



# Cognia Diagnostic Review Report

**Results for:  
Newport Independent Schools**

January 30 - February 2, 2023

# Table of Contents

- Introduction .....2**
  - Performance Standards Evaluation .....2
  - Insights from the Review .....3
    - Potential Leader Actions:.....4
- Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results.....5**
  - eleot Narrative .....9
    - Potential Leader Actions:.....10
- Improvement Priorities .....11**
  - Improvement Priority 1 .....11
    - Potential Leader Actions:.....12
  - Improvement Priority 2 .....13
    - Potential Leader Actions:.....14
  - Your Next Steps .....14
- District Capacity in Diagnostic Review .....16**
- Team Roster .....18**
- Appendix .....19**
  - Cognia Performance Standards Ratings .....19
    - Key Characteristic 1: Culture of Learning.....19
    - Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning .....21
    - Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning.....25
    - Key Characteristic 4: Growth in Learning.....27
  - Student Performance Data.....30
  - Schedule .....33

# 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	6
Building-Level Administrators	1
Professional Support Staff (e.g., Counselor, Media Specialist, Technology Coordinator)	4
Students	10
Parents	4
Total	25

## 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:**

Newport Independent Schools demonstrated strengths in areas of resource allocation, clean and modern facilities, community partnerships, a supportive and engaged board of education, and a progressive recruitment and retention program for staff. District leaders displayed a sincere passion for providing quality programs to help students succeed. Stakeholder interviews indicated varying levels of awareness of the four areas (i.e., professional learning communities [PLCs], Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports [PBIS], Response to Intervention [RtI], culturally responsive teaching) that are the district's focus as it looks to provide a quality education for all students.

Board members expressed confidence in the superintendent's ability to improve student achievement in the district. They articulated that when the superintendent was Newport High School's principal, the school exited its Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) school status. Board members reported that the superintendent's prior success showed commitment to improving student learning. Stakeholders said they are pleased with the policies and programs the superintendent and district leaders have recommended, and they support the incentives offered to recruit and retain teachers.

Board members, district leaders, and the superintendent highlighted the recruitment and retention program as a district strength. In interviews, stakeholders discussed positive employee incentives (e.g., tuition reimbursement, employee referral program, signing bonuses).

Stakeholder interviews revealed the district's commitment to having clean and modern facilities. District leaders and board members expressed pride in the central office building and the high school. They also shared that the district plans to construct a hospitality classroom for the career technical education program.

District leader, parent, and board member interviews revealed that positive community relationships and business partnerships provide schools and the district with opportunities for collaboration. Interviews showed that the district has 40 community partners (e.g., Newport Alumni Mentoring Program, Brighton Center, Christ Hospital, Wave Foundation). These community and business partnerships allow the district to provide various supports and services to help meet students' non-academic needs (e.g., mentoring, mental health counseling, enrichment activities, medical screenings). Stakeholders shared that they value the opportunity to collaborate to improve the overall school experience for students.

A review of evidence including the walkthrough expectations document, the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP), PLC policy, surveys, stakeholder interviews, and classroom observational data revealed strengths and opportunities for improvement. Collectively, this evidence verified that district leaders have developed structures and systems to support student engagement and growth in learning. However, the Diagnostic Review Team found no evidence of program implementation. For example, the walkthrough expectations document stated that teachers should receive feedback on the same day as the walkthrough; however, the evidence did not show that administrators provide feedback in a timely manner or that they have established a schedule of weekly meetings to analyze walkthrough data. Furthermore, the progress monitoring section of the CDIP indicates that the district will provide walkthrough data to schools. The plan indicates goals and actions should be reviewed and monitored during principal and superintendent meetings, in the monthly curriculum department meetings, and in instructional coaches' meetings. However, the team did not find evidence in the coaching meetings document or through stakeholder interviews that educators are collaborating to review and monitor the plan. The CDIP also

indicates that the district will implement a process to develop and deliver professional development around newly adopted resources, but it does not provide a progress monitoring measure for this process.

The PLC policy states that PLCs should use the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cyclical phases continually to develop, monitor, and analyze action plans to improve instructional practices and student achievement. However, evidence from documents and stakeholder interviews did not show that PLCs are developing action plans through the analysis of classroom walkthrough data. Also, while documents indicated that the instructional leadership team shall calibrate, monitor, and evaluate the work conducted in PLCs, the Diagnostic Review Team did not find evidence to show that they are providing this oversight of PLCs.

Stakeholder interviews revealed a strong desire by district leaders and school staff members to improve instructional practices (e.g., robust curriculum, rigorous instruction, engaging lessons). The Diagnostic Review Team encourages the district to leverage this desire for improvement and the findings from this report to strengthen processes, programs, and practices.


### **Potential Leader Actions:**

- Develop and implement a system to ensure that the progress monitoring activities included in the CDIP (e.g., walkthroughs, curriculum adjustments, RtI process modifications and refinements) are completed to increase student learning.
- Evaluate systems and supports to ensure instructional practices and assessments are at the appropriate depth of knowledge level needed to meet the rigor of the state standards.

# Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (eleot) Results

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

Every member of the Diagnostic Review Team was eleot certified and passed a certification exam that established inter-rater reliability. Team members conducted 21 observations during the Diagnostic Review process, including all core content learning environments. The following charts provide aggregate data across multiple observations for each of the seven learning environments.



A. Equitable Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
A1	1.3	Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs.	81%	10%	10%	0%
A2	2.7	Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support.	0%	33%	62%	5%
A3	2.6	Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner.	14%	14%	67%	5%
A4	1.3	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.	76%	19%	5%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.0</b>			

B. High Expectations Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
B1	1.6	Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher.	43%	57%	0%	0%
B2	2.0	Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable.	19%	57%	24%	%
B3	1.3	Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work.	67%	33%	0%	0%
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).	29%	57%	14%	0%
B5	1.5	Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning.	57%	33%	10%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			

C. Supportive Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
C1	2.0	Learners demonstrate a sense of community that is positive, cohesive, engaged, and purposeful.	29%	38%	33%	0%
C2	1.7	Learners take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback).	52%	24%	24%	0%
C3	2.2	Learners are supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks.	14%	48%	38%	0%
C4	2.6	Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher.	14%	29%	43%	14%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.1</b>			

D. Active Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
D1	1.5	Learners' discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher predominate.	52%	48%	0%	0%
D2	1.7	Learners make connections from content to real-life experiences.	48%	33%	19%	0%
D3	2.1	Learners are actively engaged in the learning activities.	10%	67%	24%	0%
D4	1.3	Learners collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments.	67%	33%	0%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			



<b>E. Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
E1	1.4	Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.	62%	33%	5%	0%
E2	1.9	Learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work.	29%	52%	19%	0%
E3	1.9	Learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content.	29%	52%	19%	0%
E4	1.5	Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed.	52%	43%	5%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>1.7</b>			

<b>F. Well-Managed Learning Environment</b>						
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>	<b>Somewhat Evident</b>	<b>Evident</b>	<b>Very Evident</b>
F1	2.5	Learners speak and interact respectfully with teacher(s) and each other.	14%	33%	43%	10%
F2	2.5	Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others.	19%	19%	52%	10%
F3	2.3	Learners transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another.	33%	14%	43%	10%
F4	2.1	Learners use class time purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions.	19%	52%	24%	5%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>			<b>2.4</b>			

G. Digital Learning Environment						
Indicators	Average	Description	Not Observed	Somewhat Evident	Evident	Very Evident
G1	2.1	Learners use digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning.	33%	24%	43%	0%
G2	1.3	Learners use digital tools/technology to conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning.	71%	24%	5%	0%
G3	1.2	Learners use digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning.	86%	10%	5%	0%
<b>Overall rating on a 4-point scale:</b>		<b>1.5</b>				

## eleot Narrative

The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 21 observations in core content classrooms using the eleot tool. The team observed smooth transitions between classes with no incidents identified. Administrators, security staff, and teachers monitored hallways during transitions.

While students were polite and helped the team locate and access classrooms, observational data showed that it was evident/very evident in 62 percent of classrooms that "Learners demonstrate knowledge of and/or follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others (F2)." The team also noted that while most students were compliant, some chose not to engage in the lesson and others had their heads on their desks. It was evident/very evident in 29 percent of classrooms that class time was used "purposefully with minimal wasted time or disruptions (F4)."

The Equitable Learning Environment earned an overall rating of 2.0. It was evident/very evident in 72 percent of classrooms that "Learners are treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner (A3)." Additionally, in 67 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "Learners have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology, and support (A2)." During interviews, students said that most staff members were friendly and treated them with respect. Further, students reported that they had opportunities to access resources and support at the school.

While the Supportive Learning Environment scored 2.1 and was the second highest rated learning environment, the team identified that relationships between students and teachers differed across the school. The team observed that it was evident/very evident in 57 percent of classrooms that "Learners demonstrate a congenial and supportive relationship with their teacher (C4)." Also, learners who "take risks in learning (without fear of negative feedback) (C2)" were evident/very evident in 24 percent of classrooms. Students noted that the social aspect of the school was what drew them to attend Newport High School. Some students expressed a need for the school to offer more real-life opportunities and college and career pathways. The leadership team members said that they provided needed support to students but noted that the school needs to increase its academic expectations.

The High Expectations for Learning and Active Learning Environments were rated at 1.7, indicating that these are areas for growth. Learners who "strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)" and "demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)" were evident/very evident in zero percent of classrooms. Additionally, it was evident/very evident in 10 percent of

classrooms that "Learners take responsibility for and are self-directed in their learning (B5)." The team did not observe students contributing to learning or teachers providing tips on study, time management, literacy (including written), or organizational skills. Students reported that the school provided them with laptops for both home and school use; however, the team observed most students used digital tools to access classroom content and complete electronic worksheets. Learners who use digital tools/technology to "communicate and work collaboratively for learning (G3)" and "conduct research, solve problems, and/or create original works for learning (G2)" were evident/very evident in five percent of classrooms. In most classrooms, the team observed students compliantly completing learning tasks. Learners who "collaborate with their peers to accomplish/complete projects, activities, tasks and/or assignments (D4)" and predominately engage in "discussions/dialogues/exchanges with each other and teacher (D1)" were evident/very evident in zero percent of classrooms. Student interviews revealed few classrooms provided opportunities for students to collaborate with their peers.

The Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment emerged as an area that needs improvement. It was evident/very evident in five percent of classrooms, for example, that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)" and "monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)." The team observed a few instances of students summarizing learning, reflecting on their work, or revising work during class time. Interviews revealed that in many classrooms students completed exit slips. However, students could not explain the purpose of the exit slips, and the team did not observe this practice.

## Potential Leader Actions:

- Schedule collaborative opportunities for both district- and school-based resource coaches to provide professional learning sessions and classroom coaching for staff members to ensure high academic expectations and active student engagement.
- Leverage students' access to digital tools to increase research and collaborative activities and complement the school's many skills-based programs.
- Develop a student progress-monitoring system using multiple forms of assessment data (e.g., formative, benchmark) to monitor and support student learning.

# Improvement Priorities

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

## Improvement Priority 1

Develop, implement, and monitor an instructional process that supports individual learner needs.

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

### Findings:

Student performance data, as detailed in the appendix of this report, indicated the district has an opportunity for improvement by implementing differentiated instruction and increasing instructional rigor. A review of student performance data from the 2021-22 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) revealed 19 percent of seventh-grade students scored proficient/distinguished in reading compared to 43 percent statewide. Moreover, 26 percent of eighth-grade students scored proficient/distinguished in reading compared to 44 percent statewide. This same trend was present in math. Specifically, 19 percent of seventh-grade students scored proficient/distinguished in math compared to 38 percent statewide and 18 percent of eighth-grade students scored proficient/distinguished in math compared to 36 percent statewide.

Disaggregated data on the 2021-22 KSA revealed the percentage of African American students in eighth grade who scored proficient/distinguished in reading was lower than in all other student subgroups. In particular, 15 percent of African American students in eighth grade scored proficient/distinguished in reading compared to 58 percent of Hispanic students and 28 percent of white students.

Classroom observational data also suggested the district has not executed systems to ensure curriculum and assessment practices promote high levels of student achievement. The High Expectations Learning Environment, Active Learning Environment, and the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment each earned an average overall rating of 1.7 on a four-point scale. During observations, the Diagnostic Review Team observed a lack of student engagement in most classrooms. According to interview data, teachers rarely adjust instruction. It was evident/very evident in 24 percent of classrooms that "Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." The principal indicated that lesson plans are generated from the textbooks, and other stakeholder interviews offered limited evidence of effective lesson planning. Observational data revealed that instruction generally lacked rigor and engagement as it was evident/very evident in 14 percent 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)." Also, the team observed that students worked on the same learning tasks in most classrooms.

Students in interviews reported they are seldom aware how their work is assessed and rarely monitor their own progression of learning. Stakeholder interviews revealed a lack of evidence to show how formative assessments are used to drive classroom instruction. Observational data supported the interview data as it was evident/very evident in five percent of classrooms that "Learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)." Also, in five percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "Learners monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)." The team observed few instances of feedback given to students to guide their learning. Learners who "receive or respond to feedback from teachers/peers/other resources to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)" were evident/very evident in 19 percent of classrooms.



The team found few instances of differentiation designed to meet students' individual learning needs. For example, it was evident/very evident in 10 percent of classrooms that "Learners engage in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs (A1)." Educator survey data differed somewhat from observational data as educators perceived they are implementing differentiated instruction more frequently than observational data or family and student survey data suggested. For example, 62 percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, "At my institution, we deliver instruction that considers learners' needs, interests, and potential (8)." Family survey data revealed 42 percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, "in the past 30 days, my child had learning experiences that were unique to their needs (17)", and student survey data indicated that 38 percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement "In the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13)."

Stakeholders revealed that there are processes and systems (e.g., PLCs, walkthroughs, RtI) to ensure the implementation of the district-approved curriculum. However, the team recommends that the district ensures instruction is aligned to the Kentucky Academic Standards (KAS) and implements a progress monitoring system to improve student learning. While stakeholders indicated work is being completed to align instruction to the KSA, the team did not see evidence of this alignment.

### **Potential Leader Actions:**

- Develop, implement, and monitor an instructional process that includes a viable curriculum aligned to KAS and ensures the use of existing high-quality instructional resources.
- Design, deliver, and monitor a process for the routine analysis of formative and summative assessment data to inform instructional adjustments.
- Preview and monitor lesson plans to ensure lessons are designed and delivered to meet grade-level standards with learner-centered practices. Provide feedback on lesson plans before lessons are taught.

## Improvement Priority 2

Develop, implement, and monitor a continuous improvement process that establishes expectations for data analysis and uses findings to improve instructional practices.

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

The student performance data, as detailed in the appendix of this report, indicated the percentage of students who scored proficient/distinguished on the 2021-22 KSA was below the state average in reading, math, social studies, and editing and mechanics across all grade levels. Data analysis revealed potential opportunities to generate improvement in state assessment outcomes through the implementation and monitoring of data-informed instructional practices.

The Diagnostic Review Team noted the lack of high academic expectations for students and the absence of rigor in many learning activities. Classroom observational data revealed that it was evident/very evident in zero percent of classrooms that "Learners strive to meet or are able to articulate the high expectations established by themselves and/or the teacher (B1)." In 24 percent of classrooms, it was evident/very evident that "Learners engage in activities and learning that are challenging but attainable (B2)." It was evident/very evident in zero percent of classrooms that "Learners demonstrate and/or are able to describe high quality work (B3)." In 14 percent of classrooms, 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)." These findings provide an opportunity for the school to create a system that ensures students are actively engaged in rigorous coursework in all classrooms every day.

Observational data revealed inconsistent use of academic feedback to guide students' learning. Instances of learners who "monitor their own progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored (E1)" were evident/very evident in five percent of classrooms. Also, opportunities where "learners receive/respond to feedback (from teachers/peers/other resources) to improve understanding and/or revise work (E2)" were evident/very evident in 19 percent of classrooms. It was evident/very evident that "learners demonstrate and/or verbalize understanding of the lesson/content (E3)" in 19 percent of classrooms and that "learners understand and/or are able to explain how their work is assessed (E4)" in five percent of classrooms. Interview data confirmed these findings as most students could not articulate how their work is assessed, Students also reported they rarely receive individual feedback.

Based on stakeholder interviews, the district's primary method for continuous improvement is the PLC process, but interview data also revealed inconsistencies in PLC implementation. Although stakeholders reported that the district provides a robust protocol for PLCs, including non-negotiables and administrative look-fors, it was unclear how PLCs affect daily instructional practices. Stakeholder interviews and a review of documents and artifacts such as meeting minutes revealed the PLC protocol to be laborious, difficult to understand, and time-consuming. These challenges impede teachers' efforts to fully implement process components such as data analysis and instructional adjustments. Some stakeholders could not articulate how the PLC protocol informs the instructional decision-making process, the design or redesign of lessons to meet learner needs, or the analysis of formative assessment data. Some district leaders described consistently implementing formative assessment practices that drive daily instruction. However, other district leaders identified the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) reading and math assessments, iReady reading and math assessments, and the College Equipped Readiness Tool (CERT) as the primary assessments used in PLCs and other meetings to determine instructional improvements. Leaders indicated that these interim assessments are given to students three times per year but could not articulate how they lead to instructional changes to improve student learning.

Stakeholder interview data revealed inconsistencies in communication between school and district leaders regarding needed support and clarifications about the PLC process. While district leaders said that they have



regular meetings with principals to review data, several stated that school improvement plans and PLC processes could be more effectively implemented and monitored.

Stakeholder surveys revealed an opportunity to involve all stakeholders in the continuous improvement process and communicate how school initiatives will improve student outcomes. For example, the student survey data revealed that 43 percent agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “The adults try new things to improve our school (6).” Additionally, 38 percent of students agreed/absolutely agreed that “In the past 30 days, I had lessons that were changed to meet my needs (13).” Similarly, 41 percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed “in the past 30 days, my child had instruction that was changed to meet their needs (15)”, and 51 percent of families agreed/absolutely agreed that “The adults are committed to trying new things to improve the school (6).” Finally, 64 percent of educators agreed/absolutely agreed with the statement, “At my institution, we base our improvement efforts on learners’ needs (5).” These data revealed a difference of opinion between the teachers and the students and their families on meeting students’ needs. Consistent progress monitoring and adjustments to classroom instruction through current processes could help improve student and family perceptions.

An analysis of documents and artifacts indicated the existence of processes for continuous improvement, learner support, and other non-academic supports (e.g., PLC protocols, Comprehensive School Improvement Plan [CSIP]). The robust PLC protocols include administrative look-fors, PDSA cycles, and data analysis. The 2022-23 opening day PowerPoint presentation, instructional coaches meeting agendas and minutes, and district-wide protocols indicated that PLCs are a non-negotiable expectation for schools; however, interview data revealed that some school staff feel the policies are burdensome and not implemented with fidelity. The 2022-23 CDIP and Newport High School CSIP show alignment between district and school goals for student achievement and provide a monitoring tool. Several district leaders referred to a regular schedule for monitoring CSIP goals. Additionally, as part of the district’s four focus areas, resources are allocated to schools for the implementation of the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), including PBIS and Rtl. The district has developed processes (e.g., MAP Analysis Sheet, monthly instructional coaches and principal support meetings, PLCs) for collecting academic and non-academic data. While the district’s Rtl Tool Guide for a Framework of Support document and stakeholder interviews with district leaders provided some evidence of the implementation of an effective continuous improvement process, the team found limited evidence to indicate embedded practices and progress monitoring.

## Potential Leader Actions:

- Ensure clear communication exists between district-level leaders and school staff concerning needed support and the PLC process.
- Evaluate and modify current continuous improvement processes to build teacher capacity and effectiveness in instruction.
- Ensure effective implementation and appropriate adjustments to PLC processes and protocols.

## 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.



# District Capacity in Diagnostic Review

The Diagnostic Review Team engaged in professional discussions and deliberations about the functioning and capacity of the district to determine its ability to manage an intervention in each school identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI). As outlined in 703 KAR 5:280, Section 4, the determination of the district's level of functioning and ability is based on an assessment of capacity in the following areas:

- The district demonstrates maintenance and communication of a visionary purpose and direction committed to high expectations for learning as well as shared values and beliefs about teaching and learning;
- The district leads and operates under a governance and leadership style that promotes and supports student performance and system effectiveness;
- The district establishes a data-driven system for curriculum, instructional design, and delivery, ensuring both teacher effectiveness and student achievement;
- The district ensures that systems are in place for accurate collection and use of data;
- The district ensures that systems are in place to allocate human and fiscal resources to support improvement and ensure success for all students; and
- The district ensures that a comprehensive assessment system, which generates a range of data about student learning and system effectiveness and uses the results to guide continuous improvement, is implemented.

Following its review of extensive evidence and in consideration of the factors outlined above, the Diagnostic Review Team submitted the following assessment regarding the district's capacity to the Commissioner of Education:

- It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district has the capacity to manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.
- It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district requires intensive support in order to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.
- It is the consensus of the diagnostic review team that the district does not have the capacity to successfully manage the intervention in each school identified for CSI.

After a thorough review and consideration, it is the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that the Newport Independent Schools administration has the capacity to lead the turnaround of Newport High School.

The district administration has established a vision and mission focused on continuous improvement while ensuring teaching and learning are always at the forefront of their work. The Diagnostic Review Team reviewed extensive evidence, stakeholder interviews, and observed numerous classrooms as evidence of the district's work around teacher quality and student achievement. In his two years on the job, the superintendent has deliberately instilled a focus on the district's goals.

Under the superintendent's direction, district leadership has developed processes to promote a focus on four areas (PBIS, PLCs, RtI, and culturally responsive teaching) to ensure students have every opportunity for success. These four big initiatives represent the district's vision that teachers receive quality professional learning and students receive engaging instruction through student-centered learning activities.

The district has established policies and protocols for PLCs including elements for collective lesson design, collaboration of work between the schools/district, a system for formative and summative assessments, as well as measures for monitoring effectiveness. The district also developed walkthrough documents to assist with data

collection for guiding and adjusting instructional expectations and helping the district leadership team determine the overall professional needs of classroom teachers. While these initiatives vary in levels of implementation and effectiveness, they signify work toward a systems approach to teaching and learning.

Additionally, the district has led the analysis of classroom assessment data, MAP data, state assessment data, and a variety of other academic and non-academic data (e.g., perception data) to guide in the creation and implementation of the Newport Independent Strategic Plan and the CDIP. There is also evidence of some content-specific data analysis opportunities in PLCs at the CSI school. The CSI school is additionally supported by district resources (e.g., fiscal, material, and human, such as director of pupil personnel, instructional coaches, instructional interventionist, mentors). However, the systematic use of data to inform overall instructional and system effectiveness remains unclear.

While there is evidence the district creates systems for collection and use of data through systems such as PLC meetings, quarterly district classroom walkthroughs, and the departmental collection of academic and non-academic data, the extent to which these systems are followed with fidelity and to which collected data lead to meaningful change is not yet evident.

Finally, while the district has focused tremendous attention on numerous initiatives, there is still much work to be done to ensure all stakeholders have a voice in the decision-making processes. The district must make certain teachers are partners in the implementation of improvement practices and leadership must guarantee the validity of the vision through a quality monitoring system.



# Team Roster

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

Team member name	Brief biography
<b>Dr. Fred D. Primm, Jr.</b>	Dr. Fred D. Primm, Jr. has 32 years of experience in education, serving as an instructional aide, teacher, assistant principal, education administrator for the Alabama Department of Education, division superintendent of human resources, and a superintendent in two districts in Alabama. Upon his retirement in 2016, Dr. Primm started serving as an executive coach to superintendents, central office administrators, and principals around the country. For the last seven years, he has served as a national presenter and consultant in the areas of leadership, instruction, strategic planning, equity, and culture. He now also serves as a Lead Evaluator for Cognia.
<b>William Philbeck</b>	William Philbeck has worked in education in Kentucky for the past 29 years. He has served as a classroom teacher, department chair, curriculum coordinator, and elementary school principal. He is currently an Educational Recovery (ER) Leader with the Kentucky Department of Education where he works with low performing schools. In this position, he works with school administrative teams and ER staff to ensure schools focus on student achievement, teacher quality, and the establishment of systems that lead to academic success. William has served in several educational and community-based organizations and as an adjunct professor and professional development facilitator.
<b>LaNedra Cosby</b>	LaNedra Cosby has 24 years of experience in education. Currently, she is serving as an Educational Recovery (ER) Specialist for the Kentucky Department of Education. Prior to this position, LaNedra served as an academic instructional coach at Foster Traditional Academy and a K-4 classroom teacher at Hite and Sanders Elementary in Jefferson County Public Schools.
<b>Dr. Shawn Hinds</b>	Dr. Shawn Hinds has 15 years of experience in public education. Currently, Dr. Hinds serves as an Educational Recovery (ER) Leader with the Kentucky Department of Education. In this role, he supports identified Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools, assisting in developing systems for continuous improvement. Prior to this, he served as a high school English teacher, high school administrator, and university instructor. Dr. Hinds has received training in improvement science from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and school leadership from the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL). Dr. Hinds is an alumnus of the Stanford University Hollyhock Fellowship program focused on teachers in high-poverty high schools.
<b>Patty Johnson</b>	Patty Johnson has 27 years of experience in education, having taught and served in various district positions, such as assessment, career and technical education, gifted and talented program, and technology. She has shared her educational experiences at the state, regional, and local levels as well as working as an adjunct professor. She is currently serving as director of programs in her district.

# 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, fairness, equity, and inclusion, 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, fairness, equity, and inclusion 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, fairness, equity, and inclusion 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, fairness, equity, and inclusion 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, fairness, equity, and inclusion and are free from bias.	3
2. Learners' well-being is at the heart of the institution's guiding principles such as mission, purpose, and beliefs.	Staff members seldom demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions may not be based on its stated values.	Staff members occasionally demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members routinely demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented, and are consistent with and based on its stated values.	Staff members continually demonstrate commitment to learners' academic and non-academic needs and interests. The institution's practices, processes, and decisions are documented and regularly reviewed for consistency with its stated values.	3

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
3. Leaders actively engage stakeholders to support the institution's priorities and guiding principles that promote learners' academic growth and well-being.	Leaders establish conditions that rarely result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders seldom collaborate with stakeholders. Institutions choose areas of focus that are rarely based on data about learners.	Leaders establish conditions that occasionally result in support and participation among stakeholders. Leaders sometimes collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus that are sometimes based on data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that regularly result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders routinely collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	Leaders establish and sustain conditions that consistently result in support and active participation among stakeholders. Leaders consistently collaborate with stakeholders to advance identified priorities. Institutions implement a formal process to choose areas of focus based on analyzed data on learners' needs and consistent with guiding principles.	2
5. Professional staff members embrace effective collegiality and collaboration in support of learners.	The institution's operating practices rarely cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members may or may not interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, or consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members rarely work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's operating practices somewhat cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members generally interact with respect and cooperation, periodically learn from one another, and somewhat consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members sometimes work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration. Professional staff members regularly interact with respect and cooperation, often learn from one another, and routinely consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members often work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	The institution's documented operating practices cultivate and set expectations for collegiality and collaboration and are monitored for fidelity of implementation. Professional staff members consistently interact with respect and cooperation, learn from one another, and consider one another's ideas. Professional staff members intentionally and consistently work together in self-formed or assigned groups to review information, identify common problems, and implement solutions on behalf of learners.	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.	2

## Key Characteristic 2: Leadership for Learning

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
7. Leaders guide professional staff members in the continuous improvement process focused on learners' experiences and needs.	Leaders seldom engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is rarely based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members rarely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders occasionally engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is sometimes based on data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members sometimes implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders regularly engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members routinely implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	Leaders consistently engage professional staff members in developing, communicating, implementing, monitoring, and adjusting the continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process is based on analyzed data about learners' academic and non-academic needs and the institution's organizational effectiveness. Leaders and professional staff members consistently implement ongoing practices, processes, and decision making that improve learning and engage stakeholders.	2
8. The governing authority demonstrates a commitment to learners by collaborating with leaders to uphold the institution's priorities and to drive continuous improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate minimal commitment to learners and rarely support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders seldom collaborate on the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's decisions demonstrate some commitment to learners and sometimes support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to focus the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions demonstrate a commitment to learners and support the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to collaboratively further the institution's improvement.	The governing authority's policies and decisions are regularly reviewed to ensure an uncompromised commitment to learners and the institution's identified priorities. The governing authority and institution leaders use their respective roles and responsibilities to consistently and intentionally collaborate to further the institution's improvement.	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
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
10. Leaders demonstrate expertise in recruiting, supervising, and evaluating professional staff members to optimize learning.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members without consideration of contribution to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders rarely use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders seldom supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders hire qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders sometimes use data to forecast future staffing needs. Leaders supervise and evaluate professional staff members to improve performance.	Leaders identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders routinely use data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders regularly implement practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	Leaders intentionally and consistently identify, develop, and retain qualified professional staff members who contribute to the institution's culture and priorities. Leaders consistently use analyzed data from a variety of sources to forecast future staffing needs and employ best practices to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Leaders implement and monitor documented practices and procedures for supervision and evaluation that improve professional staff members' performance to optimize learning.	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, inclusion, and effectiveness.	Professional staff members implement locally adopted curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instructional practices are rarely or not assessed to assure alignment, relevancy, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners.	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, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners.	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, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners.	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, inclusiveness and effectiveness for all learners.	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
15. Learners' needs drive the equitable allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources.	Professional staff members rarely analyze learners' needs and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources. Resources are rarely allocated in alignment with documented learners' needs or to ensure equity for learning.	Professional staff members sometimes analyze learners' needs, current, and trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are sometimes based on current or updated data.	Professional staff members routinely analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are routinely based on current data and at predetermined points in time.	Professional staff members engage in a systematic process to analyze learners' needs and current trend data to adjust the allocation and management of human, material, digital, and fiscal resources to ensure equity for learning. Adjustments to resource allocation are consistently based on current data at any point in time.	2

## Key Characteristic 3: Engagement of Learning

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

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

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

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

Standard number and statement	Level 1: Reflecting areas with insufficient evidence and/or limited activity leading toward improvement.	Level 2: Developing or improving practices that provide evidence that effort approaches desired level of effectiveness.	Level 3: Engaging in practices that provide evidence of expected effectiveness that is reflected in the standard.	Level 4: Demonstrating noteworthy practices producing clear results that positively impact learners.	Team rating
29. Understanding learners' needs, and interests drives the design, delivery, application, and evaluation of professional learning.	Professional learning is rarely learner-centered and may or may not focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning does not exist.	Professional learning is occasionally learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning exists but is not fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, designed around the principles that professional staff members need opportunities to focus on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented.	Professional learning is learner-centered, customized around the needs of individual or groups of professional staff members, and focuses on improving pedagogical skills and knowledge to better address learners' needs and interests. A documented process to select, deliver, implement, and evaluate professional learning is being fully implemented and monitored for fidelity.	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

# Student Performance Data

School Name: Newport High School (Middle Grades 7-8)

## 2021-22 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Middle School Performance Results

Content Area	Grade	%P/D School (21-22)	%P/D State (21-22)
Reading	7	19	43
	8	26	44
Math	7	19	38
	8	18	36
Science	7	*	22
Social Studies	8	13	36
Editing and Mechanics	8	18	46
On Demand Writing	8	*	38

Plus

- The percentages were not high enough to qualify for a plus.

Delta

- The percentage of students who scored proficient/distinguished in 2021-22 was below the state average in reading, math, social studies, and editing and mechanics in all grade levels.

## Middle School English Learner Progress

Group	School (21-22)	State (21-22)
Percent Score of 0	*	66
Percent Score of 60-80	*	22
Percent Score of 100	*	8
Percent Score of 140	*	2

Plus

- Student performance level data for middle school English learners (ELs) were suppressed for public reporting.

Delta

- Student performance level data for middle school ELs were suppressed for public reporting.



**2021-22 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 7th**

Group	Reading	Math	Science	Social Studies	Editing and Mechanics	On-Demand Writing
All Students	19	19	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female	28	23	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Two or More Races	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non-Hispanic)	21	26	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	40	64	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (IEP)	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities/IEP Regular Assessment	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities/IEP with Accommodations	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessment	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students Without IEP	21	21	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Learner Including Monitored	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Learner	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-English Learner	20	20	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-English Learner or Monitored	20	18	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Foster Care	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gifted and Talented	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-Gifted and Talented	18	19	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Homeless	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Migrant	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
Military Dependent	*	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A

Plus

- The percentage of female students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading and math was greater than the percentage for all students.

Delta

- The percentages were not low enough to qualify for a delta.



## 2021-22 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) Percent Proficient/Distinguished 8th

Group	Reading	Math	Science	Social Studies	Editing and Mechanics	On-Demand Writing
All Students	26	18	N/A	13	18	*
Female	30	*	N/A	14	18	*
Male	22	24	N/A	12	*	*
African American	15	*	N/A	12	*	*
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Asian	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	58	31	N/A	25	*	*
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Two or More Races	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
White (non-Hispanic)	28	*	N/A	15	21	*
Economically Disadvantaged	24	15	N/A	11	*	*
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities (IEP)	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities/IEP Regular Assessment	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Students with Disabilities/IEP with Accommodations	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Alternate Assessment	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Students Without IEP	31	21	N/A	15	23	*
English Learner Including Monitored	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
English Learner	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Non-English Learner	27	18	N/A	13	18	*
Non-English Learner or Monitored	27	18	N/A	13	18	*
Foster Care	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Gifted and Talented	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Non-Gifted and Talented	26	*	N/A	12	18	*
Homeless	33	*	N/A	20	*	*
Migrant	*	*	N/A	*	*	*
Military Dependent	*	*	N/A	*	*	*

### Plus

- The percentage of Hispanic or Latino students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading, math, and social studies was greater than the percentage for all students.
- The percentage of students without IEPs (Individual Learning Plans) scoring proficient/distinguished in reading, math, social studies, and editing and mechanics was greater than the percentage for all students.

### Delta

- The percentage of African American students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading and social studies was lower than the percentage for all students.

# Schedule

## Monday, January 30, 2023

Time	Event	Where	Who
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Pre-Work Session	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
4:15 p.m.	Team arrives at Newport Independent Schools		
4:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.	Superintendent Presentation	Newport Independent Professional Development	Diagnostic Review Team Members and Newport Independent District-level leaders
5:45 p.m.	Team returns to the hotel		
6:00 p.m.- 7:30 p.m.	Team Work Session # 1	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

## Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:45 a.m.	Team arrives at the District Office	Newport Independent District Office	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:00 a.m.- 9:00 a.m.	Superintendent Interview	School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Stakeholder Interviews / Artifact Review		
4:00 p.m.	Team returns to hotel	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm	Team Work Session #2		

## Wednesday, February 01, 2023

Time	Event	Where	Who
7:45 a.m.	Team arrives at Newport Middle School	Newport Independent Middle School	Diagnostic Review Team Members
8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Principal Interview	Newport Independent Middle	Diagnostic Review Team Members
9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	Stakeholder interviews / Artifact Review	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

Time	Event	Where	Who
4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Team returns to hotel		
5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	Team Work Session #3	Hotel Conference Room	Diagnostic Review Team Members

**Thursday, February 02, 2023**

Time	Event	Where	Who
8:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Team arrives at District Office		
8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Final Team Work Session	Newport Independent School District	Diagnostic Review Team Members

