



Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:
Trunnell Elementary**

March 2-5, 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
- Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review 15**
- Team Roster 17**
- Appendix 18**
 - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings 18
 - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning 18
 - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning 20
 - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning 22
 - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning 24
 - Student Performance Data 27
 - Schedule 40

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Groups	Number
District-Level Administrators	2
Building-Level Administrators	3
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	9
Certified Staff	25
Noncertified Staff	10
Students	76
Parents	6
Total	131

Performance Standards Evaluation

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

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

Insights from the Review

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

Strengths and Continuous Improvement

After reviewing stakeholder interviews, classroom observations, artifacts and surveys, the Diagnostic Review Team identified a mostly supportive, student-centered culture and stable learning environments. However, to enhance school performance, there is a prioritized need to elevate Tier 1 instructional rigor, formative assessment practices and ensure better alignment across improvement systems.

Evidence gathered during the Diagnostic Review indicates that the school community demonstrates a positive relational culture that promotes safety, belonging and care for students. Across stakeholder groups, interviews and perception data consistently described the school environment as safe, welcoming, respectful and supportive. Stakeholders reported that a positive, welcoming and respectful school culture exists. Stakeholder perception data indicated that 80% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 81% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Family responses reflected similar perceptions, as 84% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)", and 87% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)." Educator results reflected a positive culture as well in that 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we make learners, families and each other feel welcomed (1)", and 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we treat learners, families and each other with respect (2)." Collectively, these survey results, triangulated with interviews, indicate that students, families and educators perceive the school as welcoming and respectful, providing a foundation for advancing continuous improvement.

Along these same lines, results from the "Teach Upbeat (Fall 2025)" survey were provided to the team as evidence and highlight notable strengths the school can leverage. Belonging & Wellbeing (91%) and Satisfaction & Purpose (93%) were among the highest categories, and most teachers endorsed Self-Efficacy (85%), Principal/Teacher Trust (87%), Instructional Leadership (81%), Professional Development (80%), Recruitment/Hiring/Onboarding (82%) and Future Commitment (81%). The team found that these findings align with stakeholder interview comments about a community-oriented culture that cares for students and supports staff.

Classroom observations complemented these perceptions. For example, it was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms that "learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support (A2)" and evident/very evident in 76% that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." These findings align with stakeholder comments about caring adults and a welcoming environment. The principal's presentation and stakeholder interviews indicated that the school maintains strong partnerships with community organizations that assist in meeting student needs, such as clothing, backpacks and other resources. These partnerships ensure that barriers outside the classroom are addressed, allowing students to focus on learning. This commitment to supporting the whole child fosters a learning environment where students feel valued and supported.

The team also observed a few promising instances of collaborative problem-solving and professional growth. Some staff described professional learning community (PLC) conversations where teachers examined assessments, rehearsed lessons and shared strategies for students with different needs. The Diagnostic Review Team also observed some teams internalizing lessons and adjusting approaches based on anticipated learner



responses. While these practices were not yet universal or scaled, they provide a foundation to support the school as it refines its instructional focus.

Student performance data also reflected the need for stronger systems to support instructional improvement. Across several grade levels and subject areas, the percentage of students performing Proficient/Distinguished on the Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) has declined in recent years. For example, the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025, while 5th-grade students' reading scores declined from 24% Proficient/Distinguished to 9% during the same period. Similar declines were noted in mathematics and science. These trends indicate that while staff members demonstrate dedication to students, existing systems have not produced sustained improvements in student achievement.

Evidence from student surveys indicated that learners do not experience consistent instructional responsiveness or rigor across classrooms. Student survey items signal that learners do not experience regular adjustments to instruction or frequent opportunities to think deeply. For example, 63% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)", and 65% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "I had lessons that made me think in new ways (15)", indicating that differentiation and engagement structures are not reliably embedded in Tier 1 instruction.

Observational data echoed student perceptions and underscored the need to increase expectations for student thinking and to make quality criteria more explicit. It was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)", and in 34% of classrooms that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (B4)." Opportunities for students to drive discussion were less common, as in 24% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners' discussions/ dialogues/exchange with each other and the teacher predominate (D1)." These findings indicate a need to define and model high quality for students to ensure schoolwide consistency. Classroom observations revealed that learning targets were posted but not consistently referenced and lessons were largely teacher-directed, contributing to variability in rigor, student talk and progress monitoring. When combined with reports of inconsistent PLC agendas and limited walkthrough feedback, the team found the school needs to establish instructional non-negotiables and create a more robust feedback loop that links observations and coaching directly to classroom improvement.



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

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	2.0	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	38%	24%	33%	5%
A2	2.9	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	24%	67%	10%
A3	3.0	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	0%	24%	57%	19%
A4	2.0	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.	38%	29%	24%	10%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.5				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	2.2	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	10%	62%	29%	0%
B2	2.4	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	5%	52%	38%	5%
B3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	24%	57%	14%	5%
B4	2.4	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	0%	67%	29%	5%
B5	2.3	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	10%	52%	33%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.3			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.8	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	0%	38%	48%	14%
C2	2.7	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	0%	48%	38%	14%
C3	2.8	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	0%	43%	33%	24%
C4	2.9	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	0%	38%	38%	24%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.8			



D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	2.0	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	24%	52%	24%	0%
D2	1.9	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	43%	29%	29%	0%
D3	2.4	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	10%	43%	43%	5%
D4	2.1	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	24%	38%	38%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.1			

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
E1	1.9	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	38%	38%	24%	0%
E2	2.3	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	10%	52%	33%	5%
E3	2.4	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	5%	57%	33%	5%
E4	1.9	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	38%	38%	19%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.1			

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	3.0	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	0%	29%	48%	24%
F2	2.9	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	0%	29%	57%	14%
F3	2.7	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	5%	33%	48%	14%
F4	2.6	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	5%	33%	57%	5%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			2.8			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	95%	5%	0%	0%
G2	1.0	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%
G3	1.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	90%	10%	0%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:			1.0			

eleot Narrative

The team conducted 21 observations in core content classrooms and noted both areas of strength and clear opportunities to elevate learning. Classrooms were generally orderly, and most interactions between adults and students were respectful. Support and access were noticeable in many classrooms, though differentiation occurred less frequently. The Well Managed and the Supportive Learning Environments received the highest overall ratings, each scoring 2.8 on the 4-point scale. It was evident/very evident in 72% of classrooms that “learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other (F1)” and in 62% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4).” Observers noted that it was evident/very evident in 77% of classrooms that “learners have equal access to classroom discussions,

activities, resources, technology and support (A2)” and in 76% of classrooms that “learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3).” Together, these results lead to a positive climate with predictable routines and a sense of belonging for most students. In addition, survey results indicate that students, families and educators perceive the school as welcoming and respectful, providing a strong foundation to advance continuous improvement.

At the same time, the level of cognitive demand and clarity about quality varied across classrooms. In the High Expectations Learning Environment, it was evident/very evident in 19% of classrooms that “learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)” and in 34% 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).” Evidence of challenge was more common but still inconsistent: it was evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms that “learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)” and in 29% of classrooms that “learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1).” Observers also noted limited opportunities for student-led inquiry and discussion. It was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that “learners’ discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)”, and it was evident/very evident that “learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5)” in 38% of classrooms. These results underscore the need for more explicit expectations for high quality work, alongside consistent opportunities for students to reason, explain and engage in sustained academic discussions.

The data also pointed to a need for stronger responsiveness to students’ varied needs and interests. While access and fairness were observed, targeted adjustment was less consistent. It was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms that “learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1).” Relevance and connection to real-world contexts were similarly variable, as it was evident/very evident in 29% of classrooms that “learners make connections from content to real-life experiences (D2)” and in 48% of classrooms that “learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3).” PLC observations confirmed a trend: planning sessions frequently prioritized pacing and whole-group instruction over differentiated strategies such as targeted scaffolding, small-group work or extensions based on learner readiness. Collectively, the evidence suggests a need to strengthen unit internalization and lesson design processes. This will ensure that learning tasks and classroom discourse are intentionally aligned with individual learner needs, resulting in improved student engagement and achievement.

Formative assessments and other visible learner techniques occurred in some instances. In the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment, it was evident/very evident in 38% of classrooms that “learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)” and “learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3).” However, the team rarely observed students taking ownership of their own progress. It was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that “learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)” and “learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4).” Observers also noted that learning targets were posted but not routinely referenced, and lessons remained largely teacher directed, with answers frequently provided by the teacher rather than allowing for productive struggle to support students’ deeper learning. These conditions indicate a need to more deliberately embed checks for understanding and routines that make progress and success criteria transparent to learners.

Technology integration was rarely used to extend thinking or collaboration. The Digital Learning Environment received an overall rating of 1.0. In most observations, devices were not in use or were used in ways that did not require students to research, solve problems, communicate or create original products aligned with the lesson purpose. This reflects a significant opportunity to redefine how technology is used in the classroom so that instructional planning leverages digital tools for higher-order tasks and more effectively extends student thinking and collaboration.

Overall, the eleot results and team observations indicate a school environment with relational foundations that can serve as a leverage point to deepen academics. Next steps include clarifying expectations for high quality,



rigorous work; expanding structured student talk and collaboration; embedding student visible progress monitoring and feedback and planning for purposeful differentiation and technology use that advances the intended learning. These actions would help ensure that the positive climate observed across many classrooms is paired with consistently challenging, responsive learning experiences.



Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement Priority 1

Establish and implement a schoolwide data collection and progress monitoring system that ensures student learning, attendance and behavior data are consistently gathered, analyzed and used to inform grade-level Tier 1 instruction.

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

Findings:

Across multiple data sources, the team found that the school's caring culture and work ethic have not been translated into a consistently implemented continuous improvement system that drives instructional adjustments and measurable gains in student learning. KSA results reflect persistent low performance, with the school scoring below the state averages in all grade levels and content areas from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025. These trends indicate that current routines for analyzing evidence and following through on next steps are not producing sustained improvements.

Documents and artifacts provided to the team, along with PLC observations, revealed structural gaps that weaken the continuous improvement cycle. The Diagnostic Review Team identified that protocols for goal focused agendas and follow-up were not consistently in place. Most PLCs observed prioritized logistics over standards anchored inquiry, analysis of misconceptions and monitored implementation of agreed upon instructional responses.

Other artifacts corroborate these patterns. A tiered "Coaching Cycle Framework" was shared with the team, but stakeholder interviews described inconsistent implementation and limited observation/feedback cycles from school leadership. The school also provided a "PLC Checklist", yet the depth of analysis and monitored follow-through varies widely across grade levels. Stakeholders referenced a data wall and reported that data are discussed but not routinely used to adjust instruction or revisited later to measure impact. There was a notable absence of a consistent progress monitoring loop to support an effective continuous improvement system.

Although 89% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, my child had their learning progress measured (19)" and 83% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I provided opportunities for learners that align to their needs (18)", classroom observational data revealed a discrepancy relative to perception data. For example, it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)", and it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." These findings suggest that assessment for learning is not planned for or embedded across all classrooms. Current performance trends suggest that Tier 1 instructional adjustments and progress monitoring practices lack the consistency needed to drive significant improvements in student outcomes.

Collectively, student performance trends, PLC artifacts and observations, classroom evidence, interviews and surveys indicate that structures exist (e.g., PLCs, coaching framework, data walls), but they are inconsistently implemented or monitored for impact. As a result, use of evidence is uneven, progress monitoring is limited and Tier 1 instruction is not reliably adjusted to support individual learner needs. A coherent, schoolwide continuous



improvement system, anchored in defined PLC protocols, routine observation/feedback and a visible learner approach, will be essential to improve outcomes.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Refine the current PLC protocols to include relevant learner academic data and ensure consistent implementation across all grade levels.
- Implement targeted coaching cycles that include goal setting, frequent classroom observations, timely feedback and structured reflection to support effective instructional practices.
- Establish and monitor a comprehensive continuous improvement system that systematically collects and analyzes student and staff data to inform academic and non-academic decisions to ensure all students' needs are addressed.
- Monitor the fidelity and impact of instructional initiatives through classroom observations, feedback loops and structured staff reflection protocols to drive continuous instructional improvement.

Improvement Priority 2

Create, implement and monitor an instructional vision to ensure student experiences are differentiated and aligned with grade-level expectations.

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

Findings:

The Diagnostic Review Team observed limited evidence of an instructional vision with clearly defined non-negotiables that ensure consistent rigor, differentiation and student ownership of learning across classrooms. Student results show declines across grade levels. For example, 36% of 4th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA in 2022-2023, which decreased to 20% Proficient/Distinguished in both 2023-2024 and 2024-2025. Similarly, 24% of 5th-grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished in reading in 2023-2024, which decreased to 9% in 2024-2025, signaling Tier 1 learning experiences are not reliably enabling students to meet grade level expectations.

Observational data and interviews point to variability in expectations and instruction. For example, posted learning targets were observed in classrooms but rarely referenced during instruction, whole group lessons dominated, and teachers often provided answers/solutions rather than facilitating inquiry, structured academic talk or productive struggle. In many settings, task completion took precedence over conceptual understanding and higher order thinking. These conditions reduce learners' opportunities to reason, explain and demonstrate high-quality work aligned with the intent of the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS).

Stakeholder perception data closely mirror these instructional patterns. Across stakeholder groups, feedback indicates that instruction remains largely traditional and compliance oriented. Notably, when asked "Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like in most of your child's classes (23)?", 51% of families chose "listen to teachers talk" and 57% chose "complete teacher-assigned work." When asked "Which four phrases best describe, in general, what someone would observe learners doing most of the time in your institution's classrooms (25)?", 40% of educators chose "listen to teachers talk" and 55% chose "complete teacher-assigned work." Additionally, when asked "Which four phrases describe what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?", 65% of students chose "listen to teachers talk" and 63% chose "complete worksheets." indicating a teacher-directed, compliance-focused environment rather than a student-centered learning experience.

Items about what adults consider most important for learners further emphasize compliance over student voice, inquiry and deeper learning. For example, when asked "What words or phrases best describe, in general, what educators in your institution consider to be the most important for learners (27)?", 65% of educators chose "follow directions" and 58% chose "listen" compared to 38% who chose "learn deeply" and 15% who chose "give opinions." This aligns with observational data as it was evident/very evident in 24% of classrooms that "learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)", and it was evident/very evident in 34% 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)."

PLC observations and artifact reviews confirm significant inconsistency in collaborative practices. While some teams engage in high-level unit internalization (e.g., clarifying targets, sequencing moves, integrating support for multilingual learners), others remain focused on logistics. The contrast indicates that promising practices exist but have not been formalized as schoolwide standards for instructional planning and delivery.

The Diagnostic Review Team identified minimal evidence to support a clear, articulated vision for grade-level instruction, complete with necessary scaffolds. Artifacts and interviews add context. According to the "Observation Collection Data", a state literacy coach conducted 46 walkthroughs last year and coached 14 teachers, with reported growth in the fidelity of the literacy high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) from 8% to 82% in coached contexts; however, schoolwide coaching/feedback cycles remain inconsistent, resulting in uneven



translation of practices beyond coached classrooms. This underscores an urgent need for a unified instructional vision and a formalized coaching routine to ensure that high-leverage practices such as visible success criteria, standards-aligned tasks, structured academic talk and learner-owned progress monitoring are implemented schoolwide.

Performance trends, classroom observations, PLC evidence, artifacts and stakeholder feedback all support the need for a clearly defined and consistently monitored instructional vision so that rigorous, learner centered instruction and the scaffolds necessary for diverse learners are experienced by all students.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Collaboratively develop and communicate a clear instructional vision and aligned instructional non-negotiables to ensure rigorous, grade-level instruction and effective use of instructional time.
- Provide targeted, ongoing professional learning to build teacher capacity in data analysis, differentiated instruction, high expectations for learning, student engagement and rigorous instructional design.
- Implement and communicate instructional non-negotiables and frequently monitor through a formalized instructional walkthrough instrument and coaching cycles.
- Analyze walkthrough data to identify instructional needs and provide individualized professional learning and coaching that strengthens professional practice.
- Monitor the fidelity and impact of instructional initiatives through classroom observations, coaching cycles and feedback loops.

Your Next Steps

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

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

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



Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

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

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

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted a thorough and comprehensive evaluation process, carefully examining multiple sources of evidence, engaging in numerous classroom observations and interviewing a wide range of stakeholders. Observations and stakeholder interviews highlighted a positive and supportive school climate characterized by genuine care, concern and a deep commitment to meeting the needs of diverse groups of students. Students describe the school as being safe and friendly.

The two previous Two-Day Reviews in 2021-2022 and in 2024-2025 identified PLC systems as an area in need of improvement. While the school has taken initial steps to address this concern, the current PLC structure requires further refinement. Currently, the PLC process does not consistently support teachers and staff in designing and delivering instruction that adjusts to students' learning needs and is grounded in the KAS. Evidence reflects compliance checklists for elemental discussion but limited collaboration and planning. Refining and strengthening the PLC process is essential to ensure teachers collaboratively plan for high-quality Tier 1 instruction, effectively disaggregate and analyze data, determine next instructional steps and make responsive adjustments to teaching and learning.

Additionally, KSA data reflect that the school remains significantly below state averages, with only minimal gains in select areas and declines in others. The principal has initiated walkthroughs to monitor classroom instruction; however, inconsistent implementation and the absence of a clearly articulated instructional vision have limited the overall impact of these efforts on improving professional practice and/or student achievement. Clear communication and monitoring of instructional non-negotiables are necessary to ensure integrity and coherence in practice. The principal has established a walkthrough schedule designed to provide coaching, feedback,



instructional monitoring and ongoing teacher support, which is an important step toward strengthening instructional oversight.

Additionally, many stakeholders noted the absence of individualized coaching, with several expressing a strong desire for more structured, one-on-one support to refine their instructional practices. To maximize impact, the principal should implement and communicate instructional non-negotiables and frequently monitor through a formalized instructional walkthrough instrument and coaching cycles. Monitoring and leveraging these data to inform differentiated, individualized coaching cycles for all teachers would strengthen instructional delivery, enhance professional practice and promote measurable improvements in student learning.

The team observed, and stakeholder interviews indicated, minimal visibility and presence of the principal in classrooms and common areas throughout the visit. Evidence also reflected that the school currently operates without clearly defined instructional priorities, and consistent monitoring of classroom instruction is not an established leadership practice. Additionally, the principal was unable to clearly articulate how implemented programs are influencing student learning, achievement or contributing to the school's continuous improvement efforts.

To strengthen readiness for meaningful improvement, the principal would benefit from intensive support in developing strategies that build staff capacity, shared commitment, accountability and essential pedagogical skills. A review of artifacts and stakeholder interviews revealed limited teacher preparation and inconsistent follow-through on initiatives by the administration. Evidence further suggests a need for stronger oversight and consistent accountability to ensure that rigorous academic expectations are clearly defined, implemented with fidelity and consistently monitored in classrooms.

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
Shawn Clark	Shawn Clark is currently a transformation coach for the South Carolina Department of Education, where she supports a team of coaches and leads school improvement efforts across several schools and districts. During her 27 years in education, she taught at the early childhood and elementary levels, served as an administrator at the middle school level for over a decade and worked at the district level in curriculum and instruction for five years. Shawn led a school from a state and federal accountability status of at-risk to excellent in under four years and helped lead a district as the sole district in her state to make adequate yearly progress for state and federal accountability. In addition, she supports districts across the country in implementing authentic PLCs and supervises educational interns at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
Donna Bumps	Donna Bumps is an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL) with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), where she supports turnaround schools across the state in developing and implementing sustainable systems of continuous improvement. She has 26 years of experience as an educator, having served as a middle and high school teacher, assistant principal and high school principal. Donna is trained in the Jim Shipley Systems and the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL). Also, she has contributed to multiple Diagnostic Review teams over several years, serving as both a team member and an associate lead evaluator.
Delisa Brooks	Delisa Brooks began her career as a high school business teacher. She later worked as both a middle school counselor and a district-wide at-risk counselor. Delisa served as an elementary school counselor and as a career coach for a high school. She earned National Board Certification in school counseling. Delisa has almost 30 years of experience in education and currently serves as a high school counselor.
Joshua Blevins	Joshua Blevins has over 20 years of experience in education. He currently serves the KDE as an ERL, working directly with school administrators and staff in CSI schools. In this role, he partners with school teams to strengthen systems and practices that drive student achievement. Prior to his work at the state level, Joshua held multiple leadership roles, including director, high school principal, assistant principal and middle grades math teacher.

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.	1
9. Leaders cultivate effective individual and collective leadership among stakeholders.	Leaders seldom recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders rarely create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders rarely volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders occasionally recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes create conditions that offer leadership opportunities and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders sometimes volunteer to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders frequently recognize and encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that regularly offer formal and informal leadership opportunities, and support individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	Leaders consistently recognize and actively encourage leadership potential among stakeholders. Leaders create conditions that ensure formal and informal leadership opportunities and provide customized support for individuals and groups to improve their leadership skills. Stakeholders show initiative and eagerness to take on individual or shared responsibilities that support the institution's priorities.	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
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.	1
12. Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction that are aligned for relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are sometimes assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	Professional staff members systematically implement, review, and adjust curriculum and instruction based on recognized and evidence-based content standards. Curriculum and instructional practices are regularly assessed through a formal, systematic process to assure alignment, relevancy and effectiveness for each and every learner.	2

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
24. Leaders use data and input from a variety of sources to make decisions for learners' and staff members' growth and well-being.	Leaders rarely demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that rarely take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders sometimes demonstrate skill and insight in considering and choosing information and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions that occasionally take into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders regularly demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make decisions by routinely taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	Leaders consistently demonstrate skill and insight in considering a variety of information, choosing relevant and timely information, and interpreting data. Leaders make intentional decisions by consistently taking into account data and additional factors that have an impact on learners and staff members such as institution history, recent experiences, and future possibilities.	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.	1

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

Student Performance Data

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

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Performance Results

Content Area & Grade	%P/D School (2022-2023)	%P/D State (2022-2023)	%P/D School (2023-2024)	%P/D State (2023-2024)	%P/D School (2024-2025)	%P/D State (2024-2025)
3rd-Grade Reading	14	46	15	47	19	47
4th-Grade Reading	36	48	20	50	20	50
5th-Grade Reading	24	48	24	46	9	50
3rd-Grade Math	*	43	*	43	*	43
4th-Grade Math	39	42	19	43	*	44
5th-Grade Math	*	41	14	41	14	43
4th-Grade Science	19	35	7	34	*	37
5th-Grade Social Studies	15	42	12	39	4	38
5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	19	47	17	47	19	47
5th-Grade On Demand Writing	*	39	*	39	8	38

Plus

- The percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2023-2024. The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 4% in 2024-2025.

Elementary School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	41	26	29	29	43	30
Percent Score of 60- 80	28	35	37	35	38	35
Percent Score of 100	21	24	27	23	15	22
Percent Score of 140	10	14	6	13	5	13

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of students receiving 140 points for progress on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment decreased from 10% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 100 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment decreased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 0 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 41% in 2022-2023 to 43% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of students receiving 60-80 points for progress on the ACCESS assessment increased from 28% in 2022-2023 to 38% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	14	15	19
Female	11	19	12
Male	17	*	*
White	36	11	12
African American	*	*	29
Hispanic or Latino	*	13	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	13	15	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all 3rd-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 14% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade Economically Disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA increased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- The percentage of 3rd-grade white students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 12% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 3rd-grade Female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2023-2024 to 12% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	*
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 4th-Grade Reading

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	36	20	20
Female	37	18	18
Male	35	24	22
White	48	46	*
African American	21	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	27	*	11
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	29	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	32	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	32	*	21
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 37% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Economically Disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 32% in 2022-2023 to 21% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 27% in 2022-2023 to 11% in 2024-2025.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	39	19	*
Female	43	*	*
Male	35	26	*
White	52	54	*
African American	21	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	33	17	*
English Learners plus Monitored	36	17	*
Economically Disadvantaged	37	16	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 4th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA increased from 52% in 2022-2023 to 54% in 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 39% in 2022-2023 to 19% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 35% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade English Learner students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 33% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade English Learner plus Monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 36% in 2022-2023 to 17% in 2023-2024.
- The percentage of 4th-grade Economically Disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math on the KSA decreased from 37% in 2022-2023 to 16% in 2023-2024.



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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	19	7	*
Female	*	6	*
Male	21	*	*
White	*	23	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	23	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	16	*	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 4th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science on the KSA decreased from 19% in 2022-2023 to 7% in 2023-2024.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	24	24	9
Female	21	25	*
Male	26	*	9
White	47	22	18
African American	16	17	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	15	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	13	*	9
Economically Disadvantaged	15	25	8
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 24% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 26% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 47% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Economically Disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 8% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade English Learner plus Monitored students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading on the KSA decreased from 13% in 2022-2023 to 9% in 2024-2025.



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

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

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Disengaged in math on the KSA stayed the same from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	15	12	4
Female	18	*	5
Male	13	11	*
White	35	*	18
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	19	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	10	*
Economically Disadvantaged	6	13	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all 5th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 15% in 2022-2023 to 4% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade Female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 18% in 2022-2023 to 5% in 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 5th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies on the KSA decreased from 35% in 2022-2023 to 18% in 2024-2025.
- Student performance level data were suppressed for public reporting for all other subgroup demographic populations across three years of reporting on the KSA.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade Editing and Mechanics

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	19	17	19
Female	21	25	26
Male	*	8	*
White	35	*	*
African American	*	20	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	10	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*	17	18
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of 5th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics on the KSA increased from 21% in 2022-2023 to 26% in 2024-2025.

Delta

- Percentages were not low enough to qualify as a delta.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 5th-Grade On-Demand Writing

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	*	*	8
Female	*	*	*
Male	*	*	6
White	*	*	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	8
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	9
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	8
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- Percentages were not low enough to qualify as a delta.

Schedule

Monday, March 2, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
2 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School Library	Diagnostic Review Team Members, Principal
4 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, March 3, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
3:30 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, March 4, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
7:30 a.m. – 4 p.m.	Interviews / Classroom Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
4:45 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, March 5, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:15 a.m. – 9 a.m.	Meet with KDE representative	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9 a.m. – 12 p.m.	Final Team Work Session	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members

