-

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A

School Year:	**2026 - 2027**
School Name:	**Osborne High School**
Principal Name:	**Dr. Troy Jones**
Date Submitted:	
Revision Date(s):	

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	Osborne High School
Team Lead	Sherrye Tillman
Position	Academic Coach
Email	Sherrye.tillman@cobbk12.org
Phone	770 437 5900

	Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems **ONLY**
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only

	Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification **ONLY**
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). *References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]*
School Response: In developing this plan, the school actively sought input from a diverse group of stakeholders. Instructional coaches and administrators first collaborated to identify key committee members who could provide meaningful input on the graduation rate goal. Each core content department then held a minimum of three structured meetings. During these sessions, teachers and staff analyzed relevant data, identified root causes of performance gaps, and collaboratively developed one to two targeted action steps aligned with their departmental goals. This inclusive process ensured that the voices of educators, support personnel, parents and students were central to shaping the plan's direction and evidence-based strategies.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are those individuals with valuable experiences and perspectives who will provide the team with important input, feedback, and guidance. Stakeholders must be engaged in the process to meet requirements of participating federal programs. Documentation of stakeholder involvement must be maintained by the school. Suggested stakeholder participation includes the following roles. **A parent is required**.

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

Required Stakeholders	**Suggested Stakeholders**
Administrative Team	Parent Facilitators
Content or Grade Level Teachers	**Media Specialists**
Local School Academic Coaches	**Public Safety Officers**
District Academic Coaches	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)	**Social Workers**
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists
MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)	Community Health Care Providers
	Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

The comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) and school improvement plan (SIP) team consists of individuals responsible for working collaboratively throughout the needs assessment and plan development process. Ideal team members possess knowledge of programs, the capacity to plan and implement the needs assessment, and the ability to ensure stakeholder involvement. Documentation of team member involvement must be maintained by the school. Multiple meetings should occur and a sign-in sheet must be maintained for each meeting.

Meeting Dates:	02/09/2026	03/09/2026	03/30/2026

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

(*References: Schoolwide Checklist* Section 1114(b)(1)(A))

Collaborate with your team to complete the questions below regarding the progress the school has made toward each goal in the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

Previous Year's Goal #1	**By May 2027, the graduation rate of the FY27 cohort will increase from our current 79.3% to 80.9%.** May 2023: 498 Graduated /670 FY23 Cohort = 74.33 Graduation Rate May 2024: 499 Graduated/654 FY24 Cohort = 77.63 77.39 Graduation Rate May 2025: **Benchmark 1: May 2024: 575 (0.753 x 764) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** o FY27 Cohort May 2024 Progress: 525/764 (69%) of current 9th graders are on track to graduate. (Before Course Ext) **Benchmark 2: May 2025: 579 (0.785 x 738) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** o FY27 Cohort January 2025 Progress: 611/738 (83%) of current sophomores are on track to graduate. 127 students are off cohort. o *Benchmarks 2 – 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 77.39 and the current enrollment of the FY27 Cohort (738 students). These numbers will adjust over time.* **Benchmark 3: May 2026: 569 (0.801 x 711) students will be on track for graduation.** o **FY27 Cohort January 2026 Progress 586/711 of current juniors are on track to graduate. 125 students are off cohort.** o ***Benchmarks 3 & 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 79.3 and the current enrollment FY27 Cohort 711. 82.55% are on track to graduate.*** **Benchmark 4: May 2027: 575 (0.809 x 711) students will graduate (Graduation Rate of 80.9%).**
Was the goal met? ☒ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	CCRPI Graduation Rate
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	

If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	**9th Grade Intervention Team**: The success of the 9th Grade Intervention Team's goal was driven by consistent progress monitoring, targeted student support, and strong collaboration among team members. The team regularly analyzed grade monitoring data to identify students in need and prioritized conferences and interventions accordingly. Committee members built relationships with students through ongoing check-ins, while additional supports such as RTI, parent communication, student contracts, and counseling services addressed both academic and non-academic needs. Incentives and celebrations also contributed to increased student motivation. This structured and responsive approach resulted in 78% of students on the watchlist being on track with their cohort, exceeding the established goal.
	Cardinal Grade Repair: The Cardinal Grade Repair (CGR) intervention was successful, as evidenced by a steady decrease from session to session in the number of students earning a grade of 69 or below. As a result, 10–12% more students passed their courses. This success was supported by teacher collaboration within collaborative teams, where teachers designed and aligned targeted CT assignments for students to complete or redo to demonstrate mastery. Additionally, the CGR team implemented a structured student reflection component during Saturday CGR sessions, allowing students to analyze their performance, identify barriers to success, and seek additional academic support. These combined processes contributed significantly to improved student outcomes.
	Cohort Committee: The cohort committee systematically tracked credit acquisition for each graduation year's cohort to identify students in danger of not earning the required credits to graduate. Also, a member of the cohort committee located students who did not officially withdraw from Osborne to ensure accurate enrollment status.
	ELLevation: The collaborative teams selected an ELLevation to support our multilingual learners (ELLs) for each six week interval to address in needs for the multilingual learners and for students with disabilities.

Previous Year's Goal #2	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI English II EOC will increase from 26% to 29% (3% increase). Our goal is for 240 (826 approximate 10th graders) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2026.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	**New Assessment - No Current Data to Report**
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented	

to address the area of need?	
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

Previous Year's Goal #3	**EOC COURSES**: The total percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Georgia Milestones Algebra EOC will increase from 18.1% to 21.1%. **NON-EOC COURSES**: 20% of students will show proficiency (80% or higher) on their cumulative final exam (baseline year).
Was the goal met? ☒ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	SY 2025-2026 EOC Report Data shows that 30.71% of students scored proficient or distinguished on the Georgia Milestones Algebra EOC. Department Data Monitoring Form shows the following data for proficiency on the final exams: Geometry YL – 39% Geometry – 39% Advanced Algebra – 39% Pre-Cal – 51% Advanced Financial Algebra – 61% AP Courses- 94%
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	

If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	The goal was met due to an increased focus on student academic discourse, intentional and data-driven remediation and enrichment during the weekly WOW block, and the implementation of targeted vocabulary and reading comprehension strategies. Teachers consistently used student performance data to identify learning gaps, provide differentiated support, and adjust instruction to meet student needs. Additionally, opportunities for students to explain their thinking and engage in collaborative discussions strengthened numerical reasoning and overall student understanding.

Previous Year's Goal #4	By May 2026, the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished on the Biology EOC will increase from 30.91% to 33%, as measured by the Georgia Milestones Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	

Biology EOC – Winter 25 and Spring 26 Raw Results	Winter 25	Spring 26
Level 4	3.45%	3.1%
Level 3	24.20%	25.7%

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Develop a clear framework for Tier 1 science instruction using standardized rubrics, regular walkthroughs, and consistent feedback tools. Dedicate weekly CT time for teachers to co-design rigorous tasks, align assessments, and share specific scaffolds for EL and SWD students. Model how to integrate disciplinary literacy and evidence-based reasoning into lessons. Provide professional learning for teachers to use structured language supports, like sentence stems and guided peer discussions, so all students can access complex concepts and scientific discourse.

If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

Previous Year's Goal #5	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI United States History EOC will increase from 32.31 to 35.31% (3% CCRPI Closing the Gap). Our goal is for 196 students (557 approximate current students) to be proficient plus advanced by May 2026.

Was the goal met? ☒ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☐ **Partially**

What data supports the outcome of the goal?

	FY25		FY26	
US History EOC Winter 25 and Spring 26 Raw Results	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	5.50%	8.65%	10.44%	9.12%
Level 3	21.65%	30.08%	29.63%	31.75%

The data from the chart above demonstrates a growth of 2.71% in L4 between FY25 and FY26 as well as a 4.62% growth in L3 between FY25 and FY26.

In total, 240 of students scored proficient plus advanced on the CCPRI U.S. History EOC in FY26. Additionally, students scoring proficient plus advanced increased to +40%.

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Goal was met/exceeded.
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	The following processes, action steps, and interventions contributed to the success of the goal: • Built-in EOC bootcamps (study sessions and activities) were offered in-class throughout the semester with extra days included in the course pacing for EOC review and practice. • Course/domain pacing was aligned to the pacing/EOC percentages provided by the GaDOE. • Domain projects were implemented based on data from previous assessments/semesters that identified which standards students struggled with. • Progress Learning was utilized for formative assessments to provide students with technology-enhanced items similar to what they are presented with on the EOC as well as a built-in remediation opportunities and a personalized study plan. • Stimulus-based items were presented to students on both formative and summative assessments as well as a part of classroom instruction and activities. • A common literacy strategy, MARK, was implemented to help target and support literacy skills and primary source analysis.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment – Summary of Findings (Schoolwide) Section 1114(b)(1)(A)

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATES			
Graduation Rate Longitudinal Data	**FY24**	**FY25**	**FY26**
	74.33%	77.39%	NA

OVERALL CONTENT AREA DATA			
EOC Longitudinal Data	**FY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY26** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
American Literature & Comprehension/ English II	29.84%	26%	NS
Algebra	30.49%	27.51%	30.71%
Biology	34.28%	30.91%	28.8%
U.S. History	24.87%	32.31%	40.9%

GRADUATION RATE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: Graduation Rate	**By May 2027, the graduation rate of the FY27 cohort will increase from our current 79.3% to 80.9%.** May 2023: 498 Graduated /670 FY23 Cohort = 74.33 Graduation Rate May 2024: 499 Graduated/654 FY24 Cohort = 77.63 77.39 Graduation Rate May 2025: **Benchmark 1: May 2024: 575 (0.753 x 764) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** o FY27 Cohort May 2024 Progress: 525/764 (69%) of current 9th graders are on track to graduate. (Before Course Ext) **Benchmark 2: May 2025: 579 (0.785 x 738) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** o FY27 Cohort January 2025 Progress: 611/738 (83%) of current sophomores are on track to graduate. 127 students are off cohort. o *Benchmarks 2 – 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 77.39 and the current enrollment of the FY27 Cohort (738 students). These numbers will adjust over time.* **Benchmark 3: May 2026: 569 (0.801 x 711) students will be on track for graduation.** o **FY27 Cohort January 2026 Progress 586/711 of current juniors are on track to graduate. 125 students are off cohort.** o ***Benchmarks 3 & 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 79.3 and the current enrollment FY27 Cohort 711. 82.55% are on track to graduate.*** **Benchmark 4: May 2027: 575 (0.809 x 711) students will graduate (Graduation Rate of 80.9%).**
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	**First-time 9th grade students need a system of support with specific interventions aimed at keeping them on track for graduating on time.** **Parents, teachers and students are not clear on all of the available opportunities for students to repair their grades in order to get on track with their cohort (grade repair, CVA, GVA, etc).** **Strong cohort monitoring systems are in place; continued progress requires refining and scaling these efforts to increase personalized support and re-engagement of withdrawn students.** **Teachers need to be equipped with more instructional strategies to provide language support for our growing population of multilingual learners**.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step 1** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **1. 9th Grade Intervention Team** **The 9th-grade intervention team will provide monthly targeted intervention support to help at-risk 9th grade students earn graduation credits.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** **100% of committee members will implement the targeted interventions listed below for supporting the first-time at-risk 9th grade students as evidenced by the committee meeting minutes and the mentor tracking sheets.** **Implementation Plan:** Preplanning: • Identify the 9th grade intervention team members. • Create the schedule of meetings for the year. • Committee will identify the students for the watchlist and assign mentors to each. • Committee members will check transcripts of watchlist students. Checking for balance (2 core/2 elective). Admin to submit schedule changes, if possible. • **Create a one-pager and/or video for parents about supports offered throughout the year to be distributed during Cardinal Fly-By & posted on school website** August: • Committee members will plan PL focused on strategies for 9th grade intervention • All teachers teaching a 9th grade course, will receive PL on the designated intervention strategy for the Fall semester. • Committee will plan incentives for intervention watchlist students. • ***Note: Team wanted Academic interventions planned with their CTs*** • **Credit/course requirements shared with students and parents.** September-December: • Mentors will meet with students every month. • Committee will collect grade data every two weeks. • Committee will collect informal feedback from teachers for intervention effectiveness. • Administrator will update behavior details (if any) for watchlist students.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **By May 2026, 75% of first-time 9th grade students on the 9th grade intervention watchlist will be on track with their cohort as evidenced by the final grade pull document.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** Grade Pull Monitors **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** Mentors will monitor student grades every 2 weeks to rectify areas of concern early. • Mentors will make special note of students who make little to no progress. • Committee will then need additional or different interventions for these students. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ Committee Members	• Teacher Mentors • 9th Grade Teachers • Counselors • Interventionists • CTLS • Incentives for watchlist students • Course Grades • **Parent Facilitator (coordinate resources available)**

	• Counselors will meet with students for status reports and matriculation information weekly **(bi-weekly).** • Committee will send survey to 9th grade teachers. (Survey inquiring of the strategies implemented for intervention.) • Committee will review final grades for the semester in December meeting. • **Mid-semester sit-down with upperclassmen to speak with 9th grade students** • **Progress monitoring with credit attainment aligned with the 6-week progress reports for students to complete in class.** January: • Committee will review survey data to determine needs and effectiveness of intervention strategies. • Committee will update watchlist (if needed). • Committee members plan PL focused on strategies for 9th grade intervention. • All teachers teaching a 9th grade course, will receive PL on the designated intervention strategy for the Spring semester. February-April: • Mentors will meet with students every month. • Committee will collect grade data every two weeks. • Committee will collect informal feedback from teachers for intervention effectiveness. • Administrator will update behavior details (if any) for watchlist students. • Counselors will meet with students for status reports and matriculation information weekly **(bi-weekly).** • Committee will send survey to 9th grade teachers. (Survey inquiring of the strategies implemented for intervention.) • Review data from surveys to inform changes for next semester. • **Mid-semester sit-down with upperclassmen to speak with 9th grade students** May:		

	• Committee will review final grades for the semester in May meeting. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Committee Meeting Minutes • Mentor Tracking Sheet/Teacher Input Form **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches **Frequency of Monitoring:** • PL Planning – Once per semester • Grade Pull – Every 2 weeks. • Mentors will meet with students – Monthly Committee Meetings – Monthly		

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step 2** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **2. Cardinal Grade Repair** **All teachers will implement the Cardinal Grade Repair Plan twice per semester to reduce the percentage of students not earning course credit.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** **100% of CTs will implement semester gradebook norms as evidenced by their CT's CGR assignment sheet.** **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** Gradebook Norms Training and Share CT Guidelines and Expectations **August-September/January - February:** ❑ CTs create balanced gradebook norms of common formative and summative assessments based on priority standards for each 6th week interval. ❑ Admin, DCs, and Guiding Coalition review school-wide gradebook norms to ensure instructional alignment. ❑ CTs will analyze student failure rates (Total, ELL, and SWD) to complete the CGR Assignment and Reflection Sheet. CTs will identify priority standards and diagnose whether achievement gaps are caused by rigor, linguistic barriers, foundational skills, or compliance issues. ❑ DCs will collaboratively review other departments' CT Reflection and Assignment Sheets during Guiding Coalition or Department Meetings to identify school-wide trends, share best practices, and provide feedback to teams. ❑ DCs/CTs will upload their CGR Assignment sheet (based on the 1st 6th week gradebook norms) to CGR team. ❑ Teachers will provide a missing assignment report to students with grades 69 and below. ❑ Admin and teachers will send CTLS messages to notify qualifying students and their parents of the upcoming grade repair session. ❑ Students will attend the CGR and complete the Student Reflection Exit Survey. ❑ CGR Team will monitor and share CGR attendance and student reflection data with CT Leads to share with their teams.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **Each semester, the number of students with a grade of 69 or below will decrease by 15% as evidenced by the grade reports.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Grade Pull Reports **Evaluation Plan:** Student Failure Rate Course Failure Rate will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ **3 times a semester** **Data Analysis Plan:** **Before CGR Session 1** ❑ Identify qualifying students ❑ Disaggregate student groups (ELL and SWD) **Before CGR Session 2** ❑ Measure session-to-session change for all students and for student groups (ELL and SWD. ❑ Identify students referred to CGR for a second session for Tier 1 instruction intervention ❑ End of semester — December and May (for course extension preparation) **After Course Extension** ❑ Measure the student failure rate from the 1st CGR session to the end of the semester. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists	• Synergy Grade Reports • CGR Team • CT Leads & Teachers • Academic Coaches

	October-December/March - May: ❑ CTs will analyze student failure rates (Total, ELL, and SWD) to complete the CGR Assignment and Reflection Sheet. CTs will identify priority standards and diagnose whether achievement gaps are caused by rigor, linguistic barriers, foundational skills, or compliance issues. ❑ CTs will identify repeat CGR students for Tier 1 Intervention (Reteaching, Remediation, WOW, or Tutoring) ❑ DCs will collaboratively review other departments' CT Reflection and Assignment Sheets during Guiding Coalition or Department Meetings to identify school-wide trends, share best practices, and provide feedback to teams. ❑ CTs will turn in their CGR Assignment sheet (based on the 2nd 6th week gradebook norms) to the CGR team. ❑ Teachers will provide a missing assignment report for students with grades 69 and below. ❑ Admin and teachers will send CTLS messages to notify qualifying students and their parents of the upcoming grade repair session. ❑ Students will attend the CGR and complete the Student Reflection Exit Survey. ❑ CGR Team will monitor and share CGR attendance and student reflection data with CT Leads to share with their teams. ❑ Teachers will use student survey data and attendance results from CGR Session 1 to adjust outreach strategies for CGR Session 2. **Artifacts to be Collected** ❑ CT Gradebook Norms ❑ CGR Assignment and Reflection Sheet **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal: (Fidelity/Outcomes) ☒ Assistant Principals (Fidelity/Outcomes) ☒ Guiding Coalition (Fidelity/Outcomes) ☒ Academic Coaches (Rigor/instructional Adjustments) ☒ DCs and CT Leads (Dept and Team Level Action)	☒ CT Leads	

	Frequency of Monitoring: ❑ Before CGR Session 1 – Gradebook Norms/CGR Assignment Sheets ❑ Before CGR Session 2- Use student survey data to determine student support ❑ End of semester — December and May (for course extension preparation)		

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step 3** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **3. Cohort Clean-Up** The Cohort Committee will refine the monitoring process to include **proactive cohort support and targeted retention strategies** for students in Cohorts 2027–2030, including structured communication, intervention tracking, and coordination of re-engagement supports.	**Implementation Performance Target:** **100% of Cohort Monitoring Committee members will document the identification and status of off-cohort and withdrawn students using On-Track reports and withdrawal documentation, document root cause categories contributing to off-cohort status (e.g., attendance, transience), and implement and log at least one targeted intervention (e.g., contact attempt, mentor support, referral, or pathway discussion) for each identified student.** **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning**: ❑ Establish cohort committee members ❑ Establish & clarify roles & responsibilities ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ❑ Identify social worker role and integration into cohort meetings ❑ Identify 9th Grade Intervention Team Member role and integration into cohort meetings **August-September**: ❑ Establish off-cohort list (Aug) ❑ Assign off-cohort students with mentors (after 6 wks) ❑ Establish student Incentive Distribution spreadsheet ❑ Promotion celebration from last semester (Aug) ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ❑ Proactively notify students/families of alternative pathways (e.g., Cobb Horizon) prior to withdrawal except for lack of attendance **October-December**: ❑ Student Incentive Distribution #1 ❑ Monitoring withdrawals and off-cohort students ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **By May 2026, the number of students classified as off-cohort will decrease by at least 10%, a minimum of 10% of withdrawn students will be re-engaged through credit recovery, re-enrollment, or alternative diploma pathways.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Cohort tracking records • Credit recovery completion reports • Enrollment/re-enrollment documentation **Evaluation Plan:** Student cohort data will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** • Cohort, withdrawal, and attendance data will be reviewed during bi-monthly Cohort Committee meetings using the Off-Cohort Checklist and Withdrawal Monitoring Form to identify trends, risk factors, and gaps in support. • Root cause data will be analyzed to determine primary drivers of off-cohort status (e.g., attendance, disengagement, mobility). • Communication logs will be reviewed to evaluate the effectiveness of outreach strategies (calls, texts, meetings), and findings will inform adjustments to intervention approaches. • The Off-Cohort Mentor Tracking Spreadsheet will be updated after each mentor interaction and analyzed quarterly to monitor student progress and intervention effectiveness. A midyear and end-of-year summary report will evaluate: • cohort movement	• Personnel • Mentors • Incentives • Alternative Ed Programs

	❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Proactively notify students/families of alternative pathways (e.g., Cobb Horizon) prior to withdrawal except for lack of attendance **January-February**: ❑ Promotion Celebration from 1st Semester ❑ Student Incentive Distribution #2 (Feb) ❑ Identification of seniors at risk of not graduating ❑ Monitoring off-cohort students ❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ❑ Proactively notify students/families of alternative pathways (e.g., Cobb Horizon) prior to withdrawal except for lack of attendance ❑ Continue tracked communication & intervention **March-April**: ❑ Student Incentive Distribution #3 (April) ❑ Monitoring withdrawals and off-cohort students ❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Individual Senior Meetings ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ❑ Evaluate effectiveness of interventions and adjust strategies based on data trends ❑ Proactively notify students/families of alternative pathways (e.g., Cobb Horizon) prior to withdrawal except for lack of attendance **May**: ❑ Monitoring withdrawals and off-cohort students ❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Summer school registration (if needed) ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn **Artifacts to be Collected:**	• re-engagement outcomes • intervention effectiveness • progress toward the 10% reduction target **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Counselors ☒ Clerks ☒ School Psychologist	

	❑ Withdrawal document ❑ Off-Cohort Committee Meeting Minutes **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒Counselors ☒ Clerks **Frequency of Monitoring:** Bi-Monthly Meetings		

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **4. Literacy** All teachers will implement a shared academic discourse framework daily to increase student discourse, as evidenced by the student discourse walkthrough tool.	**Implementation Performance Target:** **100% of teachers will implement at least one structured discourse opportunity per lesson, as evidenced during walkthroughs.** **Implementation Plan:** Preplanning Why Literacy Matters: Article study and school literacy vision Data Protocol Training: Teachers analyze i- Ready, EOC, 8th EOG data, Beacon, title 1 at risk list, and ACCESS data Taskforce develops a schoolwide Academic Discourse Framework aligned to WIDA Key Language Uses (Explain, Argue, Discuss, Narrate) with OHS branding. Departments collaboratively tailor the framework to all WIDA Levels 1–6, including: • Sentence stems • Expected discourse behaviors • Examples of student responses by proficiency level Create common support materials: • Classroom anchor charts • Student bookmarks • Planning templates for discourse structures August-September: August Strategy Training #1: Vocabulary & background knowledge Cycle 1 Window 8/18–8/28 (Admin/IC/DCs) Teachers implement two literacy strategies, including one from ELLevation per unit of study. September Strategy Training #2: Reading Strategies Cycle 2 Window 9/8-9/18 Teachers implement two literacy strategies, including one from ELLevation, per unit of study.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **Each semester, 80% of students will demonstrate growth in self-reported academic discourse confidence, as evidenced by pre- and post-survey results.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Student self-assessment survey • ACCESS Speaking domain scores **Evaluation Plan:** ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ Twice per semester ☐ 3 times per year ☐ Every nine weeks ☒ At the end of the year (upon ACCESS scores availability) **Data Analysis Plan:** **Share Rubric Results Monthly** Review/Compare 25/26 to 26/27ACCESS Scores Teachers will share student results with students to self-reflect on their academic discourse confidence. **Walkthrough Cycle** Cycle 1 Window 8/18–8/28 (Admin/IC/DCs) Students self-assess. Cycle 2 Window 9/8-9/18 Cycle 3 Window 10/5-10/16 Cycle 4 Window 11/2-11/13 Students reassess, reflect and track their growth. Cycle 5 Window: 1/11–1/22 (Admin/ICs/DCs) Students self-assess. Cycle 6 Window: 2/1–2/12 Cycle 7 Window: 3/8 – 3/19 Cycle 8 Window: 3/22 – 4/1 Students reassess, reflect and track their growth.	**ELLevation** **Student Survey**

	October Cycle 3 Window 10/5-10/16 November Strategy Training #3: Writing-to-learn Strategies Cycle 4 Window 11/2-11/13 Teachers implement two literacy strategies, including one from ELLevation per unit of study. January Strategy Training #4: Student Engagement Strategies Cycle 5 Window: 1/11–1/22 (Admin/ICs/DCs) Teachers implement two literacy strategies, including one from ELLevation per unit of study. February Cycle 6 Window: 2/1–2/12 Teachers implement two literacy strategies, including one from ELLevation per unit of study. March Staff Training #5 Reading Cycle 7 Window: 3/8 – 3/19 Teachers implement two literacy strategies, including one from ELLevation per unit of study. April Staff Training #6 Writing Cycle 8 Window: 3/22 – 4/1 Teachers implement two literacy strategies, including one from ELLevation per unit of study. **Artifacts to be Collected:** **Instructional walk-through tool** **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Literacy Taskforce ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Department Chairs	**Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Literacy Taskforce ☒ Academic Coaches	

	☒ Teachers **Frequency of Monitoring:** **Monthly**		

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION/ENGLISH II – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	3%	1%	2%	5%	NS	NS
Level 3	29%	23%	25%	25%	NS	NS
Level 2	35%	42%	44%	43%	NS	NS
Level 1	34%	34%	29%	27%	NS	NS

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION/ENGLISH II (READING STATUS) – By Year

Percentage of Students	FY24		FY25		FY26	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Grade Level and Above	210/350 – 60%	200/343 – 58%	117/312 – 38%	195/335 – 50%	NS	NS
Below Grade Level	140/350 – 40%	143/343 – 42%	175/312 – 56%	140/335 – 42%	NS	NS

AMERICAN LITERATURE/ENGLISH II (READING) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Insert Domain HERE		Insert Domain HERE		Insert Domain HERE	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level 2 Monitor Learning	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level 1 Remediate Learning	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

AMERICAN LITERATURE/ENGLISH II (Writing) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year						
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	**Purpose and Organization**		**Evidence and Elaboration**		**Language Usage and Conventions**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level 2 Monitor Learning	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Level 1 Remediate Learning	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

ELA DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

	Strengths	Weaknesses
AMERICAN LITERATURE & COMPOSITION/ENGLISH II **(3-year trends)** • **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ Percentage of students reading on grade level or below grade level? ○ Percentage of students scoring Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)? ○ Reading domain increases or decreases? ○ Writing domain increases or decreases?	**Reading Level (All Students)** Approximately 35–45% of students read at or above grade level each year, indicating a stable cohort consistently able to access grade-level texts. Honors/AP sections account for over half of students reading on or above grade level, demonstrating effective outcomes for advanced coursework. **Achievement Levels** 30–40% of students perform at Level 2 (Developing Learner), with a modest increase of about 5 percentage points by 2024-25, showing incremental academic progress. 10–15% of students reach Levels 3–4 (Proficient or Distinguished), primarily among higher-Lexile and advanced-course students. **Reading Domains** 15–25% of students score “Approaching Target” in reading domains such as Key Ideas & Details and Craft & Structure, indicating partial mastery and readiness for targeted support. Students with Lexile scores above ~1200L are 2–3 times more likely to reach “Approaching” or “Met Target” status in reading domains.	**Reading Level (All Students)** 55–65% of all students read below grade level, with no significant reduction across the three-year span. 70–85% of EL students and 75–85% of SWD students remain below grade level. **Achievement Levels** 45–55% of students score Level 1 (Beginning Learner) each year, indicating persistent foundational skill gaps. 65–75% of active EL students and 70–80% of SWD students remain at Level 1, with less than 5% reaching proficiency. **Reading Domains** 70–80% of students score “Below Target” in reading domains annually. Less than 10% of students meet reading domain targets, with little year-to-year change. 75–85% of SWD students remain below target in reading domains, showing minimal domain growth.

• **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	**Writing Domains** 10–20% of students score at or near target (2–3 out of 4) in informational/explanatory writing, making it the strongest writing area overall. High-performing students are 3–4 times more likely to meet writing domain targets than their peers. **English Learners** Former EL students reduce below-grade-level reading rates to 45–55%, outperforming current EL peers. By 2024-25, 15–25% of former ELs reach Level 3, showing long-term benefits of sustained language and literacy support. **SWD** Approximately 25–35% of SWD students score at "Approaching Target" or higher in informational reading tasks, compared to only about 10–15% in literary or argumentative reading tasks. 20–30% of SWDs reach Level 2 (Developing Learner), indicating partial skill acquisition.	**Writing Domains** 75–85% of students score below target in writing overall. 80–90% of EL students and 85–90% of SWD students score below target in writing, making it the most critical instructional weakness. Argumentative writing lags the most, with 15–20% fewer students meeting targets compared to informational/explanatory writing. **English Learners** 70–85% of EL students remain below grade level consistently. 65–75% of active EL students remain at Level 1, with less than 5% reaching proficiency. **SWD** 75–85% of SWD students read below grade level consistently across all three years. 75–85% of SWD students score "Below Target" across reading domains: • Key Ideas & Details • Craft & Structure • Vocabulary 85–90% of SWD students score below target in writing. Domain growth for SWDs is typically under 5 percentage points across three years. Performance gaps between SWDs and non-SWD peers do not narrow over time.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Students performing in low Lexile ranges remain the primary root cause of stagnant reading growth and achievement.	

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year
 	
• **What trends exist for all students in the:**
  ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to reading domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness
 	
  ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to writing domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness
 	
• **How do the trends differ for EL students?**
 	
• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**

	Progress Learning ALL Reading Domains • Students demonstrated strongest mastery in Vocabulary (9–12.L.V.1.a, 80%), Theme (10.T.T.1.c, 75%), Narrative Technique (10.T.T.1.a, 70%), and Figurative Language (10.T.SS.2.a, 67%), indicating solid comprehension of literary texts and command of academic vocabulary. ALL Writing Domains • In writing, students performed strongest on Use of Formal Language (10.T.SS.2.c, 74%), Transitions (10.T.SS.1.c, 72%), Use of Figurative Language in Writing (10.T.SS.2.b, 70%), and Argumentative Writing (10.T.T.3.c, 68%), suggesting proficiency with sentence-level skills and structured writing tasks. ELL Reading Domains • ELL students demonstrated relative strength in Vocabulary (9–12.L.V.1.a, 62%), Theme (10.T.T.1.c, 65%), and Figurative Language (10.T.SS.2.a, ~60%), reflecting stronger performance on explicitly taught and text-supported standards. ELL Writing Domains • Writing strengths for ELL students were seen in Transitions (10.T.SS.1.c, ~60%) and basic language conventions (L standards, ~60–70%),	**Progress Learning** ALL Reading Domains • Lower mastery was observed in Impact of Context and Language (10.T.C.1.b, 45%), Generating Questions (10.T.RA.1.a, 38%), Credible Sources (10.T.RA.2.a, 41%), and Validity and Relevancy of Evidence (10.T.RA.2.b, 39%), showing difficulty with higher-order analysis, research skills, and evaluation of information. ALL Writing Domains • Students showed significant weaknesses in Narrative Writing (10.T.T.1.e, 43%), Parallel Structure (10.L.GC.2.e, 40%), Write Poetry (10.T.T.4.b, 39%), and MLA Format (10.T.RA.2.c, 36%), indicating challenges with extended writing, conventions, and research-based writing expectations. ELL Reading Domains • ELL students demonstrated the lowest mastery in Impact of Context and Language (10.T.C.1.b, 32%) and Generating Questions (10.T.RA.1.a, 28%), with other research-based reading standards ranging from 22–33% mastery, indicating language processing and academic vocabulary barriers. ELL Writing Domains • The most significant weaknesses for ELL students occurred in Narrative Writing (10.T.T.1.e, 29%), Parallel Structure (10.L.GC.2.e, 30–35%), and MLA Format (10.T.RA.2.c, 22%), demonstrating challenges with

	showing developing control of sentence structure and cohesion. **English I and II NoRedInk Writing Benchmarks** Thesis Development (W.1.a – Claim/Argument) • Approximately 62% of students demonstrated mastery of the standard requiring a clear, debatable thesis statement, making this the strongest writing domain. • Additionally, over 80% of students scored at least partial mastery (67% or higher), indicating most students can generate a central claim even if the essay is underdeveloped. Reasoning and Explanation (W.1.c – Connecting Evidence to Claims) • Nearly 48% of students met mastery on reasoning, showing moderate success in explaining how evidence supports an argument. • This suggests reasoning is a relative strength when students attempt explanation, though consistency remains an issue. Use of Evidence (W.1.b – Evidence from Texts) • About 42% of students demonstrated mastery in selecting evidence to support claims. • A majority of students showed partial understanding, indicating evidence identification is stronger than evidence integration. **ELL Trends** 1. Thesis Statements (Claim Development) Across EL classes, 40–65% of students demonstrate partial or full mastery of writing a debatable thesis.	sustained writing, grammatical precision, and research conventions. ELL students perform approximately 15–20 percentage points lower than all students across most standards, with the largest gaps appearing in research and extended writing standards, highlighting the need for explicit, language-embedded instruction and scaffolded practice. **English I and II NoRedInk Writing Benchmarks** Counterargument (W.1.a – Acknowledging Opposing Claims) • Only 26% of students demonstrated mastery of the counterargument standard, making it the weakest writing domain. • Over 70% of students scored 0% on this component, indicating most students did not attempt or could not construct a counterclaim and rebuttal. Body Paragraph Claims / Topic Sentences (W.1.a) • 37% of students mastered the standard requiring topic sentences that clearly support the thesis. • Over 50% scored below proficiency, showing difficulty sustaining an argument beyond the introductory claim. Conclusions (W.1.e – Conclusion & Significance) • Only 35% of students demonstrated mastery of writing effective conclusions that restate the argument and explain its broader significance. • Approximately 28% of students earned a score of 0%, suggesting conclusions were frequently missing or underdeveloped. **ELL Trends** 1. Topic Sentences / Paragraph Claims • Less than 30% of EL students consistently write topic sentences that clearly support the thesis.

	Although this is lower than non-EL classes, thesis performance remains the strongest writing domain for EL students. Comparison: EL classes: ~40–65% mastery All students: ~62–78% mastery 2. Evidence Identification (with Support) 30–45% of students can identify relevant textual evidence, especially when evidence is clearly stated in the text set. Comparison: EL classes: ~30–45% mastery All students: ~42–58% mastery	• Many EL essays show lists of ideas rather than organized claims, indicating difficulty sustaining an argument across paragraphs. Comparison: • EL classes: ~15–30% mastery • All students: ~37–54% mastery 2. Reasoning (Explaining Evidence) Fewer than 35–40% of EL students demonstrate mastery in explaining how evidence supports claims. Comparison: EL classes: ~25–40% mastery All students: ~48–62% mastery 3. Counterargument (Greatest Area of Need) Under 20% of EL students attempt or successfully develop a counterargument and rebuttal. Comparison: EL classes: ~5–20% mastery All students: ~26–39% mastery 4. Conclusions Fewer than one-third of EL students write an effective conclusion that restates the argument and explains its significance. Conclusions are often omitted or limited to a single sentence, suggesting time, language, and stamina barriers. Comparison: EL classes: ~15–30% mastery All students: ~35–46% mastery

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Students need explicit instruction in higher-order literacy skills in the areas of research, context analysis, and extended writing**.**	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - ELA • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during ELA walks?** • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during ELA walks?**	**Strengths** • **Clear lesson structure**: Learning targets and success criteria are usually posted, and routines (stations, timers, transitions) are well established. • **High student engagement**: Students regularly read, annotate, discuss texts, and use Tier 1 resources (CommonLit, NoRedInk). • **Strong formative practices**: Teachers circulate, provide immediate feedback, and use small-group instruction to address student needs. • **Embedded vocabulary support**: Word walls, Frayer models, anchor charts, and modeled academic language are common. • **Discussion and collaboration**: Structured discussions and partner/group work are frequently used and generally inclusive.	**Weaknesses** • **Inconsistent alignment**: Learning targets are sometimes posted but not clearly connected to the lesson or revisited. • **Limited support for extended writing**: Writing scaffolds (checklists, exemplars, sentence stems) are inconsistently used, especially for ESOL students. • **Minimal research instruction**: Little explicit teaching of citation, source evaluation, or integration of evidence is observed. • **Underuse of access supports**: Audio, visuals, and posted prompts are not consistently available for struggling readers and ESOL learners. • **Variable lesson closure and accountability**: Some lessons lack a clear closing, and inconsistent enforcement of engagement expectations (e.g., phones) is noted.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Extended writing support, research practices, and clear lesson closure are not consistently embedded or scaffolded, limiting students' development of higher-order literacy skills aligned to priority standards.	

Survey Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☒ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	**Strengths**	Weaknesses
	English teachers demonstrate strong collaboration and collective efficacy, with well-established practices in co-planning, assessment alignment, and analyzing student work. Teams consistently use formative assessment and feedback to guide instruction, and there is clear strength in designing rigorous lessons that support reading, writing, and discussion. Many teachers report confidence in collaborative norms and value job-embedded CT work focused on student evidence.	Key growth areas include strengthening differentiated instruction to better support diverse learners, particularly ELL and SWD students, and refining remediation and extension within WOW intervention block. Teachers also expressed interest in thoughtful AI integration to streamline planning and feedback while maintaining academic integrity. Continued focus on efficiency and depth during CT meetings ensuring conversations lead directly to instructional action, will further strengthen impact.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Teachers need more job-embedded support to differentiate and remediate student learning.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☒ School Climate Survey ☐ _____	Approximately 70–75% of students report that Most or All of their teachers: • Explain new topics in ways that are easy to understand • Make learning interesting • Provide time to practice before moving on About 68% of students report receiving Very or Extremely helpful feedback on the quality of their work. Approximately 80% of students report feeling Very or Extremely safe in classrooms. Nearly 75% of students report that Most or All teachers maintain organized and respectful learning environments. About 70% of students report being Somewhat to Very proud of the school's appearance and classrooms. Approximately 60–65% of students report 0 days absent and another 20% report 1–5 days absent. Approximately 25–30% of students report that A few or None of their teachers: Help them understand what they are learning, Provide clear instructions, and give helpful feedback on assignments. • Over 40% of students report being Very or Extremely stressed due to school. • Approximately 35–40% of students identify schoolwork, grades, or performance as a major source of stress. • Nearly 30% of students report experiencing stress weekly or almost every day.	

	Approximately 30% of students report that only a few or none of the adults at school: Are available when they need help and support them when they feel overwhelmed academically	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Students need clear instructions, consistent instruction, and feedback.	
Additional Data Analysis **(If relevant)** **Select all that apply:** ☒ i-Ready 9th & 10th grade ☐ WIDA ACCESS Other(s): ☐ ☐	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	Reading Achievement (Overall Placement) • Approximately 35–40% of students are performing Early On Grade Level or Mid/Above Grade Level on the ELA diagnostic, demonstrating adequate access to grade-level reading standards. • These students show consistent performance across assessment windows and are less frequently flagged for risk. Lexile Performance • Roughly 30–35% of students have on- or above-grade-level Lexile scores (typically ≥1000L, many in the 1200L–1600L+ range), indicating readiness for complex, grade-level texts. • About 20–25% of students demonstrate Lexile growth from fall to winter, suggesting positive response to Tier 1 instruction. Progress and Stability • An estimated 25–30% of students either maintained or improved their grade-level placement between diagnostic windows, showing emerging reading consistency and stamina.	Overall Reading Proficiency • Approximately 60–65% of students are performing one or more grade levels below in overall reading placement. • Within this group, about 40–45% are two or more grade levels below, indicating significant skill gaps. Foundational and Comprehension Skills • Nearly 35–40% of students score in the Grade K–5 range in reading, despite being enrolled in grades 9–10. • Comprehension of literary and informational texts remains a challenge for approximately 45–50% of students, limiting independence with grade-level complex texts. Lexile Gaps • About 45–50% of students have Lexile levels below 800L, including a subset (15–20%) at beginning-reader or BR levels, which significantly restricts access to grade-level curriculum. Growth and Engagement Indicators • Approximately 50–55% of students show little to no diagnostic growth between assessment windows. • Red or Yellow Rush Flags appear for an estimated 20–25% of students, signaling concerns with engagement, stamina, assessment behaviors, or unfinished diagnostics.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Students need explicit support for foundational reading skills, comprehension practice, and sustained literacy engagement.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI English II EOC will increase from 26% to 29% (3% increase). Our goal is for 240 (826 approximately 10th graders) students to be proficient plus distinguished by May 2027.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students lack consistent, explicit writing instruction and meaningful practice opportunities due to competing priorities, limited time, and variability in instructional strategies and resources. As a result, students are not developing strong writing skills, including organization, use of evidence, and revision, which impacts overall literacy achievement.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District Resources

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 1. All English teachers will implement a consistent structure for teaching argumentative writing in Lit I and Lit II as evidenced by NoRedInk Benchmark rubric results.	**Implementation Performance Target:** **By December 2026 and May 2027, 100% of English teachers will administer at least two NoRedInk Writing Benchmarks for each unit, as evidenced by NRI benchmark reports.** **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** ❑ IC, DC or CT Leads facilitate professional learning focused on explicit instruction for argumentative writing, Claim development Evidence selection and citation Commentary/elaboration Organization and counterclaim development ❑ English I and II teachers will review previous years benchmark results to identify trends in student performance and student group gaps. ❑ Develop common writing expectations and anchor charts for argumentative writing. ❑ Complete the semester benchmark and assessment calendar, identifying Benchmark windows and data analysis meetings. **August-September/January - February:**	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **By December 2026 and May 2027, 70% of students will demonstrate proficiency in writing counterclaims, as evidenced by the NoRedInk Benchmark results.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** ❑ NRI Benchmark Rubric Results **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 2 times per semester ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** **August-September/January-February** ❑ Teachers analyze benchmark data to identify strengths and gaps in: Claims and thesis statements Use of textual evidence Commentary and reasoning Organization and conventions ❑ CT Leads facilitate data meetings focused on improving core argumentative writing	**NoRedInk**

	❑ **English I and English II Benchmark 1** is administered to establish baseline argumentative writing performance. ❑ Teachers will calibrate grading and writing feedback ❑ Teachers will select student exemplars to post. ❑ Teachers implement explicit Tier 1 writing instruction, including: Modeled writing, Sentence frames, Annotation for evidence, and Guided practice with feedback. **October – November/March – April:** ❑ **English I and English II Benchmark 2** is administered to measure growth and instructional impact. ❑ Teachers will calibrate grading and writing feedback. ❑ Teachers will select student exemplars to post. ❑ IC, DC or CT Leads facilitate professional learning focused on small group writing conferences and scaffolded organizers. ❑ Teachers will implement Tier 2 targeted writing supports, including small-group instruction, writing conferences, and /or scaffolded graphic organizers for students not demonstrating sufficient growth. **December/May:** ❑ Teachers analyze growth from benchmark 1 to 2 to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and interventions. ❑ Teams reflect on instructional strategies that produced the greatest writing growth to adjust instruction for the next semester. **Artifacts to be Collected:** ❑ NoRedInk Teacher Usage Report	**October-November/March -April** ❑ Teachers compare Benchmark 2 results to Benchmark 1 to determine progress in argumentative writing skills. ❑ Identify learning gaps for EL and SWD student groups. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CT Leads ☒ Teachers	

	❑ Assessment/Data Analysis Calendar ❑ Professional Learning Calendar **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Department Chair ☒ CT Leads **Frequency of Monitoring:** **Monthly Instructional Walks**		

ALGEBRA – By Year						
EOC Longitudinal Data	**FY24**		**FY25**		**FY26**	
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	9%	6%	4%	3%	10% (22)	9.8%
Level 3	24%	16%	19%	15%	22% (47)	21.5%
Level 2	37%	35%	36%	38%	31% (66)	34.7%
Level 1	30%	44%	41%	44%	37% (80)	34%

ALGEBRA – By Domain of Focus – Current Year								
Domain Mastery Levels **(Enter Domain(s) of Concern)**	**Functional & Graphical Reasoning**		**Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning**		**Exponential Expressions & Equations (PAR)**			
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	26% (52/202)	25% (111/441)	29% (58/202)	19% (83/441)	25% (51/202)	14% (62/441)		
Level 2 Monitor Learning	19% (39/202)	18% (81/441)	17% (34/202)	22% (96/441)	24% (48/202)	32% (141/441)		
Level 1 Remediate Learning	55% (111/202)	56% (249/441)	54% (110/202)	59% (262/441)	51% (103/202)	54% (238/441)		

MATH DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

ALGEBRA I EOC (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses

• **What trends exist for all students in the:**
  ○ Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?
  ○ Algebra EOC domain increases or decreases?
• **How do the trends differ for EL students?**
• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**
	A portion of students are achieving at Level 3, demonstrating that grade-level expectations are attainable.
	
	Some students are progressing from Level 1 to Level 2, indicating early movement toward proficiency.
	
	Performance in more procedural domains shows slightly stronger outcomes compared to domains requiring higher-level reasoning.
	
	Systems for data collection and monitoring are in place, allowing for identification of student needs.
		A large percentage of students remain in Level 1 and Level 2, with limited movement into Levels 3 and 4.
		
		Student performance across domains shows consistently high percentages of Below Target, particularly in:
		• Functional & Graphical Reasoning
		• Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning
		• Data & Statistical Reasoning
		
		Students demonstrate difficulty with:
		• conceptual understanding
		• problem solving
		• interpreting and applying mathematical concepts in context
		
		EL students show lower performance across all domains, particularly in tasks requiring language and reasoning.
		
		SWD students demonstrate the greatest need, with minimal growth toward proficiency and significant gaps compared to peers.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Algebra I EOC data indicates that students are not consistently meeting expectations in domains requiring conceptual understanding, problem solving, and application, particularly in Functional & Graphical Reasoning and Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning. This is partly due to inconsistent collaboration within teams to unpack standards and establish a shared understanding of learning objectives, resulting in misalignment of instruction across classrooms. Additionally, instructional practices tend to emphasize procedural fluency over reasoning, with limited opportunities for student discourse and explanation of thinking. Teachers are not consistently implementing instructional strategies that support deeper understanding and application of mathematical concepts. While teachers are balancing multiple instructional demands, there is a need for focused support to strengthen alignment to rigorous standards and the use of effective, student-centered instructional practices. As a result, students demonstrate stronger performance on procedural tasks but struggle with higher-level reasoning and application across key domains.	

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year
 	
• **What trends exist for all students in the:**
  ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to math domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness
 	
• **How do the trends differ for EL students?**
 	
• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**
	Strengths
	
	Students demonstrate stronger performance in **procedural and foundational domains**, particularly in:
	• **Unit 2 (Linear Inequalities)** and **Unit 3 (Numerical Reasoning)** with averages around **74%**
	
	Performance improves in later units, such as **Unit 7 (~78%)**, indicating that students can demonstrate mastery when concepts are scaffolded and revisited over time
	
	EL students show growth across units, improving from:
	• **55% in Unit 1 (Functions)** to **71% in Unit 7**, indicating that EL students can make progress with continued exposure and support
	
	SWD students demonstrate some progress across units, with performance increasing from:
	• **54% in Unit 4B (Quadratic Functions)** to **68% in Unit 7**, suggesting that targeted supports and
		Weaknesses
		
		Student performance across units is **inconsistent**, with no sustained upward trend in mastery, particularly in:
		• **Functional & Graphical Reasoning**
		  ○ Unit 1: ~63%
		  ○ Unit 4B: ~65%
		  ○ Unit 6: ~67%
		Students demonstrate lower performance in domains requiring:
		• problem solving
		• modeling
		• interpretation of real-world contexts
		EL students consistently perform below their peers across all units, with gaps of approximately:
		• **10–15 percentage points**
		• Example:
		  ○ Unit 6 (Exponential Functions): **56% (EL) vs. 71% (non-EL)**
		  ○ Unit 8 (Data): **59% vs. 72%**
		EL students show the greatest difficulty in:

	repeated exposure contribute to improved outcomes Across subgroups, students are more successful when tasks are: • structured • scaffolded • focused on procedural fluency	• interpreting word problems • explaining reasoning • applying mathematical concepts in context **SWD students demonstrate the most significant and persistent gaps**, particularly in higher-level domains: • Unit 4B: **54% (SWD) vs. 67%** • Unit 6: **56% vs. 68%** SWD students struggle with: • multi-step problem solving • conceptual understanding • application-based tasks
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Common assessment data across Units 1–8 shows that while students perform better on procedural standards (e.g., Units 2 and 3 at approximately 74%), performance is inconsistent in domains requiring conceptual understanding and application, including Unit 1 (~63%), Unit 4B (~65%), and Unit 6 (~67%). This reflects inconsistent collaboration and standards alignment across teams, as well as instruction that emphasizes procedures over reasoning and limits opportunities for student discourse. Subgroup data further supports this trend, as EL and SWD students consistently perform 10–15 percentage points below their peers, particularly in units requiring multi-step reasoning. These patterns indicate a need to strengthen instructional alignment and support teachers in implementing effective, student-centered strategies.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - MATH • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during MATH walks?** • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during MATH walks?**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	Teachers consistently implement guided instruction and modeling, supporting students through note-taking and problem-solving processes. Learning targets are consistently posted (100% of observations), providing clarity of lesson focus. Teachers frequently use visuals, graphic organizers, and technology (e.g., Nearpod, interactive boards) to support student learning. Students engage in procedural practice during the “Apply” portion of lessons, demonstrating attention to precision and basic skill development.	Instruction is predominantly teacher-led, with listening as the dominant mode of learning (up to 68%), limiting opportunities for student discourse. Student-to-student interaction and academic discourse are limited, with structured speaking opportunities observed infrequently (as low as 1/5 observations in some cases). Students are rarely engaged in explaining, justifying, or arguing their thinking, with key language uses such as argumentation not observed across cycles. Instruction during work sessions is primarily focused on procedural practice, with limited emphasis on conceptual understanding or application.

	Teachers circulate and provide individualized support and formative checks, maintaining positive classroom environments.	Success criteria are rarely communicated (1/17 observations), limiting student understanding of what mastery looks like. Use of scaffolds (e.g., language frames, word banks, peer interaction structures) is inconsistent, with some supports rarely observed. Teacher talk dominates instruction, reducing opportunities for student engagement, ownership, and deeper thinking.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The root cause is connected to coherent instruction and professional capacity. Instructional walk data indicates that while teachers consistently implement modeling, use visuals, and provide structured procedural practice, instruction remains largely teacher-centered, with listening as the dominant mode of learning and limited opportunities for student discourse. Students are rarely engaged in explaining, justifying, or applying their thinking, and instructional practices do not consistently support conceptual understanding across classrooms. Inconsistent use of scaffolds, limited communication of success criteria, and a lack of structured collaboration routines further contribute to this issue. These patterns suggest a need to strengthen collaboration around standards alignment and support teachers in implementing student-centered instructional strategies that promote discourse, reasoning, and deeper engagement.	
Survey Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☒ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	Teachers reported strengths in implementing instructional strategies such as academic vocabulary supports, use of visuals, and intentional grouping for remediation and practice Several teachers noted success in using district resources and aligning instruction to standards, as well as maintaining student performance on assessments Teachers demonstrated a focus on student engagement and responsiveness to student needs, including movement-based activities and monitoring student growth	Teachers identified a need to improve student discourse and opportunities for students to explain and justify their thinking Teachers reported challenges with differentiation, particularly in large classes and in providing effective remediation and enrichment (e.g., WOW time) Teachers indicated a need for additional support in: • instructional planning within collaborative teams • modeling of instructional strategies • feedback on instructional practices

	Some teachers reported success in building student confidence and improving student attitudes toward mathematics	Survey responses showed a desire for professional learning in: • supporting English Learners (ESOL strategies and vocabulary development) • student engagement and interactive lesson design Some responses suggest inconsistency in lesson structure (e.g., closings, lesson coherence, alignment of activities)
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Survey data indicates that while teachers are implementing a variety of instructional strategies and are responsive to student needs, there is inconsistency in how instructional practices are applied across classrooms. Teachers identified a need for additional support in structured planning, differentiation, and student-centered instructional strategies, particularly those that promote discourse and reasoning. Additionally, teachers expressed a need for professional learning related to supporting English Learners and increasing student engagement. These trends suggest that instructional practices are not consistently aligned or implemented in a way that supports conceptual understanding and application, which impacts student learning outcomes.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	**EOC COURSES:** Students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Georgia Milestones Algebra EOC will increase from 30.71% to 33.71%. Our goal is for ____ (_____ approximately 9th graders) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2027. **NON-EOC COURSES:** 48% of students will show proficiency (80% or higher) on their cumulative final exam.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	**Root Cause:** Inconsistent collaborative planning and a primary focus on procedural tasks have resulted in uneven classroom experiences for students, practices that are misaligned to developing standard proficiency, and limited opportunities for students to engage in mathematical reasoning, discourse, and application. This limits students' ability to develop conceptual understanding and perform successfully on tasks requiring higher-level thinking.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)*	**Implementation Performance Target:** **By October, at least 60% of math teachers will facilitate tasks that include structured discourse and mathematical reasoning, as evidenced by walkthrough observation data and student work samples.** **By December, 100% of math teachers will consistently implement these tasks.** **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning – August:** Academic coaches will provide professional learning on:	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **By December 2026 and May 2027, at least 20% of students will score 80% or higher on common summative assessments aligned to unit standards, as evidenced by CTLS assessment summary reports.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Summative Assessments • CTLS Assessment Summary Reports **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☒ Per unit	**Personnel:** Academic Coaches Assistant Principal Math Teachers **Materials/Tools:** Professional Learning materials Instructional Strategy Resources

1. Math teachers will facilitate tasks that explicitly target one or more reasoning domains at least once per unit as evidenced by walkthrough data.	• structured academic discourse and strategies that build mathematical reasoning Academic coaches will model expectations for student explanation and engagement Math Collaborative Teams will unpack standards, create learning targets/success criteria, and develop unit plans that include structured academic discourse and reasoning tasks. Academic coaches, in collaboration with CT leads, will review pacing guides and common assessments to ensure alignment to standards. **August – September: Initial Implementation** • Math Collaborative Teams will plan for student discourse in weekly collaborative meetings. • Math teachers will implement reasoning strategies that promote student discourse daily. • Academic coaches will model, co-teach, and provide feedback in classrooms • Assistant principal and academic coaches will conduct walkthroughs focused on mathematical reasoning, student academic discourse, and engagement **October-December: Building Consistency** Math teachers will increase consistency in student discourse and reasoning and refine planning based on student data/work samples Academic coaches will provide bi-monthly professional learning sessions to: • model strategies • share best practices • address instructional needs Assistant principal and academic coaches will provide feedback based on walkthrough data **January: Reset & Reteach Expectations** Academic coaches will reintroduce and model key instructional practices	**Data Analysis Plan:** • Collaborative teams will administer common formative and summative assessments aligned to standards within each unit. • Following each common formative assessment, collaborative teams will review student performance to identify standards with low levels of mastery. • Teachers will use this data to adjust instruction, including reteaching, targeted small group support, and additional practice opportunities. • Following each common summative assessment, collaborative teams will analyze student performance using CTLS standard analysis reports to determine the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency (80% or higher). • Teams will compare student performance on formative assessments to summative assessments aligned to the same standards to identify areas of growth and persistent gaps. • Based on the analysis, collaborative teams will identify specific instructional adjustments, including changes to tasks, questioning strategies, and opportunities for student discourse and reasoning. • Academic coaches and administrators will support teams in interpreting data and identifying effective instructional responses. • Data from common assessments will be reviewed regularly to monitor progress toward the evaluation performance target. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CT Leads	(AVID, ELLevation, Discovery Education) Classroom Tools (Whiteboards, graphic organizers, technology platforms – nearpod, etc) Georgia Standards of Excellence Learning Plans Walkthrough Observation and Feedback Tools

	Math Collaborative Teams will adjust planning based on student needs and refinements noted from last semester. Math teachers will implement strategies with new student groups Assistant principal and academic coaches will monitor implementation through walkthroughs **February – March: Deepening Instruction** Math Collaborative Teams will adjust planning to incorporate more complex reasoning and application tasks. Math teachers will implement more complex reasoning and application tasks. Academic coaches will continue bi-monthly professional learning with a focus on implementing rigorous reasoning and application tasks. Academic coaches will continue classroom support. Assistant principals and academic coaches will monitor instructional practices **April – May: Refinement & Student Ownership** Math teachers will increase student ownership of explanation and reasoning. Math teachers will increase student ownership by providing opportunities for students to independently explain, justify, and defend their mathematical reasoning while leading discussions, analyzing errors, and selecting problem-solving strategies. Math Collaborative Teams will reflect on which strategies were most effective and identify adjustments for next school year. Academic coaches will support reflection and refinement of instructional practices		

	Assistant principal and academic coaches will review implementation trends and adjustments for next school year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** Walkthrough Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches **Frequency of Monitoring:** Weekly walkthroughs to monitor instructional practices. Monthly review of walkthrough trends and instructional planning and implementation.		

BIOLOGY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
Administrations	**Winter 23**	**Spring 24**	**Winter 24**	**Spring 25**	**Winter 25**	**Spring 26**
Level 4	3.39%	4.35%	3.30%	5.65%	3.45%	3.1%
Level 3	30.27%	28.74%	27.06%	25.30%	24.20%	25.7%
Level 2	30.27%	30.68%	25.08%	26.49%	31.98%	32.6%
Level 1	36.08%	36.23%	44.22%	42.56%	40.33%	38.%

BIOLOGY – By Domain of Focus – FY26

Domain Mastery Levels	Domain 1: Cells		Domain 2: Genetics		Domain 3: Classification		Domain 4: Ecology		Domain 5: Evolution	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	13.5%	17.6%	17.7%	17.6%	31.5%	70.3%	22.8%	25.3%	14.6%	17.0%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	35.4%	35.4%	25.8%	26.6%	15.7%	29.7%	23.3%	29.7%	32.3%	30.2%
Level 1 Remediate Learning	50.8%	47.0%	56.2%	55.8%	52.5%Cl	0%	53.7%	45.1%	52.8%	52.7%

BIOLOGY DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS (if applicable)

BIOLOGY EOC (3-year trends)	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
• **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ Percentage of students scoring Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)? ○ Biology EOC domain increases or decreases?	• Level 4 performance remains consistent across administrations, indicating a stable, though small, group of students reaching distinguished levels • Domain 3 (Classification) demonstrates the strongest performance in the current data set (FY26), with the highest percentage of students meeting Level 3 expectations • A subset of students demonstrates the ability to reach proficiency (Level 3), indicating that grade-level expectations are attainable under appropriate instructional conditions • Some students—including EL and SWD—demonstrate the ability to meet target	• Level 1 remains the largest performance band across all administrations (36–44%), indicating a significant proportion of students are not meeting expectations • Level 3 performance has declined over time, indicating a decrease in overall proficiency • Level 2 performance remains high, indicating limited movement of students into proficiency (Level 3) • Domain 1 (Cells) and Domain 2 (Genetics) show the highest percentages of students at Level 1, indicating persistent foundational gaps in conceptual understanding

• **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?** **Overall Summary**	expectations under supported conditions, indicating that proficiency is attainable with appropriate instructional supports • Overall, a small percentage of students consistently reach proficiency and distinguished levels, with relatively stronger performance in Domain 3. Additionally, some students—including EL and SWD—demonstrate the ability to meet target expectations under supported conditions, indicating that proficiency is attainable with appropriate instructional supports.	• Domain 5 (Evolution) demonstrates low Level 3 performance and high Level 1 performance, indicating significant challenges with application, synthesis, and higher-order thinking • Across domains, students demonstrate difficulty independently applying knowledge and reasoning on tasks requiring explanation, evidence, and transfer • EL students are disproportionately represented in Level 1, indicating barriers to access • SWD students are primarily concentrated in Levels 1 and 2, indicating limited and inconsistent access to proficiency • No domain demonstrates consistent, system-wide improvement across years and student groups, indicating a lack of instructional coherence • Overall, the majority of students remain below proficiency, with limited movement from Level 2 to Level 3 and no consistent improvement across years. Persistent gaps in foundational domains (1 and 2) and inconsistent performance in Domain 5 indicate difficulty with both conceptual understanding and application, while subgroup trends suggest a systemic Tier 1 access and academic language issue rather than a difference in student ability.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Student performance trends indicate that outcomes are not primarily limited by content exposure, but by inconsistent access to aligned, high-quality Tier 1 instruction. Persistent weaknesses in foundational domains (Domains 1 and 2), combined with inconsistent performance on higher-order tasks in Domain 5, suggest that students are not consistently required to engage in reasoning, explanation, and application of learning. Subgroup patterns—particularly the disproportionate representation of EL and SWD students below proficiency—indicate systemic gaps in Tier 1 access and academic language support rather than differences in student ability. Collectively, the data points to inconsistent instructional coherence across classrooms, including variability in rigor, disciplinary literacy practices, and opportunities for students to process and demonstrate understanding at the level required for proficiency.	

COMMON ASSESSMENTS – 2025-2026 - Biology	Strengths	Weaknesses
• **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to math domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness • **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	• Standards aligned to SB4 (Classification & Phylogeny) demonstrate relatively strong and consistent performance across semesters, with some mastery levels reaching 80–95%, indicating a relative area of strength. • Standards aligned to SB5 (Ecology) show improved performance during Spring instruction, particularly on applied and contextualized tasks, with mastery frequently reaching the 70–89% range. • Procedural and structured standards within SB2 (DNA & Gene Expression) demonstrate moderate to strong performance (65–85%), indicating students can successfully complete scaffolded and guided tasks. • Students demonstrate growth during instructional sequences, with unit averages increasing from Unit 1 (62%) to Unit 3 (75%), indicating responsiveness to instruction and support. • Formative performance consistently exceeds summative performance, indicating students can demonstrate understanding during guided instruction and collaborative learning opportunities. • EL and SWD students perform closer to peers on scaffolded tasks and demonstrate measurable growth during supported instructional sequences, indicating that proficiency is attainable with appropriate instructional supports.	• Standards aligned to SB3 (Genetics & Inheritance) remain a persistent area of weakness, with performance frequently in the 40–60% range, indicating difficulty with conceptual reasoning, explanation, and application. • Standards aligned to SB6 (Theory of Evolution) demonstrate inconsistent and generally lower mastery, particularly on tasks requiring modeling, argumentation, and conceptual transfer. • Specific standards such as SB1.e frequently underperform, indicating persistent gaps in foundational conceptual understanding of cellular processes. • Performance declines as cognitive demand and independence increase, with unit averages dropping from Unit 3 (75%) to Unit 4 (67%) and summative scores consistently trailing formative performance. • EL students demonstrate larger performance gaps on language-heavy and conceptually complex standards, particularly within SB3, SB6, and SB1.e, indicating barriers related to academic language and access. • SWD students demonstrate decreased performance as complexity and multi-step reasoning increase, particularly in later instructional units. • Performance patterns vary across classrooms and standards, indicating inconsistency in instructional implementation, pacing, rigor, and opportunities for students to engage in evidence-based reasoning and scientific discourse.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The common assessment data indicates that student outcomes are not primarily limited by content exposure, but by inconsistent access to aligned, high-quality Tier 1 instruction. While students demonstrate stronger performance on structured and scaffolded tasks, they struggle when standards require reasoning, explanation, and independent application of learning. This pattern is reflected in stronger performance on procedural standards within SB2 alongside persistent weaknesses in the more conceptually demanding standards within SB3 and SB6. Instructional unit trends reinforce these findings, with performance improving during supported instructional sequences and declining as cognitive demand and independence increase in later units. Subgroup trends mirror this pattern, with EL and SWD students performing closer to peers under scaffolded conditions but demonstrating larger gaps as language demands and reasoning complexity increase, indicating systemic Tier 1 access and academic language gaps rather than differences in student ability. Collectively, the data points to inconsistent instructional coherence across classrooms, including variability in rigor, pacing, disciplinary literacy practices, and opportunities for students to engage in scientific reasoning and evidence-based discourse. As a result, students are not consistently equipped to apply and demonstrate understanding of Biology content at the level required for proficiency.

SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – Science	Strengths	Weaknesses
• **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during Science walks?** • **What instructional practices / processes are**	• Positive classroom culture with strong teacher-student relationships and a safe environment for participation. • Frequent use of small-group and individualized support structures, particularly in SPED and ESOL settings. • Evidence of student-centered instructional structures, including collaboration, guided practice, and task completion. • Alignment to standards is generally evident in lesson design and instructional materials.	• Learning targets & success criteria are not consistently used to guide instruction or support student ownership of learning. • Students are infrequently required to explain reasoning, justify responses, or engage in sustained academic discourse. • Instructional tasks are often focused on completion and recall rather than evidence-based reasoning, explanation, and application. • Inquiry-based science practices, including science and engineering practices (SEPs), crosscutting

consistently missing or ineffective during Science walks? ***Data based on 79 walk-thrus including WOW***	• Emerging implementation of instructional strategies such as differentiation, retrieval practice, Turn & Talk, & guided instruction. • Pockets of strong practice where: → academic language is intentionally supported, → inquiry and reasoning opportunities are present, → and Needs-Based Intervention (WOW) structures are implemented with fidelity.	concepts (CCCs), and phenomenon-based instruction, are inconsistently implemented. • Student engagement varies significantly across classrooms and is not consistently supported through structured instructional routines. • Checks for understanding and feedback are inconsistently used to monitor learning & adjust instruction in real time. • Needs-Based Intervention (WOW) structures demonstrate inconsistency in implementation, clarity of purpose, and alignment to identified student needs.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The walk-through data indicates inconsistent implementation of a coherent Tier 1 instructional framework for science instruction, particularly in the areas of reasoning, academic language, inquiry, and rigorous thinking. While classrooms generally demonstrate positive learning environments and student engagement in tasks, students are not consistently required to explain thinking, justify responses with evidence, or engage in structured academic discourse. Core instructional practices—including the use of learning targets, inquiry-based learning, checks for understanding, and feedback—are implemented inconsistently across classrooms. As a result, instruction often emphasizes task completion and teacher-directed learning over student sensemaking, reasoning, and application. Inconsistent implementation of WOW intervention structures further contributes to variability in instructional quality and alignment to student need. Collectively, these inconsistencies limit equitable access to high-quality Tier 1 instruction and reduce opportunities for students to engage in the level of thinking required for mastery and proficiency. **Problem of Practice:** Teachers are not consistently implementing instructional practices that require students to explain thinking, justify responses with evidence, and engage in structured academic discourse, resulting in instruction that emphasizes task completion over reasoning, application, and rigorous thinking.	

Instructional Support Survey Summary Data (Science)
 	
☒ Teacher Survey
☐ Parent Survey
☐ Professional Learning Survey
☐ _____
	• **Core Instructional Needs**: Teachers consistently identified differentiation, student engagement, science-specific instructional strategies (labs/inquiry), and data-driven instruction as the highest areas of instructional support need.
	• **Primary Barrier to Implementation**: The most significant constraint is limited planning time, with additional barriers including student engagement challenges, access to resources, and difficulty translating data into actionable instructional decisions.
	• **Data Use – Implementation Gap**: While most teachers report confidence in accessing and interpreting data, there is a clear gap between data analysis and instructional implementation, including:
	  • Aligning data to remediation (WOW/needs-based instruction)
	  • Monitoring progress over time
	  • Adjusting instruction in response to student needs
	• **Preferred Support Structures**: Teachers prefer job-embedded instructional support, particularly:
	  • Small group/department collaboration
	  • Coaching cycles
	  • Practical, self-paced resources
	  → Whole-group PL is less preferred
	• **Instructional Support Priorities**: Highest priority areas include:
	  • Inquiry-based and lab-centered instruction
	  • Strategies for ELL/SWD support
	  • Effective integration of technology and data
	• **Support Model Preferences**: Teachers prefer flexible, responsive support structures (as-needed or monthly), with communication embedded in existing team structures (CTs) and brief, targeted check-ins.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The data indicates that while instructional support structures, collaborative teams, and data systems are in place, there is a system-level gap between access to support and consistent classroom implementation. Teachers demonstrate awareness of effective instructional practices and general confidence in data use, but lack the protected time, operational clarity, and job-embedded support needed to consistently implement rigorous, differentiated, and data-driven instruction. This gap is reinforced by inconsistent expectations for Tier 1 instruction, limited opportunities for sustained coaching and feedback, and weak alignment between data analysis, remediation structures (WOW), and instructional adjustment. As a result, high-impact instructional practices—including inquiry, differentiation, and evidence-based instructional decision-making—are implemented inconsistently across classrooms, limiting equitable access to rigorous, standards-aligned learning experiences.

	Problem of Practice: Teachers have access to data, collaborative structures, and instructional supports, but lack the coherent systems, protected time, and job-embedded support needed to consistently implement rigorous, data-driven instruction that improves student outcomes.

Professional Learning Survey Summary Data - Science ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☒ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	• Strong baseline capacity in assessment administration and collaboration, with most teachers reporting consistent implementation of assessment creation, sharing, and proctoring practices. • Evidence of Collaborative Teams engaging in student work and data discussions, indicating an emerging PLC foundation. • Many teachers report consistent implementation of collaborative norms, unit planning, and collective efficacy practices. • Teachers report high exposure to school-based and district professional learning opportunities. • Teachers demonstrate a strong preference for job-embedded professional learning, particularly Collaborative Team work sessions, student work analysis, and department-level collaboration. • Teachers express strong interest in high-impact instructional practices, including AI integration, formative assessment, differentiation, and data-driven instruction. • Emerging pockets of expertise in areas such as AI integration and data analysis provide opportunities for internal capacity-building and teacher leadership.	• Data-driven instructional practices are not consistently implemented, particularly in using assessment data to inform instructional decisions and student support. • Teachers demonstrate gaps in designing rigorous assessments aligned to higher-level thinking and standards-based reasoning. • Remediation, enrichment, and extension practices are inconsistently planned and implemented, limiting effective Tier 1 → Tier 2 instructional response. • Collaborative Team effectiveness varies across departments, with repeated requests for clearer protocols, stronger facilitation, and greater focus on student thinking and instructional decision-making. • Teachers report continued need for literacy scaffolding, academic language support, differentiation, and subgroup-responsive instructional practices for EL and SWD students. • Wide variability in implementation levels across teachers indicates a lack of system-wide coherence, operational clarity, and sustained implementation support.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership	**Root Cause Explanation:** The data indicates that while foundational structures for collaboration, assessment, and professional learning are in place, there is a system-level gap between professional learning exposure and consistent classroom implementation. Teachers demonstrate readiness for job-embedded, collaborative learning models, but variability in implementation suggests that Collaborative Teams and professional learning structures are not yet consistently leveraged to drive instructional improvement.	

☐ Supportive Learning Environment	This gap is reinforced by unclear operational expectations for rigor, differentiation, and data-driven instruction; inconsistent Collaborative Team protocols and facilitation; and insufficient modeling, feedback, and accountability structures to support classroom transfer. Additionally, the lack of a coherent system connecting professional learning to instructional implementation limits consistency across classrooms. **Problem of Practice:** Teachers have access to data, collaborative structures, and professional learning—and demonstrate a preference for job-embedded, team-based learning—but lack the coherent systems, expectations, and support needed to consistently translate these into rigorous, data-driven instruction that improves student outcomes.

SCIENCE - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #4: Science	**By May 2027, the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished (Levels 3–4) on the Biology EOC will increase by at least 3% from 28.8%% to 31.8%.** Our goal is for ____ (_____ approximately 9th graders) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2027.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	**Root Cause**: The absence of a cohesive leadership framework for Tier 1 science instruction has led to inconsistent teacher capacity in designing rigorous, evidence-based lessons. Consequently, students, particularly English Learners and those with disabilities, lack equitable access to the academic discourse, scientific reasoning, and effective scaffolding necessary for deep learning. Collectively, these root causes contribute to inconsistent implementation of rigorous, standards-aligned Tier 1 science instruction, limiting students' opportunities to engage in scientific reasoning, evidence-based explanation, and disciplinary literacy practices necessary for proficiency on the Biology EOC.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)*	**Implementation Performance Target:** ***100% of Science Teachers will align daily instructional practices to the Science and Engineering Practices in the Georgia Standards of Excellence.*** **By December of 2026, 100% of our science teachers will implement scientific discourse, model analysis, data interpretation, and evidence-based explanations during science instruction.** **Implementation Plan:**	**Evaluation Performance Target:** ***40% of students will score 80% or higher on unit interim assessments.*** **By December 2026 and May 2027, 60% of students will score 80% or higher on unit interim assessments** **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Interim Assessment **Evaluation Plan:**	

Science teachers will align daily instructional practices to the Science and Engineering Practices in the Georgia Standards of Excellence as evidenced by walkthrough data.	**Preplanning:** • Administration will establish and communicate walkthrough look-fors aligned to teacher clarity. • Job-Embedded Work Session (During CT Meeting) – Focused on learning targets and success criteria for Unit 1. • Calibrate leadership and instructional teams on walkthrough indicators and instructional expectations. **August-September:** • August - Job-Embedded Work Session (During CT Meeting) – Focused on learning targets and success criteria for Unit 2. • Late August/Early September - Job-Embedded Work Session (During CT Meeting) – Focused on learning targets and success criteria for Unit 3. • Implement learning targets and success criteria aligned to Science and Engineering Practices in Georgia Standards of Excellence. • Conduct baseline walkthroughs to monitor implementation of instructional practices aligned to the SEPs in GSEs. **October-December:** • October: Job-Embedded Work Session (During CT Meeting) – Focused on learning targets and success criteria for Unit 4. • Continue implementing learning targets and success criteria aligned to Science and Engineering Practices in Georgia Standards of Excellence. • Utilize walkthrough data to provide coaching and feedback focused on implementation of science and engineering practices. • November: Job-Embedded Work Session (During CT Meeting) – Focused on learning targets and success criteria for Unit 5. **January-February:**	Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ By Unit **Data Analysis Plan:** • Collaborative Teams will analyze interim assessment within 48 hours of administration. • Teams will identify trends in student performance. • Instructional adjustments will be made based on identified strengths, gaps, and subgroup needs. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Local & District Academic Coaches ☒ DC/CT Lead	

	• Review and reflect on S1 data and Units 1 & 2 Plans. Make instructional revisions as needed. • Admin will conduct walkthrough calibration to ensure consistency in monitoring and feedback practices. February – • Monitor consistency of implementation of standards aligned instructional practices across classrooms and courses through classroom observations. • Provide targeted support to classrooms demonstrating limited evidence of standards aligned instructional practices **March-April:** • Review and reflect on S1 data and Units 3-5 Plans. Make instructional revisions as needed. • Monitor consistency of implementation of standards aligned instructional practices across classrooms and courses through classroom observations. **May:** • Evaluate walkthrough implementation trends alongside assessment performance data. • Identify strengths, challenges, and priorities for refinement in the following school year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Walkthrough observation data aligned to science and engineering practices • Walkthrough trend summaries by department/course • Teacher Clarity documents **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒District Academic Coaches **Frequency of Monitoring:** • Monthly		

U.S. HISTORY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	5.8%	4.8%	5.50%	8.65%	10.44%	9.12%
Level 3	20.47%	22.8%	21.65%	30.08%	29.63%	31.75%
Level 2	43.27%	39.30%	32.99%	34.21%	33.33%	35.81%
Level 1	36.26%	33.10%	41.24%	27.07%	26.6%	23.31%

U.S. HISTORY – By Domain of Focus – FY26

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	Domain 1: Colonization through the Constitution		Domain 2: New Republic through Reconstruction		Domain 3: Industrialization, Reform, & Imperialism		Domain 4: Establishment as a World Power		Domain 5: Post WWII to the Present	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	29.83%	32.99%	25.42%	33.68%	28.47%	25.43%	28.14%	39.18%	23.73%	36.43%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	21.36%	21.31%	37.29%	28.18%	25.08%	23.38%	23.05%	24.05%	28.47%	24.05%
Level 1 Remediate Learning	48.81%	45.70%	37.29%	38.14%	46.44%	51.20%	48.81%	36.43%	47.80%	39.52%

U.S. HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS (if applicable)

US History EOC (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses
• **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)? ○ US History EOC domain increases or decreases?	• Increase in Level 3 (Proficient) from 20.47% (F23) to 31.75% (S26), indicating overall growth in student proficiency • Increase in Level 4 (Distinguished) from 0.58% (F23) to 9.12% (S26), showing steady growth in highest-performing students • Decrease in Level 1 (Beginning) from a peak of 41.24% (F24) to 26.60% (F25), indicating improved movement out of the lowest performance level	• Inconsistent trends across semesters, with clear regression following periods of growth, indicating lack of sustained learning: ✓ Level 3 increased to 30.08% (S25) but declined to 29.63% (F25), demonstrating inability to maintain proficiency gains ✓ Level 2 remained relatively stable (34.21% → 33.33%), indicating limited movement of students into higher performance levels

• **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	• Strong within-semester growth across domains, including: ✓ Domain 4: +20% (F24 → S25) ✓ Domain 3: +12.3% (F24 → S25) • Growth observed across all domains during instructional cycles, with initial increases ranging from +31% to +42% (S23 → F23) • EL students improved from 1.58 (S25) to 2.1 (F25), demonstrating ability to recover and grow under effective instruction • SWD students increased from 1.5 (F24) to 2.2 (S25), indicating responsiveness to scaffolded instruction	✓ Earlier patterns show even greater instability, including a -4.70% drop in Level 3 (S23 → F23), reinforcing that gains are not consistently maintained • A majority of students remain below proficiency, limiting overall performance gains: ✓ 59.93% of students remain in Levels 1 and 2 (F25), meaning nearly 3 out of 5 students are not meeting proficiency expectations ✓ Even during stronger semesters (e.g., S25), Levels 1 and 2 still accounted for 61.28% of students, indicating persistent foundational gaps • Performance regression across higher-order domains after periods of growth indicates weak retention and transfer: ✓ Domain 4 (highest weight, 24% of test): -8.94% decline (S25 → F25) ✓ Domain 3: -2.75% decline ✓ Domain 5: -1.70% decline ✓ These declines follow significant gains (e.g., Domain 4: +20% F24 → S25), showing that learning is not durable across semesters • Domains requiring higher-order thinking (Domains 3–5) show the greatest instability across semesters • EL students show significant fluctuations: ✓ Drop of -25.5% (S24 → F24) before recovery of +32.9% (S25 → F25) • SWD students show inconsistent performance: ✓ Increase of +46.7% (F24 → S25) followed by decrease of -31.8% (S25 → F25) • Subgroup performance remains lower across domains: ✓ SWD averages: ~1.4–1.5

		✓ EL averages: ~1.6–1.8 compared to GEN at ~2.0 • No single domain is consistently weak; instead, performance varies significantly by classroom and teacher, indicating inconsistency in instructional delivery
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Student performance varies significantly across classrooms and is not consistently sustained across semesters, indicating inconsistent implementation of rigorous Tier 1 instruction and disciplinary literacy practices. While students demonstrate the ability to grow within instructional cycles, declines across Domains 3–5 suggest inconsistent opportunities for analysis, reasoning, source evaluation, and evidence-based written response, limiting long-term retention and transfer. EL and SWD students demonstrate greater performance instability, indicating inconsistent access to academic language development, scaffolded discourse, and grade-level cognitive rigor. Effective instructional practices exist within the department, but they are not yet implemented consistently across classrooms and collaborative teams.	

COMMON ASSESSMENTS – 2025-2026	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
• What trends exist for all students in the: ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to math domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness • How do the trends differ for EL students?	• Multiple standards demonstrate high levels of mastery (80–95%+), including examples such as 12a (~93%), 11c (~85%), and 9a (~84.6%), indicating students can achieve strong levels of proficiency on assessed standards • Many standards cluster within the 75–90% mastery range, demonstrating that students are capable of achieving high levels of performance following instruction • Students demonstrate the ability to achieve high levels of mastery across multiple domains and instructional cycles when provided effective instructional support and sequencing • Domain 3 demonstrates the strongest overall performance, with the highest concentration of Level 4 students across subgroups, indicating increased success with targeted instructional alignment within the domain	• Significant variability in mastery across standards, ranging from approximately 44% to over 90%, indicates inconsistent depth of understanding across classrooms and domains • Within-domain inconsistency is evident (e.g., Domain 1: ~73% vs. ~44%; Domain 5: ~77% vs. ~55%), suggesting gaps in conceptual coherence and transfer of learning • A decline in Level 4 performance from Domain 3 to Domain 4 across subgroups indicates difficulty sustaining higher levels of application and reasoning: ○ GEN: 34 → 17 ○ SWD: 11 → 2 • Domain 1 demonstrates a high concentration of students in Level 1, particularly among EL and SWD students, indicating foundational access gaps and uneven readiness for grade-level tasks • EL students demonstrate lower performance in earlier domains with improved performance in later domains, suggesting inconsistent access to academic language and content early in instruction

• How do the trends differ for SWD students?	• Domain 2 demonstrates evidence of growth within the instructional sequence (Part 1 → Part 2), suggesting students benefit from scaffolded and sequenced learning experiences • EL students demonstrate improved performance in later domains, including increased representation in Levels 3 and 4, indicating responsiveness to academic language supports and continued instructional exposure • SWD students demonstrate improved performance in some domains, particularly Domain 3, indicating students can successfully engage with grade-level content when provided appropriate supports and scaffolds • Some classrooms demonstrate consistently strong performance across multiple standards and domains, indicating that effective instructional practices and rigorous learning experiences exist within the department	• SWD students demonstrate growth in some domains (e.g., Domain 3), but performance is not sustained consistently across domains, particularly in Domain 4 • Wide variation in performance across classrooms on the same standards indicates inconsistency in instructional implementation and student access to rigorous learning experiences • Lower-performing standards (typically within the 40–60% range) suggest students experience greater difficulty with standards requiring application, reasoning, and deeper cognitive processing • Performance patterns across domains and standards indicate that opportunities for rigorous application and higher-order thinking are not yet consistently experienced across classrooms and instructional settings
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Common assessment data indicates that while students are capable of achieving high levels of mastery on individual standards, performance remains inconsistent across standards, domains, and classrooms. The coexistence of high mastery (80–95%+) and significantly lower performance (40–60%) within the same domains suggests inconsistent development of deep and coherent understanding across instructional settings. Patterns across domains show that students can improve when instruction is sequenced and scaffolded and can achieve high levels of performance within specific domains; however, performance is not consistently sustained across domains requiring greater application, reasoning, and transfer of learning. Subgroup data further indicates that EL and SWD students are disproportionately represented in lower performance levels in earlier domains, suggesting uneven access to academic language, scaffolded instruction, and rigorous grade-level content. Additionally, wide variation in outcomes across classrooms on the same standards indicates inconsistency in instructional implementation and student access to rigorous learning experiences. As a result, students demonstrate uneven mastery across standards and domains, particularly on tasks requiring higher levels of cognitive rigor and application.	

Common Summative Assessment AUDIT – US HISTORY	Strengths	Weaknesses

• To what extent are unit assessments aligned to the full rigor and intent of the GSE and Georgia Milestones Blueprint?
• To what extent do assessments require students to analyze and interpret sources rather than simply identify information?
• How well do assessments reflect the expected distribution of DOK levels and alignment to ALDs for Proficient and Distinguished learners?
• What do student performance trends reveal about their ability to engage in higher-order thinking versus recall-based tasks?
• To what extent do assessments require students to engage in reasoning, justification, and multi-step thinking?
• How well do unit assessments reflect the format and cognitive demands of the Milestones EOC?
• How consistent is the level of rigor and access to standards-aligned tasks across classrooms?
• To what extent do unit assessments serve as reliable
	Standards & Content Alignment
	• Unit assessments are broadly aligned to the Georgia Standards of Excellence (SSUSH1–23) and reflect the major domains outlined in the Georgia Milestones Blueprint.
	• Assessments collectively address the full course progression (Colonization → Modern Era), supporting vertical content coverage.
	
	Use of Stimulus-Based Items
	• Assessments include maps, political cartoons, timelines, excerpts, and data visuals across units, mirroring the format and structure of Milestones items.
	• Students are regularly asked to interpret historical sources and visuals, supporting disciplinary literacy development.
	
	Emerging Alignment to Higher-Level Thinking
	• Select items require students to:
	  ○ Identify cause-and-effect relationships
	  ○ Determine historical significance
	  ○ Analyze trends or outcomes across time
	• These align to elements of **Proficient-level performance** within the Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs), particularly where students must explain or describe historical developments.
	
	Stronger Performance in Structured Tasks
	• Assessment patterns indicate that students are more successful on:
	  ○ Clearly scaffolded questions
	  ○ Items with direct pathways to answers
	  ○ Recognition and application of discrete content knowledge
		Overrepresentation of Low-Rigor (DOK 1) Tasks
		
		• A significant portion of assessment items emphasize:
		  ○ Recall of facts, terms, and events
		  ○ Identification of people, policies, or outcomes
		• This does not align with the Milestones Blueprint expectation of 65–75% DOK 2 and 15–25% DOK 3.
		
		Insufficient DOK 3 (Reasoning) Opportunities
		
		• Limited opportunities for students to:
		  ○ Analyze multiple sources
		  ○ Justify answers using evidence
		  ○ Evaluate historical claims or arguments
		• Many stimulus-based questions remain at a surface level (interpretation without deeper reasoning).
		
		Partial Alignment to Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs)
		
		• While some items align to "describe" and "explain," fewer require students to:
		  ○ Trace developments over time
		  ○ Evaluate impact or significance
		  ○ Make connections across concepts or domains
		• This limits the assessment of Proficient and Distinguished Learner performance.
		
		Limited Alignment to EOC Item Design

predictors of EOC performance?		• Unit tests rely almost exclusively on traditional multiple-choice items
		• Lack of:
		  ○ Multi-part or multi-step questions
		  ○ Technology-enhanced item structures
		• This creates a mismatch with the cognitive demands and format of the Milestones assessment.
		
		Inconsistent Rigor Across Units and Classrooms
		
		• Variability exists in:
		  ○ Depth of questioning
		  ○ Balance of DOK levels
		  ○ Alignment to ALDs
		• This results in inconsistent measurement of student mastery across classrooms and units.
		
		Limited Predictive Strength of Unit Assessments
		
		• While assessments measure unit-level content knowledge effectively, they are less reliable as predictors of EOC performance due to:
		  ○ Misalignment in rigor
		  ○ Lack of cumulative design
		  ○ Inconsistent emphasis on reasoning and disciplinary literacy

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The inconsistency in student performance and the limited predictive strength of unit assessments are primarily driven by misalignment between assessment design and the cognitive expectations of the Georgia Milestones EOC. While assessments are generally aligned to standards and include stimulus-based items, they do not consistently reflect the depth of knowledge, Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs), or reasoning demands required for students to demonstrate higher levels of proficiency.	

	Contributing factors include inconsistent understanding of rigor, particularly the distinction between DOK 2 and DOK 3 tasks in U.S. History, as well as the absence of a structured assessment design, review, and calibration process aligned to standards, ALDs, and blueprint expectations. Inconsistent access to high-quality Milestones-aligned assessment items and limited collaborative opportunities to analyze and refine assessments further contribute to variability across classrooms. As a result, assessments tend to overemphasize recall and structured tasks while underassessing students' ability to analyze, explain, justify, and apply historical understanding using evidence, limiting both the accuracy of assessment data and students' readiness for the cognitive demands of the EOC.

Additional Data Analysis: Department Data Meetings ☒ Teacher Survey (CNA reflection protocols, data discussions, and written responses) ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☒ Other: Collaborative Team (CT) Data Discussions / CNA Protocol Artifacts	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**

	Strengths Identified
	• Strong performance in Domain 4 indicates students are generally successful with structured tasks requiring recognition and recall
	• Team-taught classes outperform On-Level classes, suggesting that intentional scaffolds, structured supports, and increased instructional access positively impact student performance
	• SWD students outperform Gen Ed peers in some areas, indicating that targeted supports and scaffolded instruction can improve access and achievement when consistently implemented
	• Evidence of emerging vertical alignment across some domains suggests increasing coherence in instructional expectations and content delivery
		Weaknesses Identified
		• Domain 2 remains the weakest area, indicating gaps in foundational understanding and inconsistency in early-unit instruction and pacing
		• Declines in Domain 5 performance indicate difficulty with higher-order application, synthesis, and extended reasoning tasks
		• Students demonstrate ongoing challenges with disciplinary literacy skills, including:
		  ○ interpreting primary sources,
		  ○ explaining cause-and-effect relationships,
		  ○ using evidence effectively,
		  ○ connecting ideas across texts, visuals, and data
		• Performance patterns suggest students experience greater difficulty with processing, academic language, reasoning, and evidence-based explanation than with discrete content recall
		• ESL students are disproportionately represented in Level 1 performance, indicating barriers to language access within Tier 1 instruction
		• Wide variability across On-Level classrooms suggests inconsistency in instructional

		implementation, pacing, and expectations across classrooms • Inconsistent pacing and sequencing limit opportunities for foundational skill development in earlier domains and application and synthesis in later domains
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The identified strengths and weaknesses indicate that student performance is not primarily limited by content exposure, but by inconsistent access to high-quality, aligned Tier 1 instruction. While students demonstrate success when instruction is structured and scaffolded, they are not consistently developing the disciplinary literacy, reasoning, and evidence-based thinking skills necessary to analyze and apply historical understanding. Contributing factors include inconsistent implementation of disciplinary literacy practices, variability in instructional rigor and expectations across classrooms, and misaligned pacing and sequencing that limit opportunities for foundational skill development and higher-order application. Subgroup trends—particularly the disproportionate representation of ESL students in lower performance levels alongside stronger outcomes in supported instructional settings—further suggest this is primarily a Tier 1 language and instructional access issue rather than a difference in student ability. Collectively, the data indicates that the root cause lies within the systems of coherent instruction and professional capacity, specifically the need for consistent implementation of disciplinary literacy practices, aligned pacing, scaffolded academic language supports, and rigorous Tier 1 instruction across classrooms.	

Professional Learning Survey Summary Data – Social Studies ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☒ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	• Teachers demonstrate baseline proficiency with assessment systems (i.e., creating, sharing, proctoring, and retrieving data reports) • Increased evidence of internal expertise, with multiple teachers reporting Consistent or Fully Embedded practices across areas • Presence of high-functioning practitioners across general education and specialized roles (i.e., CTAE/SPED), indicating capacity for peer leadership • Teachers identify high-leverage professional learning needs, including literacy scaffolding,	• Many teachers report Beginning or Emerging levels in key collaborative and instructional practices (i.e., norms, data conversations, unit planning, and grading calibration), indicating limited consistency • Inconsistent implementation of collaborative team (CT) processes, including norms, collective commitments, and meaningful data conversations

	differentiated instruction, subgroup data analysis, and AI integration • Strong preference for job-embedded professional learning structures (i.e., CT work sessions, department-led PL, collaborative protocols) • Teachers are engaged in ongoing professional learning (i.e., school-based PL, district PL, advanced degrees, conferences) • ▯ Evidence that effective instructional practices exist across multiple teachers and contexts, including assessment design, collaboration, and data use	• Limited consistency in designing rigorous, standards-aligned assessments that reflect higher-order thinking • Need for improved CT meeting efficiency and focus on student thinking, indicating collaboration time is not consistently impactful • Inconsistent use of data to drive instructional decisions, despite access to data systems and reports • Limited implementation of instructional strategies for EL and SWD students, particularly in literacy and academic language • Limited implementation of writing, discourse, and disciplinary literacy practices aligned to Social Studies standards • Variation in self-reported implementation (Beginning → Fully Embedded) indicates a lack of a consistent instructional model across classrooms
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Professional learning survey data indicates that while teachers demonstrate baseline proficiency with assessment systems and access to professional learning opportunities, implementation of key instructional and collaborative practices remains inconsistent across the department. Although some teachers report Consistent or Fully Embedded practices, these practices are not yet systematically implemented across classrooms. Many teachers continue to report Beginning or Emerging levels in collaborative team processes, data-driven decision-making, and rigorous standards-aligned instruction, while also identifying a need for support in literacy scaffolding, differentiated instruction, and subgroup data analysis. This suggests gaps in professional capacity related to meeting the needs of diverse learners and implementing rigorous Tier 1 instruction consistently.	

	As a result, effective instructional practices exist within the department but are not consistently implemented across classrooms, leading to variability in instructional experiences and limiting students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking, academic language, and evidence-based reasoning.

US History - Improvement Plan

GOAL #5: US History	**By May 2027, the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished (Levels 3–4) on the US History EOC will increase by at least 3% from 40% to 43%.** Our goal is for # (_____ approximately 9th graders) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2027.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Collectively, these root causes result in inconsistent access to rigorous, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction, particularly in disciplinary literacy, reasoning, academic language, and evidence-based analysis, limiting students' ability to demonstrate and sustain proficiency on the U.S. History EOC.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Data** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step 1** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)*	**Implementation Performance Target:** **100% of Social Studies teachers will implement at least one literacy-based practice within a lesson a minimum of 2-3 times per week, as evidenced by walkthrough data and the course unit plans.** **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** • Train teachers on Tier 1 disciplinary literacy practices, including Tier 3 academic vocabulary, structured academic discourse, evidence-based writing, primary source analysis, DOK 2–3 task design, and the S.S. Literacy Pretest and domain pretest/posttest.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **70% of students will score 80% or higher on unit summative assessments.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** • CTLS common & summative assessment reports by standard & domain • Common & summative assessment item analysis reports aligned to DOK and Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) • S.S. Literacy Component Data Summaries & Pre/Posttest Data Summary **Evaluation Plan:**	

Social Studies teachers will implement disciplinary literacy practices daily as measured by walkthrough data.	• Calibrate expectations for rigorous instruction using Georgia Milestones Blueprint expectations, Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs), and exemplar assessment tasks • Define walkthrough look-fors aligned to disciplinary literacy, academic language, reasoning, and student engagement indicators • Align pacing guides, common assessments, and instructional tasks to DOK 2–3 rigor and EOC expectations **August–September:** • Implement the S.S. Literacy Pretest, share results and compare baseline data amongst student subgroups • Implement the first domain summative with upcoming domain pretest items, share results and potential strategies to support areas for growth • Establish classroom routines for discourse, writing, source analysis, and evidence-based responses • Implement clear learning targets aligned to analysis, reasoning, and historical thinking skills • Conduct baseline walkthroughs and common assessment analysis to identify instructional strengths and gaps • Utilize the Literacy Component Data Summary to analyze and track student literacy performance • Begin collaborative team calibration around DOK levels, assessment rigor, and student work expectations **October–December:** • Deepen implementation of disciplinary literacy practices across classrooms • Conduct collaborative reviews of common assessments and student work aligned to DOK and ALD expectations • Provide targeted coaching and feedback cycles focused on questioning, reasoning, and evidence-based responses • Monitor Domain performance trends and adjust instruction, scaffolds, and pacing as needed • Utilize the Literacy Component Data Summary to analyze and track student literacy performance	Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ based on assessment schedule within CT's **Data Analysis Plan:** • Conduct weekly Collaborative Team (CT) data meetings to analyze common assessment results by standard, domain, subgroup, and DOK level • During CT meetings, teams will: - analyze student performance trends to identify strengths, gaps, and misconceptions, - examine student work samples for evidence of reasoning, source analysis, academic language, and evidence-based writing, - evaluate alignment between instructional tasks, assessments, and DOK 2–3 expectations, - and plan targeted instructional responses, scaffolds, and intervention strategies for EL and SWD students • Monitor academic/content-related progress through: - movement between performance levels (Levels 1–4), - subgroup growth trends, - common assessment performance by domain and standard, - and walkthrough evidence aligned to disciplinary literacy and rigor indicators • Monitor literacy progress through the Literacy Component Data Summary sheet and the pretest/posttest data which will:	

	• Implement domain summative with upcoming domain pretest items, share results and potential strategies to support areas for growth • Facilitate and analyze the S.S. Literacy Posttest to identify growth and areas for improvement between the pretest and posttest **January–February:** • Implement the S.S. Literacy Pretest • Implement the first domain summative with upcoming domain pretest items, share results and potential strategies to support areas for growth • Increase rigor of writing and discussion tasks • Monitor EL/SWD scaffolding • Increase opportunities for multi-step thinking, evidence-based writing, and analysis of multiple sources • Monitor EL/SWD access to rigorous Tier 1 instruction, academic language supports, & scaffolded engagement with complex texts • Conduct leadership calibration walkthroughs to ensure consistency in implementation expectations & feedback • Utilize the Literacy Component Data Summary to analyze and track student literacy performance **March–April:** • Implement spiral review focused on transfer, synthesis, and EOC-aligned reasoning tasks • Monitor use of DOK 3 tasks, extended responses, and Milestones-aligned assessment structures • Analyze subgroup performance trends and provide targeted instructional supports and intervention planning • Continue collaborative team data analysis and adjustment of instructional practices based on student performance trends • Utilize the Literacy Component Data Summary to analyze and track student literacy performance • Implement domain summative with upcoming domain pretest items, share results and potential strategies to support areas for growth	- track student performance on literacy-based stimulus found on summative assessments - group assessment items into the following categories: maps, charts/graphs, reading excerpts, & political cartoons/visual analysis. - compare student performance to baseline data gathered on the literacy-based course pretest items to track progression and identify potentials areas that require additional support - be used to share and compare results amongst CT's as well as the department to identify commonalities and areas for vertically aligned interventions • Conduct monthly leadership data reviews to identify schoolwide trends, monitor implementation fidelity, calibrate instructional expectations, and ensure alignment between classroom instruction, assessments, and EOC expectations • Use data findings (CFA's, summatives, literacy component data summary) to refine pacing, instructional supports, assessment design, and collaborative team planning throughout instructional cycles **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Dept Chairs ☒ CT Leads ☒ Teachers	

	May: • Evaluate implementation fidelity using walkthrough data, student work analysis, and collaborative team artifacts • Analyze EOC, common assessment, and subgroup performance outcomes to determine impact on student achievement and instructional effectiveness • Identify successful instructional practices and areas requiring continued support for the following school year • Facilitate and analyze the S.S. Literacy Posttest to identify growth and areas for improvement between the pretest and posttest • Analyze the Literacy Component Data Summary sheet to track student literacy performance throughout the Spring semester and compare the results to the results from the Fall semester. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Collaborative team (CT) planning documents and meeting notes • Unit plans and lesson plans aligned to DOK 2–3 expectations • Walkthrough data aligned to disciplinary literacy and rigor indicators • Student work samples demonstrating evidence-based writing, source analysis, and reasoning **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Department Chair ☒ CT Lead ☒ Teachers Frequency of Monitoring: • Weekly CT Meetings • Monthly Walkthroughs • Monthly Data Reviews		

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement ***(Required Components)***			
Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	**Date(s) Scheduled**	**Date Completed**	**"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed**
***1. Required:* Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026)** Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	September 2026		☒ **1** ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
***2. Required:* Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026)** Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	October-November 2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ **6**
***3. Required:* Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027)** Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	March 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ **6**
***4. Required:* Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy)** Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. **Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)**	October-December 2027 March-April 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ **3** ☐ 6
***5. Required:* Transition Activities** for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visiting the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. **Briefly describe the transition activities here:** • Cardinal Fly By • Rising 9th Grade Parent Night	Cardinal Fly By July 2026 Rising 9th Grade Parent Night February 2027		☐ 1 ☒ **4** ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
***6. Required*: Provide translated information** related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d*	***List documents translated for parents:*** • Family-School Engagement Policy • School-Parent Compact		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ **5** ☐ 3 ☐ 6

Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities *(Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)*							
Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	**"Shall" Addressed**	**Goal(s) Addressed**	**Resources**	**Funding Source(s)** *SWP Checklist 5.e*	**Date**	**How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.**	**Staff Responsible**
Parent Mini Workshops We offer learning opportunities for parents based on their interests and needs (i.e., how to use ParentVue, CTLS Parent, and understanding graduation requirements).	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	• Title 1 Parent Facilitator • Communities in Schools • Parent Resource Center Supplies	Title I Local	October 2026 November 2026 February 2026 March 2026	Activities are monitored and evaluated by the Principal and Title I Administrator. The parent facilitator keeps a Teams folder updated with artifacts (i.e., sign in sheets, agendas, supplemental pay forms, parent input data, etc.).	Principal Assistant Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator
Academic Success Night	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	• Title 1 Parent Facilitator • Communities in Schools • Parent Resource Center Supplies		Oct/Nov 2026 Feb/Mar 2026	Activities are monitored and evaluated by the Principal and Title I Administrator. The parent facilitator keeps a Teams folder updated with artifacts (i.e., sign in sheets, agendas, supplemental pay forms, parent input data, etc.).	Principal Assistant Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator

GaDOE required six "Shall's". Each shall must be addressed at least once during the school year:

1. Assist parents in understanding state academic standards, state and local assessments, and how to monitor their child's academic progress.
2. Provide materials and training to help parents work with their child to improve academic achievement. (Ex. Literacy training, technology training)
3. Educate school staff in the value and utility of the contributions of parents, and how to reach, communicate with, and partner with parents to implement parent programs to build ties between parents and the school.
4. Coordinate and integrate parent programs and activities with other Federal, State, and local programs (Preschool to Kindergarten, transitions, parent resource centers, etc.) to support parents in more fully participating in their child's education.
5. Ensure information related to school and parent programs/meetings are sent in a format and language parents can understand.
6. Provide other reasonable support for parental involvement activities as parents may request. These are school developed activities based upon parent input. (#14 in list of "shalls" and "mays")

School Improvement Plan Required Questions
Schoolwide Plan Development – *Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)*
1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages.** *SWP Checklist 5(a)*
2. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings**. *Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)*
3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page.** *SWP Checklist 5(c)*
4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages.** *SWP Checklist 5(d)*
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. *SWP Checklist 5(e)* **Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)** **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: This year, each core department, as well as the Administration Team, met over the course of four meetings to determine root causes, action steps, implementation plans, and monitoring plans for our goals We followed the Title I recommendations to include input from stakeholders such as our Guiding Coalition, School Social Worker, Cardinal Grade Repair/Course Extension Coordinators, Professional School Counselors, Students, Parents, District Title I Supervisor, District Title I Academic Coach, and Media Specialist. Information was compiled from the meetings and emails and was reviewed by members of the team to use in developing the plan.
ESSA Requirements to Include in the Schoolwide Plan – *Section 1116(B)(1)*

6. Jointly develop with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parental and family engagement involvement policy, agreed on by such parents, that shall describe the means for carrying out the requirements of Subsections (c) through (f). Parents shall be notified of the policy in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language the parents can understand. Such policy shall be made available to the local community and updated periodically to meet the changing needs of parents and the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes Posting every Title I school's parent policy on the school's website in multiple languages where practicable, Fall and Spring input meeting agendas and sign in sheets providing parents the opportunity to assist in the development of the school's parent policy, compact and parent engagement budget.**
SWP Checklist 4

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - *34 CFR § 200.26*

7. Describe how the school regularly monitors and the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement. *SWP Checklist 3(a)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:
Teachers actively participate in Collaborative Teams (CTs) on a weekly basis, and through this process regularly monitor student progress toward meeting state standards. The school conducts school-level semester data analysis twice a year (EOC, Course Pass Rates, etc.) and analysis of progress toward meeting the CCRPI goals. A Title I rank-order list is created annually to help in appropriately placing students in 9th grade.

In addition, the Cobb Teaching and Learning System (especially CTLS ASSESS) provides ongoing monitoring of student performance and achievement. I-Ready assessments are given to ESOL students, 9th and 10th grade students at least twice a semester. Results of several district assessments (i-Ready, formatives and summatives, etc.) are given and reviewed as well. Local School Academic Coaches meet with the Administration Team, Title I Supervisor, and District Title I Coaches to review progress toward meeting the goals of the plan.

8. Describe how the school determines whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the challenging State academic standards, particularly for those students who had been farther from achieving the standards. *SWP Checklist 3(b)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:
The school uses GaDOE CCRPI Content Mastery, Progress, Closing the Gap, and Graduation Rate provide a standard, measurable way for us to monitor the school's academic progress. The CCRPI allows us to determine our performance targets for the next year. A combination of course pass rates, EOC scores, EOC Domain data, ACCESS scores, and performance on common formative and summative assessments provide data for CTs to determine the content-specific needs of students. Students needing additional instructional support are scheduled support for their content courses, which can be IEL or sheltered classes for MLLs, co-taught or small group courses for students with disabilities, and ELA or Math intervention courses for students who need additional support to address learning gaps.

9. Describe how the schoolwide plan will be revised, as necessary, based on regular monitoring to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program. *SWP Checklist 3(c)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:
Each year, the Title I Supervisor conducts monthly checkpoints leading up to our mid-year review. Local school CTs meet regularly to monitor student progress, discuss strategies for supporting students, and determine next steps. Weekly meetings between the Administration Team and Academic Coaches allow for continuous monitoring. As we move through the implementation plan of each action step, we can determine if the plan is working or needs to be revised.

Schoolwide Plan Reform Strategies – *Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)*
10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State's challenging academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State's challenging academic standards, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(a)*
11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(b)*
12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include - counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)*
13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). *SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)* **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: Osborne High School has an operational Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies (PBIS) program, which we refer to as SOAR (Supportive, Open-minded, Accountable, & Resilient). The aim of SOAR is to serve as a tiered approach for staff when addressing student behaviors. This year we have refocused on our knowledge of the existing PBIS matrix (i.e., SOAR) and its application with students. We have provided training twice this year in understanding the matrix and we have provided resources to identify and distinguish between minor and major infractions. SOAR emphasizes a progressive approach to discipline; before a student is referred for minor discipline they must have gone through several corrective steps within the classroom. Major discipline infractions are addressed by administration. Monthly discipline reviews occur in SOAR Team meetings as well as faculty/staff meetings. In a recent review of the year's comprehensive discipline data, there was a need to revise the attributes of our matrix to focus on safety, open-mindedness, accountability, and resilience; additionally, we revised the rules expected in the common areas throughout the building (i.e., hallway, cafeteria, restrooms, arrivals/departures, and extra-curriculars) to support our students in reducing our biggest disciplinary issues (i.e., tardies, insubordination, out-of-area/skipping).
14. Describe professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)* **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: Professional learning is customized to meet the needs of CTs (Collaborative Teams), departments, or individual teachers. Teachers work collaboratively with guidance from Instructional Coaches to plan, deliver, assess, and reflect on instruction. As part of their work, Instructional Coaches develop periodic needs assessment surveys for teachers, which allow them to customize PL in a way that meets teacher, team, and department needs. Teachers attend conferences

or workshops designed to enhance professional practice (co-coordinated through District, Title I, Title II, Title III, SFPSPD, and Local Funds). Our teachers also attended professional learning opportunities during the Digital Learning Days, covering CTLS, ELLevation, PBIS and Wayground.

New teacher Induction training is differentiated among Year 0-3 Teachers and Veteran Teachers New to Osborne. First and second year teachers attended monthly professional learning using Teach Like a Champion as our primary text. We continued our monthly Lunch and Learn sessions, where the new to Osborne faculty members were able to learn about different aspects of our school culture, resources, and hear from experienced colleagues while building staff-wide connections.

Our focus for professional development this year was assessment, and monthly sessions were led by academic coaches and teacher leaders.

Osborne works collaboratively with District Title I Supervisors and District Title I Academic Coaches to design the school's improvement plan, facilitate professional learning, assist with classroom walkthroughs, conduct data analysis, model instructional strategies, and ensure alignment of curriculum, instruction, assessments, and pacing. The school also collaborates with Columbia University Teachers College to provide onsite PL (i.e, engagement strategies for core teachers this Spring, follow-up classroom visits with teachers requesting feedback, teacher leader development, etc.).

15. **ONLY MIDDLE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED** Describe the transition activities provided for preschool children to kindergarten, 5th grade students to 6th grade and 8th grade students to 9th grade. *SWP Checklist 2.c(v)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

16. **ONLY HIGH SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED** Describe how the school prepares and makes aware of opportunities for postsecondary education and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual or concurrent enrollment, or early college high schools. *SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:
Our professional school counselors offer various Financial Aid and college and career workshops. Through the use of Naviance, students engage in career exploration and future planning activities, including Career Matchmaker assessments, Ability Profiler assessments, and goal setting focused on education, financial planning, and career pathways.

The Osborne Counseling Department hosts "Apply to College Months" in both Fall and Spring, including two designated Apply to College Days and two Apply to Technical College days. The Department informs students about Dual Enrollment opportunities through Bridge Law with local technical colleges and universities, as well as Dual Achievement Option B.

To support post-secondary planning, Osborne's Counseling Department hosts biweekly SAT/ACT Registration Sessions, weekly college and scholarship application work sessions, and conducts "check-in days" where our students can ask post-secondary questions in an open forum. Counselors also work closely with off-cohort students through small groups and individualized interventions to ensure students stay on track for graduation.

The Counseling Department hosts two FAFSA Completion Events, offered in English and Spanish due to a partnership with the Georgia Student Finance Commission and Osborne's HOPE Program. The Osborne High School Communities in Schools Coordinator has planned college visits. The Counseling

Department posts a weekly student newsletter to communicate information to seniors and parents about the college application process, scholarship opportunities, financial aid applications, and post-secondary planning.

Osborne High School's CTAE Department currently offers 11 pathways within 9 career clusters. Students learn the technical or occupational skills necessary to obtain employment or advance within an occupation. Students participating in the CITA program interact regularly with industry professionals and students can earn industry certifications in their classes.

Osborne High School offers a Work Based Learning Program where students can explore a career based on their interests. Students get real-world experience and a chance to apply their academic knowledge in a professional setting. Teachers and students, led by the Osborne High School Work Based Learning Program, have established relationships with local businesses by attending the Smyrna Business Association monthly. Osborne High School also established a partnership with Great Promise Partnership, an organization which "empowers students to stay in school while also addressing Georgia's workforce needs" (http://gppartnership.org/)

Comprehensive Needs Assessment – *Section 1114(b)(1)(A)*

17. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school, that considers information on the academic achievement of children in relation to the challenging State academic standards, particularly the needs of those children who are failing, or are at-risk of failing, to meet the State academic standards and any other factors as determined by the local educational agency. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The comprehensive needs assessment section of the schoolwide plan.** *SWP Checklist 1*

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)*			
Position	**Supports Goal(s)**	**Supports which system(s)**	**How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?**
Academic Coach	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4 ☒ Goal 5	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	
Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4 ☒ Goal 5	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	
Parent Facilitator(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4 ☒ Goal 5	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	• **Family Engagement and Communication**: The Parent Facilitator will establish strong communication channels with families, ensuring they are informed about school goals, programs, and student progress, which fosters a collaborative school-home partnership. • **Workshops and Support for Parents**: The facilitator will coordinate with teachers and staff, to organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies to support their children's academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. • **Increased Parental Involvement**: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. • **Connecting Families with Resources**: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.

School Improvement Goals *Include goals on the parent compacts and policy*	
Goal #1	**By May 2027, the graduation rate of the FY27 cohort will increase from our current 79.3% to 80.9%.** May 2023: 498 Graduated /670 FY23 Cohort = 74.33 Graduation Rate May 2024: 499 Graduated/654 FY24 Cohort = 77.63 77.39 Graduation Rate May 2025: **Benchmark 1: May 2024: 575 (0.753 x 764) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** ○ FY27 Cohort May 2024 Progress: 525/764 (69%) of current 9th graders are on track to graduate. (Before Course Ext) **Benchmark 2: May 2025: 579 (0.785 x 738) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** ○ FY27 Cohort January 2025 Progress: 611/738 (83%) of current sophomores are on track to graduate. 127 students are off cohort. ○ *Benchmarks 2 – 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 77.39 and the current enrollment of the FY27 Cohort (738 students). These numbers will adjust over time.* **Benchmark 3: May 2026: 569 (0.801 x 711) students will be on track for graduation.** ○ **FY27 Cohort January 2026 Progress 586/711 of current juniors are on track to graduate. 125 students are off cohort.** ○ ***Benchmarks 3 & 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 79.3 and the current enrollment FY27 Cohort 711. 82.55% are on track to graduate.*** **Benchmark 4: May 2027: 575 (0.809 x 711) students will graduate (Graduation Rate of 80.9%).**
Goal #2	**Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI English II EOC will increase from 26% to 29% (3% increase). Our goal is for 240 (826 approximately 10th graders) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2027.**
Goal #3	**EOC COURSES: The total percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Georgia Milestones Algebra EOC will increase from 30.51% to 33.51%.** **NON-EOC COURSES: 20% of students will show proficiency (80% or higher) on their cumulative final exam (baseline year).**
Goal #4	**By May 2027, the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished (Levels 3–4) on the Biology EOC will increase by at least 3% from 30.91% to 33%.**
Goal #5	**By May 2027, the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished (Levels 3–4) on the US History EOC will increase by at least 3% from 40% to 43%.**