotiables that include expectations for incorporating rigorous, data-driven instructional practices, while frequently monitoring the quality of implementation.

Although the team found evidence that the institution has a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) plan specifically focusing on Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, most stakeholder interviews revealed the lack of Tier 2 and Tier 3 programs. They also noted that the school has a formal daily literacy intervention class that provides academic support for all students; however, observational and interview data indicated inconsistencies in expectations and the use of instructional strategies during this class. Stakeholder interviews, surveys and observational data corroborated the need for direct academic interventions and differentiation of instruction to meet each student's needs and create opportunities to build upon the foundation of the existing MTSS plan at the Tier 1 level. According to the student stakeholder survey, 47% of students reported, "I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Subsequently, observational data revealed that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)" was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms. Also, observational data showed that it was evident/very evident in 0% 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)." Lastly, it was evident/very evident that "learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)" in 7% of classrooms.

Interviews, surveys and observational data further indicated a need to enhance current structures for implementing rigorous instruction. It was evident/very evident that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)" in 0% of classrooms. Furthermore, classroom observational, interview and survey data validated that classroom instruction was primarily teacher-led and provided limited opportunities for students to participate in academic discourse. "Learners who collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)" were evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms.

Stakeholder interviews and observational data identified a need for instructional strategies to support engagement and differentiation in all classrooms. Student survey data verify the need for engagement in learning. When students were asked, "Which four words best describe, in general, your institution's culture (20)?", 59% of students selected "boring."

The Diagnostic Review Team suggests that the school includes and provides opportunities for teachers to serve as leaders, supporting the school's instructional vision and non-negotiables.

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 15 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	1.3	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	80%	13%	7%	0%
A2	3.0	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	33%	33%	33%
A3	2.8	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	40%	40%	20%
A4	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions, and dispositions.	60%	40%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:						
2.1						

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.7	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	33%	60%	7%	0%
B2	1.7	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	33%	67%	0%	0%
B3	1.5	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	53%	47%	0%	0%
B4	1.6	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	40%	60%	0%	0%
B5	1.8	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	20%	80%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.7				

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.1	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	13%	67%	20%	0%
C2	2.0	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	27%	47%	27%	0%
C3	2.1	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	13%	60%	27%	0%
C4	2.5	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	7%	53%	27%	13%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.2				

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.1	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	20%	47%	33%	0%
D2	1.9	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	47%	27%	13%	13%
D3	2.0	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	13%	73%	13%	0%
D4	1.1	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	93%	7%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.8				

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.	60%	33%	7%	0%
E2	1.9	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	13%	80%	7%	0%
E3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	27%	67%	7%	0%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	67%	27%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.7				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.4	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	7%	53%	33%	7%
F2	2.4	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	7%	53%	33%	7%
F3	1.9	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	40%	27%	33%	0%
F4	1.9	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	27%	53%	20%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.2				

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.5	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	67%	13%	20%	0%
G2	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	87%	7%	7%	0%
G3	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		1.2				

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 15 observations in core content classrooms using the eleot. The team also conducted informal observations in non-core content classrooms and common areas. The observational data revealed several areas for improvement. However, if the school implements effective modeling and consistent, data-driven and individualized professional development and mentoring/coaching, potential exists for the school to meet the needs of each classroom teacher. The highest-scoring learning environments were Supportive and Well-Managed, both rated 2.2 on a 4-point scale. While the Well-Managed Learning Environment scored higher than other learning environments, it remains a concern due to the lack of classroom norms and leadership expectations for students. The data revealed it was evident/very evident in 40% of classrooms that “learners



demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)", and it was evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms that "learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)." The lowest scoring learning environments were Digital Learning, rated a 1.2 on a 4-point scale, and High Expectations and Progress Monitoring, which were both rated a 1.7. The Diagnostic Review Team suggests increasing student engagement by establishing a clear focus on engagement in learning for students and professional staff. School leadership has communicated an expectation for bell-to-bell instruction, requiring teachers to teach the full class period. While the school has made bell-to-bell instruction a non-negotiable for its teachers, the team observed many lessons that lacked proper pacing, engaging exercises and overall structure, resulting in a loss of student learning. Further, student behavior in some classrooms impeded the learning process due to a lack of effective classroom management strategies. Observational data corroborated this point as it was evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms that "learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)." In combination with artifacts and the principal presentation, interview data showed the school has developed a PBIS framework to support classroom behavioral management. While the team observed many instances where the use of PBIS would have been beneficial and appropriate, it was seldom observed in classrooms.

Through walkthroughs and classroom observations, the team found that most of the teachers treated students with respect and concern. Observational data revealed it was evident/very evident in 60% of classrooms that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." While teachers were primarily seen as respectful to students and displaying general concern, the team observed few classrooms using visual educational aids (e.g., posters, anchor charts, content-related material) to support student intrigue, engagement and collaboration.

Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)", revealing a significant opportunity to elevate student expectations, rigor, progress monitoring and learner feedback within the school. Students mostly worked independently while completing tasks/assignments from books or workbooks and listening to the teacher speak or lead instruction from the interactive whiteboard. Most classrooms lacked components that support engagement in learning, student-led learning and rigorous or challenging tasks. Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)", and it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." Across most classrooms, students were disengaged during teaching and learning unless prompted or redirected.

The Diagnostic Review Team did not observe students demonstrating their intellectual leadership in many classrooms because the opportunity was neither provided nor planned for. Students were seldom given opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking, produce high-quality work or participate in collaborative conversations. This was shown in the observational data, as it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)", and it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that "learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5)." Furthermore, the team observed teachers forgoing opportunities for students to show their thinking and learning processes (verbally or in writing), thereby limiting the quality of feedback for improvement. As a result, most students were unable to articulate their understanding of the lesson and its content. Also, it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that "learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)." Similarly, the observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)."

In some classrooms, students exhibited compliant behavior, as cognitive student engagement was rarely observed. Observational data showed it was evident/very evident in 13% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." The team rarely observed students engaged in collaborative exchanges. Inevitably, the data showed it was evident/very evident in 27% of classrooms that "learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)." In most

classrooms, teachers posed closed-ended questions, impeding students from responding at higher levels. There were many missed opportunities to implement collaborative activities and tasks that would have enabled students to engage in active, hands-on learning. Consequently, it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4).” Further, during student interviews, the team learned that students would appreciate opportunities and events that allow them to engage with the content and have fun while learning. Another growth area that was revealed during observations was differentiation in teaching and learning. The review team noted that teachers heavily relied on whole-group and direct instruction. The team rarely observed students undertaking tasks that were designed for their individual achievement levels. The team observed students learning and receiving the same tasks as their peers. Instruction was not tailored to the diverse learning needs or the abilities of each student in the classroom. Furthermore, observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).”

The team found little evidence showing preparation and intentional planning to embed digital learning tools for students’ use. While some students were observed in a few classrooms completing assignments on their laptops, it was rare to see students innovatively using digital technology. The team observed many missed opportunities for learners to creatively and collaboratively engage in the learning process. The observational data further supported this point, as it was evident/very evident in 7% of the classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems and/or create original works for learning (G2).” While the team saw few instances of technology use, most technology was used by teachers via interactive whiteboards to facilitate lessons. Observational data showed that it was evident/very evident in 0% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)”, and it was evident/very evident in 20% of classrooms that “learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate and/or use information for learning (G1).”



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

Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven formalized system that identifies and provides support, coaching and mentoring for the individualized needs of each certified staff member to strengthen professional practice.

Standard 6:

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

Findings:

Through stakeholder interviews, a review of artifacts provided by the school and an analysis of survey data, the team found a critical need for a formal, effective process that documents and uses data to adequately support and strengthen the professional practice needs of school leadership and professional staff. The school conducted a survey named Upbeat. Findings from question 37 of the “25-26 Upbeat Survey discussions” indicated 66% of staff agreed, “The evaluation feedback I receive helps me improve my instruction.” While surveys were initiated to generate data to determine professional needs, the school lacks a developed, streamlined formal process that uses multiple data sources to identify and address the needs of its teachers and the school leadership team.

Observational data revealed a clear need for deep student engagement and a rigorous academic culture, where students strive to meet their individual goals in growth-oriented learning spaces. It was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)” and that “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Moreover, student performance data revealed that the percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 6th-, 7th- and 8th-grade reading was below the state average on the 2024-2025 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA). The student performance data showed percentages did not meet the threshold for a plus. Through deliberations, the team identified a need for an effective process to monitor both teaching and learning to support the school's improvement and turnaround efforts.

The school leadership provided evidence of its “PLC Workbooks” to support its PLC process. Interview data showed the “PLC Workbooks” were an effective tool that may be of exceptional benefit to the teaching and learning process. While the tool is of high quality, the implementation and understanding of its use will need to be revisited to ensure it is used as intended and with fidelity. The team attended a PLC meeting while on site and saw a lack of formal PLC structures and norms. During PLCs, there was limited conversation focusing on data and instruction connected to the “PLC Workbook.” Further, through PLC observations and interviews, the team found that teachers were expected to have the “PLC Workbooks” completed before the meeting; however, some teachers were unable to do so because of a lack of constructive training/modeling about the expectations and the intended purpose of the “PLC Workbook.” A further review of the “PLC Workbook” revealed they were incomplete or blank. Formal and informal stakeholder interviews and conversations aligned with the PLC observations conducted by the team. A review of artifacts and leadership interviews showed the school recently initiated a PLC relaunch. The school could leverage its existing PLCs and embedded professional development (EPD) professional learning time to implement and monitor a data analysis system aligned with long- and short-term performance goals related to the state's accountability measures. The team recommends that school leadership collect and analyze data from multiple data sources and use findings to improve the quality and fidelity of both school and district-level instructional initiatives.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Document the short- and long-term professional needs of each certified staff member, including classroom teachers, assistant principals and instructional coaches.
- Use data to provide targeted support to address instructional practice, leadership roles and responsibilities and targeted professional growth aligned to school improvement efforts.
- Provide professional learning on the collection, analysis and use of classroom instructional data to develop and guide coaching for all certified staff to address school improvement efforts.
- Participate in professional learning about implementing and monitoring the CSIP process to guide the school's turnaround work.
- Hold assistant principals, interventionists and coaches accountable for their assigned roles and responsibilities for monitoring instruction, lesson plans and PLCs, as well as providing feedback and coaching.

Improvement Priority 2

Refine the current monitoring system to provide a systematic, data-driven decision-making process for evaluating instruction (i.e., Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3) and assist teachers in collecting, analyzing and using formative, summative and trend data to provide and adjust rigorous instruction and deepen learners' understanding and mastery of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS).

Standard 22:

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

Findings:

School leadership indicated the whole school was focused on Tier 1 instruction; however, high-quality teaching and support for diverse learners were rarely observed. Observational data and walkthroughs indicated a need for multi-tiered tasks and learning environments that support the unique needs of all learners. Formal and informal observational, student performance and survey data indicate a need for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. Forty-seven percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the last 30 days, we had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)", and 54% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the last 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)." At present, the school lacks an effective system to monitor instruction and clearly establish expectations for using assessment data to inform classroom instructional practices.

Stakeholder interviews revealed that a negligible percentage of professional staff are versed in using classroom and assessment data efficiently to monitor and adjust the curriculum and deepen individual learners' understanding. Observational data indicated it was evident/very evident in 7% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)" and that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)." During some observations, the team noted that the academic needs of higher-performing learners were not being met, as the learning environment lacked a multi-tiered approach to improve the achievement levels of all learners. The school's student performance data were not high enough to qualify for a plus, which aligns with eleot observational data, as instruction in most classrooms was at a low cognitive level and lacked differentiation and rigor. Observational data further corroborated this point, as it was evident/very evident in 0% 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)."

Survey data indicated 80% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the last 30 days, I participated in learning experiences that increased my knowledge and skills (22)"; however, stakeholder interview data depicted a different perspective, revealing an authentic desire for formal training and professional development about topics like data analysis, instructional practices and effective classroom management techniques. The school provided evidence to support its professional learning efforts (e.g., professional development, EPDs, PLCs); however, quality, modeling and monitoring are largely lacking. Professional learning, in general, is perceived by most stakeholders as inconsistent and disjointed rather than tailored to their specific needs. The team found limited evidence of an effective, formal walkthrough and feedback/coaching protocol that supports teachers in monitoring student progress and evaluating the effectiveness of current classroom strategies.

If the school restructures and implements appropriate tools to measure learner engagement, coaching/modeling and feedback and teacher observations, then it would be able to consistently use data to influence the individualized coaching and professional learning needs of its professional staff, thereby enhancing student performance in Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Provide professional learning on the collection, analysis and use of data to plan and deliver evidence-based, differentiated and rigorous instruction aligned to the KAS.
- Establish clear expectations for the consistent use of formative and summative assessment data in Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 for instructional decisions.
- Use current walkthrough data to guide coaching to increase teacher effectiveness, student engagement, instructional rigor, use of evidence-based strategies and higher-order thinking.

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.



Additional Review Elements for More Rigorous Intervention (MRI) Schools

Teams reviewing MRI-designated schools must consider the following additional elements:

- A review of how the school and district have managed and expended the relevant school improvement funds previously awarded with a specific focus on the impact of the funding decisions;
- A review of the progress made towards accomplishing any improvement priorities recommended by prior Diagnostic Review reports and/or Two-Day Reviews;
- A review of prior year turnaround plans and related documentation;
- A review of existing improvement efforts and initiatives and data documenting the results of the initiative;
- A comprehensive resource allocation review;
- A review of stakeholder involvement in the improvement process; and
- A review of district support on the implementation of the school's turnaround plan.

The Academy @ Shawnee (Middle School) underwent a prior Diagnostic Review in 2022; however, this Diagnostic Review considers the specific actions taken by the school since the 2022 review. The current principal has been in place since the beginning of the 2024-2025 school year. Currently, there is one executive principal, one head principal, three assistant principals, three guidance counselors, one mental health practitioner and three curriculum coaches on staff for the middle school. The turnover rate for the 2024-2025 school year was 38.1% which was higher than the district and state average; however, the current administration was able to fill all but two vacant positions for the 2025-2026 school year.

The previous Diagnostic Review yielded two improvement priorities. Improvement Priority 1 was based on Standard 7 and instructed the school to develop, communicate, implement and monitor a formalized process for schoolwide continuous improvement based on individual learners' needs and instructional effectiveness; analyze data (e.g., formative, summative assessments, classroom walkthrough) with the entire established turnaround team on a regular basis to inform an instructional process that includes teaching, learning and data monitoring expectations to meet the needs of all students. The school combined the middle school turnaround team with the high school team, and the combined team meets twice monthly and oversees the improvement efforts at both the middle and high school levels. Following the Diagnostic Review at the high school level in 2025, the turnaround team conducted a root cause analysis using a fishbone diagram and interrelationship diagram to determine the root causes of the observation results from the review and to inform the turnaround plan. While a new turnaround plan and a 30-60-90 day plan were developed from this work, artifacts and stakeholder interviews indicate that the plans have not been deeply monitored for implementation. During the Enhanced Support Zone week (ESZ), which occurs the week before the beginning of the school year, the training for staff was focused on unit internalization and HQIR implementation. However, staff report that there continues to be inconsistent HQIR implementation and use of the provided materials with integrity. When staff completed a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Assumptions, Threats (SWOT) analysis the responses reflected concern about clarity of expectations, redundant requirements and a lack of accountability around completing the HQIR internalization. Stakeholder interviews revealed that although some processes (e.g., PLC and internalization) have improved, implementation and monitoring continue to be growth areas.

Improvement Priority 2 from the 2022 Diagnostic Review, based on Standard 22, directed the school to develop, implement and monitor a formal, systematic process to analyze individual learner and school data to deepen each student's understanding of content and increase student achievement. Stakeholder interviews indicated that the school has made significant progress in adopting a PLC process which has been redesigned to focus on HQIR

internalization and student work analysis. Teacher feedback informed revisions to the PLC process for the middle school level; however, survey results indicated that 41% of staff are still unclear about PLC expectations. SWOAT analysis results also highlighted confusion regarding how to apply data discussed during PLC meetings and concerns that some data conversations lack coherence.

The school received school improvement funds (SIF) to assist in reaching the goals of the turnaround plan. The total funding amounted to \$741,734 over five years: \$326,634 in Cohort 1, \$117,628 in Cohort 3, \$110,474 in Cohort 4 and \$186,998 in Cohort 5. Budget allocations were made for instructional coaches, conferences and professional learning opportunities (which included teacher extra service stipends and travel expenses), HQIR materials (consumable workbooks, general supplies and literacy manipulatives), educational consultants (Adolescent Literacy Model [ALM]), technology resources (Chromebooks, iPads, laptops and clear touch mounts) and online learning platforms (IXL, Study Island, Edmentum). A review of the school's evidence and artifacts in conjunction with stakeholder interviews indicated that although many of the conferences and professional learning opportunities were beneficial, there has been a high staff and administrative turnover and therefore not all initiatives have been implemented with fidelity. Moreover, artifacts and interviews revealed little evidence to support the implementation or evaluation of use of the professional learning received. An educational consultant from the ALM worked with teachers this past year during weekly EPD sessions; the school conveyed that this initiative has been moderately effective. Further, the school reported that there have been changes in online learning platforms as the previously purchased IXL program was underutilized and therefore not renewed this year.

While SIF funds have contributed to quality resources and professional learning, the most recent data from the KSA indicates that there has been limited growth in all content areas. In 2024, there was a large turnover in administration and certified staff resulting in the systems that had previously been implemented not transferring with the change in leadership. This also resulted in many certified vacancies that the school could not fill; a high percentage of substitute teachers and certified staff having to cover classes during planning periods made full implementation of the HQIR and the PLC process difficult. The current executive principal has been able to fill almost all vacancies for the 2025-2026 school year and has completed a new turnaround plan using activities from the Instructional Systems Monitoring Tool (ISMT) which the curriculum coaches and administrators helped develop. The new turnaround plan has been reviewed by the turnaround team and a 30-60-90 day plan for each activity has been developed; however, stakeholder interviews revealed that formal monitoring of the plan has not yet occurred, and the school leadership team recognizes this as an area of growth.

The district has provided additional support to the school by giving them additional staffing to implement a unique administrative model. The ESZ assistant superintendent often participates in turnaround work and consults with the executive principal about the improvement efforts at the school. The executive principal has been given an opportunity to participate in a series of five professional learning sessions specifically designed for turnaround leaders provided by the district; however, no agendas or documents for these sessions were provided as evidence. No evidence of district leadership meetings or improvement monitoring was provided to the team.

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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
Alexis Speed	Alexis Speed currently serves as a director of institutional improvement at Cognia. Alexis exemplifies professionalism, leadership and a commitment to lifelong learning and school transformation. With over 15 years of experience in education, Alexis has made a global impact through her diverse work in teaching, leadership, administration, school turnaround and school improvement, both domestically and internationally. She has successfully led initiatives to achieve school improvement targets, advance district priorities and elevate student achievement. With a wealth of experience, a results-oriented mindset and a clear vision for the future, Alexis continues to inspire transformation and innovation in education.
Tim Huddleston	Tim Huddleston is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), assisting targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools. He also supervises university students at the University of the Cumberlands. Tim has 33 years of educational experience at the elementary to the collegiate levels. He has held roles as a classroom teacher, assistant principal, principal, university supervisor and school improvement specialist. For the past decade, he has coached school improvement efforts at both building and district levels, bringing extensive expertise in data analysis, curriculum, instruction, assessment and school turnaround systems.
Kenya Hall	Kenya Martin-Hall is a school improvement specialist for the Jefferson County School District in Birmingham, Alabama. In that position, she coordinates and supports the implementation of initiatives for continuous improvement for 58 elementary, middle and high schools in the district. She also serves on various district steering committees for strategic planning, continuous improvement and state monitoring. She has over 23 years of K-12 experience as an educator, including classroom teacher, instructional coach, Instructional transformational specialist, assistant principal, federal program specialist, post-secondary adjunct professor and district leader-school improvement specialist. She has also served as an educational consultant for various school districts throughout Alabama.
Kelley Mills	Kelley Mills has 25 years of experience in education, including six years with KDE. She has served as an ERL, supporting CSI schools for four years and was previously a continuous improvement coach for two years. Her career includes serving as an elementary teacher, curriculum coach at the school and district levels and an elementary school principal. She has completed the National Institute for School and System Leadership and been trained in the Jim Shipley & Associates School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence, Classroom Continuous Improvement and Cognitive Coaching.



Appendix

Cognia Performance Standards Ratings

Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

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

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



Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
17. Learners have the support and opportunities to realize their learning potential.	Professional staff members give little or no consideration to individual learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Academic and non-academic opportunities are limited and standardized according to grade levels or a predetermined sequencing of courses. Learners frequently encounter a variety of barriers when accessing academic and non-academic offerings that would be well-suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are rarely challenged to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members consider varying learner needs and well-being when developing and providing academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access to some variety in academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners may encounter barriers when accessing some academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are sometimes challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members know their learners well-enough to develop and provide a variety of academic and non-academic experiences. Learners have access and choice in most academic and non-academic opportunities available according to grade levels or through expected sequencing of courses. Learners rarely encounter barriers when accessing academic and non-academic experiences most suited to their individual needs and well-being. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards individual achievement and self-efficacy.	Professional staff members develop relationships with and understand the needs and well-being of individual learners. Academic and non-academic experiences are tailored to the needs and well-being of individual learners. Learners are challenged and supported to strive towards maximal levels of achievement and self-efficacy without barriers or hindrances by schedules or access to academic and non-academic offerings.	1
18. Learners are immersed in an environment that fosters lifelong skills including creativity, curiosity, risk taking, collaboration, and design thinking.	Learners engage in environments that focus primarily on academic learning objectives only. Little or no emphasis is placed on non-academic skills important for next steps in learning and for future success. Learning experiences rarely build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration or design-thinking.	Conditions within some aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in some experiences that develop non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Some learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions within most aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. Collectively, the learning experiences build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	Conditions across all aspects of the institution promote learners' lifelong skills. Learners engage in ongoing experiences that develop the non-academic skills important for their next steps in learning and for future success. A formal structure ensures that learning experiences collectively build skills in creativity, curiosity, risk-taking, collaboration and design-thinking.	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
21. Instruction is characterized by high expectations and learner-centered practices.	Instructional activities are primarily designed around curriculum objectives with little or no focus on learner needs and interests. Professional staff members rarely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their individual potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on needs and interests typical of most students. Professional staff members infrequently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Most learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members routinely deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	Learners engage in instructional activities, experiences, and interactions based on their individual needs and interests. Professional staff members consistently deliver instruction designed for learners to reach their potential.	1
22. Instruction is monitored and adjusted to advance and deepen individual learners' knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	Professional staff members rarely monitor and adjust instruction. Professional staff members rarely analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members sometimes monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members sometimes analyze data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members regularly monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members routinely analyze trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content.	Professional staff members consistently monitor and adjust instruction based on each learner's response to instruction and achievement of desired learning targets. Professional staff members use a formal, systematic process for analyzing trend and current data to deepen each learner's understanding of content at increasing levels of complexity.	1

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

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

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

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



Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
6th-Grade Reading	*	48	*	49	23	52
7th-Grade Reading	25	45	*	47	14	48
8th-Grade Reading	17	44	*	41	3	42
6th-Grade Math	*	38	*	42	*	41
7th-Grade Math	*	37	*	39	*	43
8th-Grade Math	6	36	*	37	*	40
7th-Grade Science	*	23	*	22	*	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	17	35	*	35	*	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	31	49	14	47	8	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	45	*	49	*	49

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th- and 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA was below the state average in 2022-2023.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in math and social studies was below the state average in 2022-2023.

- The percentage of 6th- and 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in reading was below the state average in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA was below the state averages in 2022-2023, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Middle 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	*	68	71	66	84	60
Percent Score of 60-80	*	24	25	23	16	26
Percent Score of 100	*	7	4	8	0	10
Percent Score of 140	*	2	0	3	0	3

Plus

- Percentages were not high enough to qualify as a plus

Delta

- The percentage of students scoring in the 0 category on the ACCESS assessment was above the state average in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students scoring in the 60-80 category on the ACCESS assessment was above the state average in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students scoring in the 100 category on the ACCESS assessment was below the state average in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students scoring in the 140 category on the ACCESS was below the state average in 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 6th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	23
Female	*	*	27
Male	*	*	20
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	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	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	20
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	21

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 6th-Grade Math

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (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 7th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	25	*	14
Female	30	*	17
Male	*	*	13
White	*	*	*
African American	24	*	15
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	24	*	15
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in the subgroups of all students, female, African American and economically disadvantaged declined from the 2022-2023 to the 2024-2025 school year on the KSA.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th-Grade Math

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (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 7th-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 8th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	17	*	3
Female	*	*	*
Male	26	*	4
White	*	*	3
African American	11	*	*
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	*	*	4
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on the KSA in the subgroups of all students and male declined in reading on KSA from the 2022-2023 to the 2024-2025 school year.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Math

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	6	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	9	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	11	*	*
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 8th-Grade Social Studies

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	17	*	*
Female	*	*	*
Male	26	*	*
White	*	*	*
African American	11	*	*
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	16	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	31	14	8
Female	*	18	*
Male	48	*	6
White	45	*	*
African American	11	*	*
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	31	*	7
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in the subgroup of all students declined in editing and mechanics from the 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 school year on the KSA.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-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, January 12, 2025

Time	Event	Where	Who
2 p.m.– 3 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team
3:25 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team
5:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

Tuesday, January 13, 2025

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team
8:40 a.m. – 5:20 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
5:20 p.m. – 6 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team
6:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

Wednesday, January 14, 2025

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m.	Team arrives at institution(s)	School	Diagnostic Review Team
8:40 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team
4 p.m. – 4:20 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel	Diagnostic Review Team
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #4	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team

Thursday, January 15, 2025

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:30 a.m. – 3 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Artifact Review / Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team

