Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

Results for:

Zoneton Middle School

Feb. 23-26, 2026

cognia™

Table of Contents

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	4
Building-Level Administrators	2
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	6
Certified Staff	15
Noncertified Staff	12
Students	10
Parents	5
Total	54

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

A review of documents, as well as survey, interview and observational data, indicate that Zoneton Middle School has established conditions for learning that can be leveraged for continuous improvement. Survey results reflected high perceptions of safety and adult decision-making, as 82% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make decisions to keep us safe (3)" and 82% of families agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults think about children's safety when they make decisions (3)." Educator survey results reinforced these findings, with 84% of educators who agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we think of everyone's safety when making decisions (3)."

Stakeholder perception evidence also indicated strong family confidence in the school's climate, staff effectiveness and learning support. Family survey results showed 92% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults treat us with respect (2)" and 87% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults make us feel welcomed (1)." Additional strengths in family perception include 84% who agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults care about children's well-being (7)." These findings suggest families experience the school as supportive, organized and focused on student learning needs.

Evidence also indicated that the school has structures and artifacts that support a consistent learning environment and improvement of routines. Documents such as the "PBIS Handbook", which includes a tiered behavior system, "The Zoneton Way", including processes and procedures and "The Den", which includes a yearly calendar of events, reflect schoolwide systems intended to promote consistent expectations, student support and communication.

Artifacts associated with the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP), including the "CSIP Needs Assessment," "PD Plan with CSIP" and "PDSA Work", show defined tools and a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) approach tied to coaching, feedback and literacy. Collaborative routines documented in professional learning community (PLC) agendas, school leadership team agendas and faculty meeting agendas indicate structured venues for planning and decisions. Interviews confirmed improvement planning occurs at the leadership level, but it lacks clarity and regular staff involvement, suggesting the continuous improvement cycle is stronger in the Plan phase than in the Do, Study or Act stage where timely communication, shared understanding and classroom follow-through are essential.

Educator survey results corroborate this gap, as 82% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", while 53% agreed/absolutely agreed that "at my institution, we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)." Student surveys similarly show varying learning experiences. For example, 49% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12)" and 46% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Furthermore, while the school climate is perceived positively by families, as 87% agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults make us feel welcomed (1)" and 92% agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults treat us with respect (2)", student perception surveys showed 72% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults make us feel welcomed (1)" and 68% agreed/absolutely agreed that "adults treat us with respect (2)." By analyzing these data to understand the student experience, the school can more effectively translate these insights into instructional improvements.

A review of interview data, documents and artifacts indicate two priorities for continuous improvement: 1) enhancing staff ability to use student data for instructional planning and 2) ensuring coaching cycles drive classroom change. While leaders noted inconsistent follow-through on feedback, they emphasized the need for clearer expectations and structured reflection. Additionally, aligning interventions remains challenging; success requires strengthening the connection between Tier 1 instruction, consistent progress monitoring and defined entry/exit criteria.

Finally, interview data highlights the importance of building trust and shared ownership to ensure improvement efforts feel supportive rather than punitive. Grounding decisions in learner evidence and clearly linking data, coaching feedback and PLCs to core priorities through two-way communication will help bridge the gap between the Plan artifacts and Do, Study and Act routines. This alignment ensures professional learning leads to consistent, high-quality Tier 1 instruction and improved student outcomes.

Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 28 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.

A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
A1	1.8	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	46%	32%	14%	7%
A2	2.3	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	14%	50%	25%	11%
A3	2.6	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	11%	29%	46%	14%
A4	1.4	Learners demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions, and dispositions.	75%	11%	14%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		2.0				

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
B1	1.9	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	32%	46%	21%	0%
B2	2.1	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	21%	50%	25%	4%
B3	1.8	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	43%	43%	11%	4%
B4	1.9	Learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing).	32%	46%	18%	4%
B5	2.0	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	25%	54%	18%	4%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:	**1.9**					

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
C1	2.4	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	18%	25%	54%	4%
C2	2.1	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	36%	21%	39%	4%
C3	2.4	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	18%	39%	29%	14%
C4	2.4	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	36%	4%	46%	14%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:	**2.3**					

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
D1	2.1	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	36%	36%	14%	14%
D2	1.6	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	57%	29%	11%	4%
D3	2.4	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	14%	43%	29%	14%
D4	1.9	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	43%	39%	7%	11%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.0**				

E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment						
Indicators	**Average**	**Description**	**Not Observed**	**Somewhat Evident**	**Evident**	**Very Evident**
E1	1.5	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	64%	25%	11%	0%
E2	2.0	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	25%	54%	18%	4%
E3	2.0	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	25%	54%	21%	0%
E4	1.4	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	71%	21%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.7**				

F. Well-Managed Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
F1	2.7	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	14%	18%	54%	14%
F2	2.8	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	4%	25%	61%	11%
F3	2.3	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	29%	21%	43%	7%
F4	2.4	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	11%	43%	39%	7%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**2.5**				

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	1.6	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	50%	36%	14%	0%
G2	1.4	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	75%	11%	14%	0%
G3	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	82%	11%	7%	0%
Overall rating on a 4-point scale:		**1.4**				

eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 28 classroom observations in core subject areas and several informal observations in common areas. These data provided insight into instructional practices and the learning environments experienced by students across classrooms. The team noted some evidence of classroom routines and behavioral expectations intended to support orderly learning spaces. At the same time, preliminary patterns indicate opportunities to strengthen instructional coherence, rigor, student ownership of learning and formative practices that guide instructional adjustments to meet learners' needs.

Students behaved and followed the rules in many classrooms. Observational data show it was evident/very evident in 68% of classrooms that "learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and peers (F1)." In addition, the team observed that, in 60% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners are treated in a fair, clear and consistent manner (A3)." While these findings align with the idea that equitable, consistent treatment helps cultivate respectful classroom interactions, their limited presence signals the need for greater consistency across the school.

In addition, it was evident/very evident in 72% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)", indicating that in many settings, routines are established. However, it was evident/very evident in 50% of classrooms that "learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another (F3)" and evident/very evident in 46% of classrooms that "learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)." These findings underscore the need to strengthen classroom transitions to maximize instructional time and ensure that classroom routines support uninterrupted learning.

The team found a lack of instructional rigor in most classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 22% 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)." In addition, it was evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms that "learners are actively engaged in the learning activities (D3)." The team noted that increasing opportunities for students to engage in rigorous learning tasks will directly impact students' cognitive engagement in classrooms. The instructional environment frequently featured teachers leading the learning at the front of the classroom, with students serving as passive receivers. The observation was supported by data, as it was evident/very evident in 28% of classrooms that "learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)" and evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities and/or assignments (D4)."

Observational data revealed that differentiation and responsiveness to learner needs were inconsistently observed across classrooms. It was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that "learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." This pattern aligns with student survey evidence indicating opportunity for growth in instructional responsiveness and engagement, as 46% of students agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Additionally, when students were asked, "Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?", 66% chose "do the same work as everyone else" and 60% chose "listen to teachers talk." A review of the "Instructional Hub", "Guided Planning" and "Data Trackers" indicated the presence of systems that can be leveraged to strengthen this area.

Finally, observational data also revealed an opportunity to create more consistency around the support students receive. For example, a supportive relationship between students and their teacher was present in over half of the classrooms, as it was evident/very evident in 60% of classrooms that "learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)." The team observed this supportive relationship less frequently translated to impacting student learning, as it was evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms that learners both "take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback) (C2)" and "are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks (C3)."

The team recommends that the school review all observational results, which should be considered alongside evidence documented in "ZMS i-Ready Data Tracker" and "ESS Personalized Learning Plans" to better understand how learner needs are identified, grouped and monitored over time.

Improvement Priorities

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

Improvement Priority 1

Develop, implement and monitor a consistent professional learning and coaching system that uses observational trends, student work samples and learner performance data to provide timely, actionable feedback and differentiated support for teachers and the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) to ensure consistent high-quality Tier 1 instructional practices across all classrooms.

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

Findings:

Student performance evidence underscores the urgency for a more systematic approach to supporting professional practice. Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) results remain below the state average in all tested grades and content areas for the past three years, with notable gaps in the 2024-2025 data, including 7th-grade reading with 23% of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished compared to the state average of 48% and 8th-grade reading with 20% of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished compared to the state average of 42%. These results indicate the need to strengthen Tier 1 instruction through consistent support for professional practice to improve learner outcomes and reduce persistent gaps.

Multiple structures are in place to support professional learning and continuous improvement. Documents and artifacts, including the "PD Plan with CSIP", "CSIP Needs Assessment", "PLC agendas", "Guided Planning Documentation" and "Level Up Framework", along with "PDSA Work", show routines designed to build staff practice through planning, feedback and cycles of improvement. Stakeholder interviews further validated these structures, citing monthly district coach meetings, Ohio Valley Educational Cooperative (OVEC) support, National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) training, Jostens Renaissance training and district efforts, such as periodic monitoring, monthly i-Ready Assessment Suite check-ins and walkthrough support. The school also gathers input through a Google Form used by the leadership team to inform the master schedule and professional learning needs.

Despite these structures, implementation variability persists. Survey results show that 82% of educators agreed/absolutely agreed that "we base our improvement efforts on learners' needs (5)", while 53% agreed/absolutely agreed that "we work closely with each other and our stakeholders to support learners (6)." Additionally, 50% agreed/absolutely agreed that "we provide an instructional environment where all learners thrive (9)." Student surveys similarly indicate uneven experiences, as 46% agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, "In the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)" and 60% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults try new things to improve our school (6)." Together, these data suggest that while routines exist, instructional coherence, collaboration and consistent implementation and monitoring are not yet universal.

Stakeholder interviews indicate that leadership capacity has strengthened. The ILT was intentionally assembled based on individual strengths, and most stakeholders reported an improved culture and sense of community compared to four years ago. Although the leadership team demonstrates clear urgency to improve outcomes, teachers' responses vary, making it difficult to transfer the urgency across staff.

Interviews also identified a persistent Tier 1 instructional challenge. The implementation of high-quality instructional resources (HQIRs) also reflects similar patterns. A review of documents shows the implementation of the i-Ready Assessment Suite and CommonLit in August of 2025. Interviews indicated that the i-Ready

Assessment Suite is used consistently for math across all grades. For English language arts, however, the HQIRs differ in grades six and seven. In sixth grade, CommonLit is primarily used, while in 7th grade, instruction mostly relies on Expeditionary Learning Education.

The training provided to teachers for these programs was limited and the rollout was described as slow. Stakeholder interviews shared that time was not provided for unit or lesson internalization, indicating the need for more job-embedded coaching and sustained follow-through.

Classroom observational data further show the need for a more consistent coaching system. This aligns with interview and survey findings that existing structures and the HQIR rollout have not produced consistent Tier 1 practices across classrooms. For example, it was evident/very evident in 43% of classrooms that "learners are supported by the teacher, their peers and/or other resources to understand and accomplish tasks (C3)", and evident/very evident in 28% of classrooms that "learners' discussion/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)."

Overall, the team found that the school has established improvement structures and leadership routines; however, the system for strengthening professional practice requires a more explicit definition of coaching frequency, differentiated supports and implementation monitoring. Therefore, a coherent professional learning and coaching system, with clear expectations, timely feedback, differentiated support and follow-up monitoring is needed so adult learning consistently translates into high-quality Tier 1 instruction and measurable improvements in student performance.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Establish a tiered support model for strengthening core instruction to ensure Tier 1 includes whole staff professional learning on common instructional expectations and high-quality instructional practices, Tier 2 includes small group coaching based on shared needs and Tier 3 includes intensive individualized support with increased frequency and progress checks.

- Implement a formalized one-on-one coaching cycle for teachers receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 support that could include a pre-conference, targeted observations, feedback conferences and follow-up observations tracked and reviewed monthly by the school leadership.

- Use observational trends, student work samples and learner performance data to set coaching goals, determine next steps for teachers and identify professional learning priorities, ensuring feedback is timely, specific and directly connected to daily classroom practice.

- Develop an ILT coaching strand with differentiated support based on role, including coaching on data use, feedback quality and monitoring routines, so instructional leaders provide consistent expectations and actionable guidance across classrooms.

- Strengthen PLC routines to include the analysis of student work and learner performance data and follow-up actions for instructional leaders to monitor implementation through classroom evidence and progress checks.

Improvement Priority 2

Strengthen and monitor schoolwide instructional expectations that reinforce rigor, high expectations and learner engagement by ensuring every classroom consistently delivers standards-aligned, high-quality instruction that requires productive struggle, authentic application and student discourse. Support the expectations through routine analysis of observational trends, student work samples and learner performance data to strengthen task quality, academic feedback and real-time instructional adjustments.

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

Findings:

Student performance, perception data, observations, interviews and a review of artifacts collectively indicate that rigorous, engaging and grade-level tasks are inconsistent across classrooms. As previously noted in Improvement Priority 1, KSA results for the school were below the state average across all grades and content areas, with 2024-2025 math scores 20 or more percentage points below the state average in every grade, indicating that many learners are inconsistently meeting grade-level expectations during Tier 1 instruction.

Learner perception data aligned with this pattern. Student surveys revealed 49% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that made me want to learn new things (12)", and 46% agreed/absolutely agreed that "in the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)." Family results show stronger confidence in expectations as 83% agreed/absolutely agreed that "the adults have high expectations for learning (10)" and 73% agreed/absolutely agreed that "my child has had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)." Students' responses suggest that what is communicated as high expectations does not consistently translate into meaningful, cognitively demanding and relevant classroom tasks. Additional student responses clarify how instruction is experienced, as 80% selected "give a grade", and 69% selected "give quizzes", when asked, "Which four phrases best describe the ways your teachers measure your learning progress (24)?" While 66% chose "do the same work as everyone else", 60% chose "listen to teachers talk" and 57% chose "teacher assigns work" when asked, "Which four phrases best describe, in general, what learning looks like most of the time in your classes (21)?" These patterns point to compliance-oriented experiences rather than learner-centered instruction that includes choice, collaboration, rich discussion and application.

Classroom observational data corroborated the survey findings and further specified where Tier 1 instruction falls short. For example, it was evident/very evident in 21% of classrooms that "learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)." In 29% of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)", and in 22% it was evident/very evident that "learners engage in rigorous coursework, discussions and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing) (B4)." Opportunities for collaborative learning and student discourse were similarly limited as it was evident/very evident in 18% of classrooms that "learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)" and in 28% that "learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate (D1)." Observers also noted instances during the scheduled i-Ready Assessment Suite intervention block where some students were sleeping or disengaged, indicating that even when time is protected, strategies are not consistently leveraged to ensure productive learning for all.

Interview evidence provided insight into the variability seen in surveys and observations. The team observed markedly different learning experiences across classrooms at the same time, ranging from students presenting original products (e.g., songs written for history) to peers completing device-based tasks with minimal discourse. Interviews also noted uneven use of HQIRs across grade levels, mirroring the varying levels of rigor and engagement captured in observations and student responses. Together, these accounts suggest that access to high-quality tasks, opportunities for higher-order thinking and sustained student talk and collaboration heavily depend on individual classroom choices rather than a school-wide Tier 1 framework.

A review of documents and artifacts indicates the school has foundational tools intended to support coherence and standards alignment, such as the "Instructional Hub" and "Data Trackers." The presence of these resources, alongside the HQIR rollouts (i.e., i-Ready Assessment Suite and CommonLit), demonstrates an effort to improve and the potential for common expectations. However, the survey and observational data, coupled with interview evidence of variable resource use and instructional design, suggest these tools rarely improve task quality, cognitive demand, engagement and formative monitoring in daily practice across grade levels and content areas.

Potential Leader Actions:

- Define instructional expectations that articulate what rigorous, learner-centered instruction looks like in every classroom, and then support implementation through professional learning, modeling and routine feedback to increase consistency across the school.

- Implement a schoolwide high-quality task routine that prioritizes standards alignment, appropriate cognitive demand, authentic application and structured student discourse, and then use common planning time to strengthen task design and anticipate scaffolds while maintaining grade-level expectations.

- Use a consistent formative assessment cycle that includes checks for understanding, timely feedback and instructional adjustments during instruction, and then monitor whether reteach and extension practices are occurring to improve learner outcomes over time.

- Use PLC structures to analyze formative and summative assessment data, identify patterns of misunderstanding and plan targeted reteach and enrichment, and then document actions and follow-up to verify impact on classroom practices and learner results.

- Coordinate ongoing professional learning to build teacher efficacy in providing rigorous, differentiated and engaging learning experiences to meet the individual needs of students.

Your Next Steps

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

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

- Review and share the findings with stakeholders.

- Develop plans to address the Improvement Priorities identified by the Diagnostic Review Team.

- Use the findings and data from the report to guide and strengthen the institution's continuous improvement efforts.

- Celebrate the successes noted in the report.

Leadership Capacity in Diagnostic Review

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

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

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

☐ The team has chosen not to reflect on the principal's capacity to lead the school's turnaround efforts.

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

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

☐ It is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the principal does not have the capacity to lead the turnaround of the CSI school and should be reassigned to a comparable position in the district.

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

Now in her fourth year, the principal at Zoneton Middle School has successfully established a culture of belonging, a welcoming environment and improved student behavior. However, this positive climate has not translated into academic growth; KSA data shows achievement remains below state averages. While the principal understands these challenges, the school has reached a plateau. Based on Professional Standards for Education Leaders (PSEL) Standard 10, the recommendation is to provide high-level coaching on how to move staff from being happy to being high performing. This involves moving beyond surface-level feedback to deeper accountability for pedagogically rich, evidence-based practices. To reach this, the principal requires targeted support aligned with PSEL Standard 10 to shift the focus from school spirit only to also address academic rigor. Specifically, the principal needs a framework to build staff readiness, ensure mutual accountability and sharpen the instructional skills of all teachers.

While leadership recognizes Tier 1 (core) instruction is a weakness, current interventions are not yet producing results. Although the school utilizes the Level Up Framework to provide teacher feedback, evidence suggests this process is not rigorous enough to change Tier 1 instruction. Communication regarding the framework and coaching supports appears fragmented rather than part of a unified system. The feedback being delivered lacks the specific actionable steps necessary to improve daily student learning. While the district instructional coach began providing guided planning sessions, the impact is limited. Because this support is only for those requesting it and occurs only bi-weekly, it functions as a safety net for a few rather than a systemic engine for school-wide improvement, leaving much of the staff without necessary guidance to make needed changes to increase student engagement and achievement.

A primary responsibility of the principal is to improve professional practice and growth among teachers with evidence-based practices. To strengthen the principal's growth as an instructional leader, the district should provide targeted mentorship focused on reflective practice and program evaluation. Currently, the school lacks a comprehensive progress monitoring system and accountability measures. The principal acknowledged these gaps during her presentation. While the principal has used i-Ready Assessment Suite data to assign students to intervention classes, this was based on fall and winter benchmark data rather than on a balanced assessment system aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS). Without a balanced assessment system, the school cannot accurately track growth for all students or develop the school-wide interventions necessary to improve learner academic outcomes.

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 eleot 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
Seneca Baines	Senaca Baines has 25 years of experience as a teacher and administrator. He is currently the director of student services and science content specialist in Jasper County School District in Ridgeland, South Carolina. In that position, he coordinates alternative education, child welfare and attendance, discipline procedures, grant-funded programs, guidance services, school safety and science curriculum implementation. Seneca is endorsed as a Transformational Leader for completing the South Carolina Transformation Leadership Academy. Seneca spent 15 years as a middle and high school administrator.
Felicia Bond	Felicia Bond has over 30 years of experience in education, including 13 years with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) as an Educational Recovery Leader (ERL), supporting CSI schools. Her career includes teaching high school math for over 20 years and serving as district curriculum specialist and building assessment coordinator. She is a certified facilitator for the National Institute for School and System Leadership (NISL) and for Jim Shipley & Associates in School Improvement Planning for Performance Excellence and Classroom Continuous Improvement. Felicia has presented at state and national conferences on successful continuous improvement practices in schools.
Kevin Cook	Kevin Cook currently serves as an ERL for KDE, working with CSI schools. He has been in education for over 25 years, with experience as a middle school and high school classroom educator, elementary school assistant principal, middle school assistant principal, high school assistant principal, technical school principal and high school principal. For the past two years, he has been actively involved with school improvement work and has extensive experience with analyzing data, curriculum, instruction, assessments and systems. In this position, he supports schools and districts in implementing sustainable systems as they close achievement gaps and positively impact student growth through continuous improvement. He has completed the Jim Shipley Systems and the NISL program. In this position, he supports schools and districts in implementing sustainable systems as they close achievement gaps and positively impact student growth through continuous improvement.
Laquetta Carter	Laquetta Carter is a principal and instructional leader with extensive experience supporting school-wide systems for academic achievement, equity and continuous improvement. She has taught grades K-8, including middle school, with a strong focus on literacy development, multilingual learner achievement and content-area alignment. Laquetta is a World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) conference presenter, specializing in instructional systems that improve outcomes for multilingual learners. She has served as an assistant principal and instructional coach, supporting educators through curriculum alignment, professional learning, multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) design, and data-informed instructional practices.

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.	2
5. Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners.	The institution's operating practices rarely cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members may or may not interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, or consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members rarely work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's operating practices somewhat cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members generally interact with respect and cooperation, periodically learn from one another, and somewhat consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members sometimes work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members regularly interact with respect and cooperation, often learn from one another, and routinely consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members often work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration and are monitored for fidelity of implementation. Professional staff members consistently interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, and consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members intentionally and consistently work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	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.	2

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

Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning

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

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: **Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity** leading toward improvement.	Level 2: **Developing or improving practices** that provide evidence that effort **approaches desired level of effectiveness**.	Level 3: **Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness** that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: **Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results** that **positively impact learners**.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	1
30. Learners' progress is measured through a balanced system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning.	Professional staff members seldom use assessment data to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are rarely or inconsistently used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members occasionally use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are sometimes used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners regularly use assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives. Assessment data are routinely used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	Professional staff members and learners collaborate to determine learners' progress toward and achievement of intended learning objectives based on assessment data gathered through formal and informal methods. Assessment data are systematically used for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	1
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)
6th-Grade Reading	31	48	31	49	41	52
7th-Grade Reading	35	45	18	47	23	48
8th-Grade Reading	25	44	24	41	20	42
6th-Grade Math	13	38	17	42	20	41
7th-Grade Math	31	37	*	39	15	43
8th-Grade Math	14	36	18	37	18	40
7th-Grade Science	14	23	*	22	15	29
8th-Grade Social Studies	23	35	18	35	15	39
8th-Grade Editing and Mechanics	35	49	26	47	30	49
8th-Grade On Demand Writing	38	45	26	49	28	49

Plus

- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased 10 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 6th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased 7 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased 4 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Delta

- KSA results are below the state average for percent Proficient/Distinguished in all grade levels and content areas for the past three years.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased 12 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased 5 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 7th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased 16 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased 8 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased 5 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.
- The percentage of 8th-grade students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased 10 percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2024-2025.

Middle School English Learner (EL) Progress

Group	School (2022-2023)	State (2022-2023)	School (2023-2024)	State (2023-2024)	School (2024-2025)	State (2024-2025)
Percent Score of 0	*	68	*	66	*	60
Percent Score of 60-80	*	24	*	23	*	26
Percent Score of 100	*	7	*	8	*	10
Percent Score of 140	*	2	*	3	*	3

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	31	31	41
Female	29	31	44
Male	33	31	39
White	33	36	40
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	31	*	50
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	40
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	53
Economically Disadvantaged	27	30	38
Students with Disabilities with IEP	29	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 6th-grade reading increased by 10 percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 6th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 15 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by six percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 6th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by seven percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 6th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 19 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 6th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by 11 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by two percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	13	17	20
Female	*	15	*
Male	20	19	24
White	11	19	*
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	*	16	*
Students with Disabilities with IEP	12	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 6th-grade math increased by seven percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by four percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Delta

- The percentage of 6th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by one percentage point from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	35	18	23
Female	35	24	26
Male	35	*	21
White	40	*	24
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	30
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	29	14	23
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on 7th-grade reading increased by five percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by two percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Delta

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 7th-grade reading decreased by 12 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by nine percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 14 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by 16 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by six percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	31	*	15
Female	30	*	*
Male	33	*	18
White	32	*	15
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	27	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	27	*	14
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 7th-grade math decreased by 16 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 15 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 17 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 7th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by 13 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Group	Science (2022-2023)	Science (2023-2024)	Science (2024-2025)
All Students	14	*	15
Female	14	*	*
Male	*	*	18
White	17	*	15
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	12	*	13
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

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

Delta

- The percentage of 7th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in science decreased by two percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Group	Reading (2022-2023)	Reading (2023-2024)	Reading (2024-2025)
All Students	25	24	20
Female	29	32	*
Male	22	13	18
White	26	24	18
African American	18	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	25	21
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	23	22	16
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	21

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading increased by three percentage points from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024.

Delta

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 8th-grade reading decreased by five percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by four percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by eight percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by four percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in reading decreased by seven percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Group	Math (2022-2023)	Math (2023-2024)	Math (2024-2025)
All Students	14	18	18
Female	17	19	12
Male	11	17	24
White	14	20	14
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	17	29
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	7	14	17
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	14

Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 8th-grade math increased by four percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by 13 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade Hispanic or Latino students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by 12 percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math increased by 10 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Delta

- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by five percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in math decreased by six percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Group	Social Studies (2022-2023)	Social Studies (2023-2024)	Social Studies (2024-2025)
All Students	23	18	15
Female	23	22	14
Male	23	13	16
White	22	21	12
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	29
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	21	18	12
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	14

Plus

- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies increased by three percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Delta

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 8th-grade social studies decreased by eight percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by nine percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by seven percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by 10 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in social studies decreased by nine percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

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

Group	Editing and Mechanics (2022-2023)	Editing and Mechanics (2023-2024)	Editing and Mechanics (2024-2025)
All Students	35	26	30
Female	45	32	40
Male	26	*	22
White	35	29	28
African American	36	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	43
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	34	23	25
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 8th-grade editing and mechanics increased by four percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased by two percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics increased by eight percentage points from the 2023- 2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Delta

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 8th-grade editing and mechanics decreased by five percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by five percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade male students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by four percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade White students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by seven percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in editing and mechanics decreased by nine percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th-Grade On-Demand Writing

Group	On-Demand Writing (2022-2023)	On-Demand Writing (2023-2024)	On-Demand Writing (2024-2025)
All Students	38	26	28
Female	53	38	*
Male	25	*	25
White	*	31	*
African American	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	35	*	*
Asian	*	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	*
English Learners	*	*	*
English Learners plus Monitored	*	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	38	27	22
Students with Disabilities with IEP	*	*	*

Plus

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 8th-grade on-demand writing increased by two percentage points from the 2023-2024 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Delta

- The percentage of all students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in 8th-grade on-demand writing decreased by 10 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade female students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased by 15 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2023-2024 school year.
- The percentage of 8th-grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in on-demand writing decreased by 16 percentage points from the 2022-2023 school year to the 2024-2025 school year.

Schedule

Monday, Feb. 23, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
4 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Principal Presentation	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
5 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session #1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Tuesday, Feb. 24, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #2	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Wednesday, Feb. 25, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:30 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Thursday, Feb. 26, 2026

Time	Event	Where	Who
8 a.m.	Team arrives at institution	School Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:30 a.m. – 3 p.m.	Observations / Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members