School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A

School Year:	**2025 - 2026**
School Name:	**High School**
Principal Name:	**Dr. Dana Giles**
Date Submitted:	**May 27, 2025**
Revision Date(s):	**May 28, 2025**

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	Pebblebrook High School
Team Lead	Glenn J. Richard
Position	Assistant Principal
Email	Glenn.Richard@Cobbk12.org
Phone	770-819-2521

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: On May 22, 2025, Pebblebrook High School convened its School Improvement Planning Committee, consisting of teachers, administrators, academic coaches, paraprofessionals, support staff, the parent facilitator, and community partners, to review key data sources including EOC trend data (1st and 2nd semesters), CTLS Summative Data, and other performance indicators.
Stakeholders collaboratively analyzed the data to identify instructional priorities and gaps, ensuring alignment with district goals and Title I supports. The parent facilitator also shared plans to expand the Family Leadership Capacity Training Program to strengthen home-school partnerships. Input from all stakeholder groups was used to shape the goals and strategies outlined in the plan, with a commitment to providing ongoing professional development and support throughout the implementation process.

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:	May 16, 2025	May 19, 2025	May 22, 2025

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Dr. Dana Giles	
Title I Supervisor	Delores Thompson	
Assistant Principal	Glenn Richard	
Academic Coach-Social Studies	Lisa Garvey	
Academic Coach-ELA	Telicia Leonard	
Academic Coach-Math	Rachel Rogers	
Academic Coach-Social Studies	George Washington	
Parent Facilitator	Charlene Holder	
Parent	Toni Russell	
Student	Morgan Russell	
Title I District Academic Coach	Brittany Matthews	
Title I District Academic Coach	Wendy Torres	

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	During the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished in all EOC courses will increase from 30% (approximately 175 students) to 34% (approximately 205 students) as measured by the EOC assessments. During the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of students scoring below proficient in ELA courses grades 9-10 will decrease from 51% (approximately 775 students) to 47% (approximately 700 students) as measured by summative assessments.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☒ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The EOC assessment reflects that 34% (200 students) of students scored proficient or distinguished on the assessment. The percentage of students scoring below proficient on non-EOC summative assessments remained 51% (500 students).
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The following actionable strategies will be implemented to address student needs: -Deconstruction of new ELA standards with learning criteria and task alignment. -Implement and progress monitor the effectiveness of the new ELA Common Lit curriculum and assessments -Implement ELLevation strategies to support ELL learners -Implement Greek and Latin morphemes into weekly explicit vocabulary instruction. -Integrate weekly small group station teaching for remediation and enrichment
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	The following action steps contributed to the success of the EOC goal -Weekly common formative assessments and data analysis to direct teacher instruction -Biweekly remediation of priority standards based on student need. -Collaborative planning and common lesson execution. -Small group station remediation -Increase integration of academic discourse strategies such as Socratic Seminars, debate-

Previous Year's Goal #2	The percentage of math students scoring proficient will increase from 35% (approximately 164 students) to 38% (approximately 194 students) as measured by the EOC data. The non-EOC math courses for the FY25 school year will have 300 students score in the proficient and distinguished level on summative assessments.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☒ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The EOC Test shows that only 35% of our students were proficient on the EOC. The non-EOC math courses for the FY25 school year had 600 students to score proficient or distinguished on summative assessments.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	• Redelivery of Algebra standards • Create new common formative and summative assessments o Implement Ellevation strategies to support our ELL students o Determine a common strategy for each unit to support all students.
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	The following contributed to our students being successful on summative assessments: • Common strategies • SOAR Week (remediation, acceleration, & celebration) • The increase in common math language and a specific focus on vocabulary • The increased use of technology (Desmos) assists students with computation

Previous Year's Goal #3	During the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of US History EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC will increase from 39% (approximately 223 students) to 43% (approximately 245 students) as measured by the 2024-2025 US History EOC During the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 30% (approximately 600 students) to 34% as measured by the 2024-2025 summative assessments
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☒ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	**US History EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC increased from 39% of the students to 41% of the students.** **Overall, non-EOC course Final Exam Data shows that 45% of students scored within the proficient range on Final Examination**
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The most significant area of need in Social Studies remains the development and application of visual literacy and historical thinking skills among students. Many students struggle to accurately interpret and analyze visual sources, such as maps, charts, graphs, political cartoons, tables, and photographs, which significantly impacts their ability to comprehend historical context, draw inferences, and apply critical reasoning to EOC-level questions. In addition, students often lack proficiency in core historical thinking skills, including sourcing, contextualization, and making cause-and-effect connections. These skill gaps hinder overall performance on complex assessment items and have contributed to stagnant proficiency rates, preventing the Social Studies PCC from fully reaching its targeted growth goals. To address this area of need, the department will implement targeted, research-based strategies to improve students' visual literacy and historical thinking. These strategies include explicit instruction in how to read and analyze different types of visuals within the context of each unit, guided practice in sourcing and corroborating evidence, structured academic discussions around visual documents, and the integration of historical reasoning tasks into instruction, checks for understanding, and formative assessments. Teachers will also embed visuals and related questions into SOAR Week activities and use formative data to monitor student growth and adjust instruction accordingly. Each PCC will continue to conduct weekly data analysis with a focused lens on student misconceptions related to visual interpretation and historical thinking, ensuring that instructional shifts are timely, intentional, and aligned with student learning needs.
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be	The Social Studies department made measurable progress toward increasing student proficiency by implementing targeted instructional strategies aligned with schoolwide goals. To address literacy-related barriers in accessing social studies content, the department incorporated evidence-based strategies focused on improving comprehension of historical texts and visual sources. These strategies involved vocabulary development, identifying the main idea, summarizing, and analyzing cause and effect. The goal was to help students better access, retain, and analyze complex historical concepts and documents. Weekly collaboration included the sharing of instructional resources and strategies, developing common learning targets, reviewing both formative and summative assessment data, identifying specific gaps in student understanding, and guiding instructional planning. Identified gaps—particularly in historical reasoning and visual literacy—were strategically readdressed during our monthly SOAR Week, providing opportunities for intentional reteaching and targeted skill reinforcement.

implemented to sustain progress?	To support English Learners, as well as non-ELL students, each PCC selected and implemented a monthly ELLevation strategy aligned to their students' specific needs. Following implementation, teachers engaged in collaborative reflection during Pebblebrook Collaborative Community PCC meetings to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach. These reflections informed timely instructional adjustments, enabling continuous improvement and more responsive instruction that aimed to enhance student outcomes across diverse learner groups.

Previous Year's Goal #4	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 41% (273 students) to 45% (298 students) as measured by the 2024-2025 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 27% to 30% as measured by the 2024-2025 Summative Assessments.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☒ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished decreased from 41% to 34% as measured by the 2025-2026 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished increased from 27% to 43% as measured by the 2025-2026 Summative Assessments.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The most significant area of need in Biology continues to be vocabulary acquisition and development, particularly moving beyond rote memorization toward more profound understanding and application of academic and content-specific terms. Students struggle with understanding both Tier 2 (academics/instruction) and Tier 3 (content-specific) vocabulary, which significantly impacts their ability to comprehend complex texts, apply scientific knowledge, and analyze higher-order concepts assessed on the EOC. This gap in vocabulary understanding has directly influenced overall proficiency rates and prevented the biology PCC from fully meeting its targeted goal. To address this area of need, the department will implement targeted, research-based vocabulary strategies across all science classrooms. These strategies include explicit vocabulary instruction embedded in context within each unit, the use of etymology to support decoding unfamiliar words, consistent scaffolding for vocabulary development, structured academic discussions, and regular reinforcement of key terms. Additionally, teachers will integrate vocabulary-focused activities during SOAR Week and utilize weekly formative assessments to monitor growth. Each PCC will continue conducting weekly data digs with a focused lens on vocabulary-related misconceptions, ensuring that instructional adjustments are timely and aligned to student needs

If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	Data from non-EOC classes showed measurable progress toward increasing student proficiency by implementing targeted instructional strategies aligned with schoolwide goals. To address literacy-related barriers in science content, the entire department incorporated evidence-based literacy strategies, including main idea mapping, close reading, and various summarizing techniques. The goal was to provide students with support in accessing and retaining complex scientific texts and concepts. Weekly data digs were conducted to analyze both formative/summative assessment data, identify gaps in student understanding, and inform instructional planning. Identified gaps were strategically readdressed during our monthly SOAR Week, allowing for intentional reteaching and skill reinforcement. To support English Learners—as well as non-ELL students—each PCC selected and implemented a monthly ELLevation strategy which was aligned to their students' needs. After each implementation, teachers engaged in collaborative reflection within their Pebblebrook Collaborative Community PCC to assess the effectiveness of the strategy. These reflections informed necessary adjustments, enabling continuous improvement and more responsive instruction that aimed to enhance student outcomes across diverse learner groups.

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

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATES				
Graduation Rate Longitudinal Data	**SY22**	**SY23**	**SY24**	**SY25**
	74.7%	74.7%	75.9%	

OVERALL CONTENT AREA DATA				
EOC Longitudinal Data	**SY22** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY23** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
American Literature & Comprehension	28%	34%	34%	34%
Algebra	31%	34%	30%	33%

Biology	27%	36%	41%	34%
U.S. History	36%	37%	38%	41%

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24		SY25	
	Winter 2021	Spring 2022	Winter 2022	Spring 2023	Winter 2023	Spring 2024	Winter 2024	Spring 2025
Distinguished	%	%	1.6%	3.5%	3.0%	5.0%	3.3%	4%
Proficient	%	%	20.9%	29.2%	32.5%	27.6%	33.3%	28%
Developing	%	%	47.4%	37.2%	36.8%	35.1%	37.6%	37%
Beginning	%	%	30.0%	30.1%	27.9%	32.3%	25.8%	29%

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION (READING STATUS) – By Year

Percentage of Students	SY22		SY23		SY24		SY25	
	Winter 2021	Spring 2022	Winter 2022	Spring 2023	Winter 2023	Spring 2024	Winter 2024	Spring 2025
Grade Level and Above		%	61.3%	61.5%	62.9%	59.2%	69.9%	61%
Below Grade Level		%	38.7%	38.5%	37.1%	40.8%	30.1%	39%

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

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Reading & Vocabulary	Craft & Structure/ Integration of Ideas	Reading Informational Texts

	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Met Target %	31%	21%	20%	21%	30%	24%
Approaching Target %	18%	21%	30%	22%	19%	21%
Below Target %	51%	58%	50%	57%	51%	56%

AMERICAN LITERATURE (Writing) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year						
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Writing & Language		Writing		Language	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Met Target %	47%	58%	44%	57%	64%	59%
Approaching Target %	20%	18%	26%	20%	30%	29%
Below Target %	32%	23%	30%	23%	6%	13%

ELA DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

	Strengths	Weaknesses
AMERICAN LITERATURE & COMPOSITION (3-year trends) • **What trends exist for all students in the:** o **Percentage of students reading on grade level or below grade level?** o **Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no**	Based on the EOC trend data, o Students reading on grade level have increased from 61.3% to 69.9% between Winter 2022 to Winter 2024. o The percentage of students scoring proficient and	Based on the Am. Lit. EOC trend data, o Reading & Vocabulary from Winter to Spring 2024, students meeting the target decreased from 31% to 21%, while that below target increased from 51% to 58% indicating a regression in vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension skills. o Craft & Structure/Integration of Ideas from Winter to Spring remained stagnant at 20% to 21%, while

increase or decrease)? ○ **Reading domain increases or decreases?** ○ **Writing domain increases or decreases?** • **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	distinguished levels has increased from 28% to 34% (195 students) between 2022 to 2024. Based on the 2024-25 EOC trend data, o EL students scored 81% below reading level compared to 31% below reading level. o EL student students scoring proficient remained consistent with approximately 7% proficient rate. Based on the 2024-25 EOC trend data, o SWD students scored 57% below reading level compared to the 31% below reading level. o SWD students scoring proficient decreased from 14% to approximately 11% proficient.	students below target increased from 50% to 57%, indicating students are struggling with analyzing text structure and integration of ideas. o In reading Informational Texts, students meeting the target decreased from 30% to 24%, and students below the target increased from 51% to 56%, which indicates challenges with interpreting and analyzing informational texts. o EL students scored – 89% below target and requires remediation in the Reading & Vocabulary domain. – 82% below target and requires remediation in Craft & Structure/ Integration of Ideas – 88% below target and requires remediation in Reading Informational Texts. o SWD students scored – 79% below target and requires remediation in the Reading & Vocabulary domain. – 41% below target and requires remediation in Craft & Structure/ Integration of Ideas – 76% below target and require remediation in Reading Informational Texts
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year • **What trends exist for all students in the:** o **Percentage's mastering standards aligned to reading domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness** o **Percentage's 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?**	**Based on 9th and 10th grade common assessment data:** o **75% (750 students) of students have demonstrated proficiency in Reading and Literary standard RL 4, which align with new ELA standard 9-12 T.SS. 2 Craft and Expectation T.SS.2. a** o **60% (589 students) of students have demonstrated proficiency in Reading and Informational standard RI4, which aligns with new ELA standard 9-12 T.SS. 2 Craft and Expectation T.SS.2. a** o **68% (667 students) of students have demonstrated proficiency in Writing standard W3, which aligns with new ELA standard 9-12 T.T.1 Narrative Techniques and Expectation T.T.1.b.** o **The SWD students demonstrate strength in completing DOK level 1 (identifying) for skills aligned with Reading and Literary standard RL4.**	**Based on Beacon assessment data 62% () of rising 9th grade students are reading below grade level.** **Based on 2024-25 i-Ready assessment data 70% (739 students) of all rising 10th and 11th grade students are reading below grade level.** **Based on 9th and 10th grade common assessment data, 72% (707 students) of students need support with the Writing standard W2, which aligns with new ELA standard 9-12 T.T.2 and Expectation T.T.2. a.** **The areas of needs for both EL and SWD students align with the needing support of the 9th and 10th grade student groups.**
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction	**Root Cause Explanation:** 1. **Teachers need additional training on modeling, explicit teaching, and monitoring student use of evidence-based reading strategies to support all learners.**	

☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**2. Instructional strategies for writing and methods for providing feedback on constructed responses are inconsistent across the department.** **3. Strategies for assessing writing are needed for all teachers.**	
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**	**Weaknesses**
	Based on the ELA instructional walks, o **100% of teachers plan and execute lesson plans to engage student learning using technology.** o **95% of teachers continuously collect and analyze data to target student needs for monthly remediation and enrichment.** o **80% of teachers effectively leverage evidence-based strategies (jigsaw, flexible grouping, station (small group) teaching, and summarization) during instruction at least once.** o **100% of teachers provided the opportunity for student choice, in-class independent reading time.**	**Based on the ELA instructional walks,** o **45% of teachers did not demonstrate use of student-friendly learning targets aligned with the ELA standard** o **60% of teachers did not execute lessons or provide tasks explicitly aligned with ELA standards.** o **65% of teachers did not explicitly model/think aloud evidence-based reading strategies and/or provide students with the opportunity to apply reading strategies to increase comprehension weekly.**
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership	**Root Cause Explanation:** 1. Teachers require additional training on leveraging deconstructed standards to develop and deliver rigorous, engaging lesson plans.	

☐ Supportive Learning Environment	2. Teachers require training on how to monitor students' ability to effectively execute the use of evidence-based strategies.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ **Teacher Survey** ☐ **Parent Survey** ☒ **Professional Learning Survey** ☐ **_____**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	Based on professional learning survey feedback, o **100% of teachers indicate professional learning series with focus on differentiation was relevant, practical and useful.** o **100% of teachers indicate being more equipped to apply the knowledge and implement the information provided during professional learning series.** o **100% of teachers indicate the resources/strategies modeled or provided during PL were relevant, applicable, and accessible.**	**Based on professional learning survey feedback, 25% of teachers missed ongoing professional learning at least once.** **Based on professional learning survey feedback, 25% of teachers missed ongoing professional learning at least once.**
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership	**Root Cause Explanation:** 1. **Repeated absences from professional learning sessions by the same teachers indicate a need for increased opportunity for teachers to attend professional learning during the school hours.**	

☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**2. Repeated absences from professional learning sessions by the same teachers indicate the need to provide opportunities for teachers to reschedule and make-up missed professional learning sessions.**	
Additional Data Analysis **(If relevant)** **Select all that apply:** ☐ **i-Ready 9th & 10th grade** ☐ **WIDA ACCESS** **Other(s):** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	The percentage of students scoring at or above level reading Lexile scores will increase from 70% to 74% as measured by the EOC assessment data. The non-EOC ELA courses for the FY26 school year will have 65% of students score at or above level on the final reading comprehension exam.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need support with reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and writing proficiency. Teachers require training on explicit reading instruction, integrating consistent vocabulary instruction with Greek and Latin morphemes, and implementing strategies for English Language Learners (ELLs).
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** ☒ All Students ☐ 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:** At least 90% of ELA teachers will attend and actively engage in monthly professional learning sessions, as evidenced by sign-in sheets, agendas, and facilitator feedback forms. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning:** - Review student Lexile data from previous years to identify trends and instructional needs. - Identify monthly evidence-based reading instructional strategies. - Align units with academic vocabulary and Greek and Latin morphemes.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By February 2026, 85% of ELA teachers will demonstrate consistent use of at least three evidence-based reading and writing strategies in lesson plans and classroom instruction **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Lesson Plans • Walkthrough Instruction Observations Forms • Teacher Implementation Feedback Survey • Student work samples	**CTLS** **ELLevation Strategies** **Academic Coaches** **District Coaches**

1. ELA teachers will participate in monthly professional learning sessions to develop and demonstrate effective use of evidence-based reading and writing strategies.	- Plan interventions for students below grade level • **August-September:** - The academic coach will deliver professional learning on reading instruction practices: close reading strategies and modeling with think-aloud. - The academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing instructional practices. - Administer baseline Lexile assessments and analyze results in PLCs - Student Lexile goal setting. - Integrate explicit Greek and Latin morphemes and Tier 2 & 3 vocabulary instruction into all literacy blocks. - Embed skill-building writing strategies such as: modeling & mentor texts, mini-writing workshops - Embed weekly skill-building strategies such as: Text annotation Citing textual evidence Context clue analysis - Academic coaches/ CCC leads, and administrators will deliver professional learning on compelling reading instructional practices. • **October-December:** - Academic coach will deliver professional learning on reading instruction practices: text-dependent questioning routines (e.g., "What does the text say?", "How do you know?"). - Academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing instructional and scoring practices. - Analyze Lexile progress and subgroup data - Share effective reading strategies - Implement specific strategies for interpreting informational text features and multimodal texts - Embed skill-building writing strategies such as: peer response workshops, mini-writing workshops, revision stations	**Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** 1. Data Collection 2. Data Organization 3. Data Analysis 4. Interpretation & Action 5. Reporting **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	**Assistant Principals**

	• **January-February:** - Use PLCs to compare Lexile growth from fall. - Teachers complete a strategy reflection survey to identify which strategies most effectively supported Lexile growth. - Develop exemplar student writing samples and create criteria for proficient, distinguished writing. - Academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing instructional and grading practices. - Student goal setting for Lexile growth • **March-April:** - Continue using conferencing to target students' Lexile levels. - Continue common collaborative scoring analysis of student writing. - Monitor student goal setting for Lexile growth - Academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing, instructional, and reading practices • **May:** - Administer end-of-year Lexile assessments. - Use PLCs to compare Lexile growth from fall to spring. - Teachers complete a strategy reflection survey to identify which strategies most effectively supported Lexile growth. - Share effective lesson samples and tools. - Provide input for next year's PD and instructional priorities **Artifacts to be Collected:** • PL Feedback and Sign-In Sheets • Walkthrough Forms with a focus on reading or writing strategies • Lesson Plans with embedded Lexile-building strategies		

	• Assessment Data (Lexile levels, formative and summative) • Student work samples (annotated texts, responses, reflections) **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** **Monthly**		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers require additional training on using new ELA deconstructed standards to design rigorous, engaging lessons and monitor student application of evidence-based strategies, as well as support in adapting instruction amid curriculum changes.		
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** ☐ X 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 ELA teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions as scheduled, with at least 90% contributing lesson components aligned to deconstructed ELA standards and incorporating evidence-based literacy strategies, as evidenced by planning artifacts and meeting minutes from the CCC. **Implementation Plan:** • Preplanning: - Provide training on unpacking the new ELA standards and identifying evidence-based strategies.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By the end of the school year, 85% of collaboratively planned lessons will demonstrate alignment to the new ELA standards and integration of evidence-based reading and writing strategies. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Instructional walkthroughs with a focus on strategy implementation • Lesson plan reviews using a standards-alignment rubric	**CTLS** **ELLevation Strategies** **Academic Coaches** **District Coaches** **Assistant Principals**

2. Teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning sessions to design and refine rigorous, standards-aligned lessons using the deconstructed new ELA standards, incorporating evidence-based reading, and writing strategies for all students.	- Develop a collaborative planning protocol and norms for CCC meetings. - Distribute templates for standards-aligned lesson planning. - Create shared digital Teams folders for each grade level to store artifacts and unit plans. • **August-September:** - Begin weekly CCC meetings with grade-level teams. - Use deconstructed standards to plan first units and align lesson objectives. - Embed one evidence-based strategy into lessons. - Begin lesson plan reviews for alignment and rigor - Begin reviewing student work samples to assess evidence of strategy implementation. - Academic coach models effective literacy strategies in planning or co-teaching. - Include weekly formative assessment strategies in lesson planning. • **October-December:** - Continue refining units with rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. - Focus CCC time on analyzing exemplar texts and aligning questions and writing tasks. - Continue reviewing student work samples to assess evidence of strategy implementation. - Academic coach models effective literacy strategies in planning or co-teaching. - Use planning time to adjust pacing or scaffolds based on student data.	• Student work samples. **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

	- Academic coach models effective literacy strategies in planning or co-teaching - Continue weekly formative assessment strategies in lesson planning • **January-February:** - Use CCC time to revise and adapt Semester 1 lessons based on student performance data. - Continue integrating one evidence-based strategy into lessons. - Conduct lesson plan checks using a standards alignment rubric - Continue reviewing student work samples to assess evidence of strategy implementation. - Academic coach models effective literacy strategies in PCC. - Revise literacy goals and pacing for new student groups. • **March-April:** -Focus CCC sessions on planning rigorous reading and writing tasks aligned to grade-level standards - Include formative assessment strategy in lesson planning to monitor student performance. Conduct lesson plan checks using a standards alignment rubric Continue reviewing student work and walkthrough data to identify trends • **May:** -Teachers complete a collaborative planning reflection survey. - CCC teams identify strengths, gaps, and ideas for next year.		

	- Leadership and instructional coaches compile and present trend data from the year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** - CCC Meeting Agendas & Minutes - Lesson Plans with Deconstructed Standard Alignment - Annotated Standards and Unpacked Curriculum Maps - Collaborative Planning Protocols and Norms - CCC Reflection Surveys (mid-year and end-of-year) **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** **Weekly**		

ALGEBRA – By Year								
EOC Longitudinal Data	**SY22**		**SY23**		**SY24**	**SY25**		
Administrations	**Winter 21**	**Spring 22**	**Winter 22**	**Spring 23**	**Winter 23**	**Spring 24**	**Winter 24**	**Spring 25**
Distinguished	3%	4%	8%	4%	9%	4%	11%	6%
Proficient	26%	25%	36%	24%	33%	23%	38%	35%
Developing	37%	30%	15%	34%	22%	37%	31%	41%
Beginning	37%	32%	41%	38%	36%	36%	20%	29%

ALGEBRA – By Domain of Focus – Current Year								
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	**Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Exponential Expressions and Equations Domain Achievement A.PAR.8 (Unit 5)**		**Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Exponential Functions Domain Achievement A.GFR.9 (Unit 6)**	**Data & Statistical Reasoning: One- and Two-Variable Statistics Domain Achievement A.DSR.10 (Unit 7)**	**Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Arithmetic Sequences and Linear Functions Domain Achievement A.FGR.2 (Unit 1)**			
	Winter 24	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Met Target %	33%	8%	19%	8%	6%	23%	22%	12%
Approaching Target %	17%	24%	36%	23%	52%	31%	39%	29%
Below Target %	50%	68%	45%	69%	42%	46%	39%	59%

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)?**	1. Based on the EOC trend data, Distinguished students have increased from 1.1% to 55% from 2018 to 2024	1. Based on the EOC trend data, the number of beginning students from 2018 has fluctuated, but currently we are at 36% from 35.3% in 2018
○ **Algebra EOC domain increases or decreases?** • **How do the trends differ for EL students?**	2. Based on the EOC trend data, the percentage of ELL students who are proficient has increased from 6.37% to 22.9%.	2. Across ELL and SWD from SY 23 to SY 24, the number of distinguished students has decreased. ELL SY'23 was 2.13% and in SY'24 ,1.95%, SWD: from SY'23 3.06% and SY '24 2.08%
• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	3. Based on The EOC trend data, SWD students from 2021- 2024 increased from 0.0% to 2.08% to date.	3. The students' pass rate is lower than in 2021 and 2022. 2021. We currently have a 64% pass rate.

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year has • **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ **Percentage's 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** 1. Based on the Geometry and Advanced Algebra data monitoring documents, our students have consistently demonstrated a pass rate of 50% or higher on all common summative assessments. 2. Based on the results from our school-developed common assessment data in the Geometry PCC, our students achieved an 82.0 score with a 73% pass rate in Unit 1 on polynomials. 3. Based on the results from our school-developed common assessment data in Advanced Algebra, students have demonstrated an algebra achievement score of 77.1 with an 80% pass rate in Unit 1, following a normal distribution.	**Weaknesses** 1. Based on the algebra data monitoring document, students achieved a score of 11.4 on the Unit 7 "Investigating Data" summative assessment. 2. According to the advanced algebra data monitoring document, the students have demonstrated an achievement score of 45.1 on unit 2, which includes standards on factoring, solving, and graphing polynomial functions. 3. Based on the results from our school-developed common assessment data in AP Precalculus, our students have demonstrated challenges in trigonometric graphs, with only 29% passing the assessment and 8% proficiency.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Teachers need additional training on unpacking the new algebra standards and instructional strategies to provide adjustments to instruction based on student data. Teachers require additional planning and strategies to address student deficiencies effectively. The student deficiencies identified are the following areas:	

	o Geometry o Prove theorems involving similarity o Understand congruence in terms of rigid motions o Prove geometric theorems o Advanced Algebra Represent data with matrices, perform mathematical operations, and solve systems of linear equations. Understanding of the unit circle, and solving trigonometric equations using the unit circle o AP Pre-Cal o Modeling radical, exponential, and logarithmic functions o Modeling with rational and Piecewise-Defined functions	
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** 1. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC consistently discusses formative and summative assessments. 2. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC consistently aligns all assessments with learning objectives. 3. Based on the PHS Guided Focus Walks form, 84% of math teachers are using acceptable or outstanding instructional strategies in the classroom.	**Weaknesses** 1. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC is not consistent with considering vocabulary for instruction. 2. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC does not align with considering instructional practices in conjunction with assessment data. 3. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC does not develop SMART goals for each unit based on 75% of respondents not observing during their meetings.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Teachers require additional training on unpacking the algebra standards and developing instructional strategies to support student vocabulary development.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ **Teacher Survey** ☐ **Parent Survey** ☐ **Professional Learning Survey** ☐ **_____**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	1. The PHS Math Department has effectively adapted the curriculum for advanced students as evidenced by more than 50 percent of students earning a level 3 or higher on the AP Pre-calculus exam. 2. The PHS Math Department has a staff with teachers who seek ways to improve their instruction as evidenced by 100 percent of teachers stating that comprehension strategies, strategies for analyzing visuals, problem-solving strategies, and strategies for students to justify and explain their thinking would effectively improve the academic achievement of their students. 3. The PHS Math Department has consistency across PCCs as teachers ranked the reviewing of standards, giving common assessments, and discussing lessons with a more than 50% positivity rating.	1. The teachers in the PHS Math Department have a significant need for professional development focusing on active learning strategies, as evidenced by it being ranked as our number one area of need on the teacher input survey. 2. The PHS Math Department needs support in providing students with more active learning opportunities, given the extensive curriculum and limited time to teach and plan for the entire curriculum. Support in determining priority standards would be beneficial. 3. The PHS Math Department needs support adapting the curriculum for our English Language Population as that is the area where the lowest population of teachers (73.7 percent) believed our math curriculum had been effectively adapted to teach.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Teachers need training that math-specific strategies to serve ELL students.	

Additional Data Analysis **(If needed)** **Other(s):** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	No additional Data analysis for Math	No additional Data analysis for Math
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	The percentage of math students scoring proficient will increase from 33% (approximately 177 students) to 36% (approximately 201 students) as measured by the EOC data. The non-EOC math courses for the FY26 school year will have 61% (approximately 530 students) to score in the proficient and distinguished level on the final exam.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers need additional training on unpacking the new algebra standards and instructional strategies to provide adjustments to instruction based on student data.
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.** Math teachers will participate in monthly professional learning sessions to develop and demonstrate effective use of evidence-based instructional strategies.	**Implementation Performance Target:** Approximately 85% of teachers participate in professional learning every month, as evidenced by PL sign-in sheets. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning:** Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve the delivery of math instruction. • **August-September:** Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve the delivery of math instruction. • **October-December:** Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve the delivery of math instruction. • **January-February:** Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve student engagement in math classes. • **March-April:**	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By December 2025, 70% of students will demonstrate proficiency on common summative assessments administered after using an evidenced based instructional strategy. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Walk-thru forms • Summative assessments • Surveys **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ at the end of each unit. **Data Analysis Plan:** PCC will • Review student performance data	

	Math teachers/academic coaches/Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve student engagement in math classes. • **May:** Math teachers/academic coaches/Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve student engagement in math classes. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • PCC Documents • PL Sign-In Sheets • Walk-through Forms • Assessment Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** **During weekly PCC meetings**	• Compare outcomes before and after using the instructional strategy • Identify patterns (SWD, ELL) • Adjust future instruction based on data **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers need additional training on unpacking the algebra standards and instructional strategies to support student vocabulary		
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)* **2. Math teachers will analyze student performance data weekly with their collaborative team to inform adjustments to instructional plans and assessments that are responsive to identified student needs.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of math teachers will participate in weekly collaboration & data digs with content teams as evidenced by PCC meeting minutes. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning:** PCC Leads will lead training on data protocols, data monitoring documents, and district assessment platforms (Delta Math, Progress Learning, & CTLS) PCC will determine the weekly schedule for collaborative meeting times. PCC will develop an assessment schedule • **August-September:** PCC Leads will train teachers to interpret data and adjust instructional plans based on trends. (What are student strengths/needs?) PCC will ensure common assessments align with standards and instructional shifts • **October-December:** Teacher-led interventions in response to student needs. Collaboratively develop mini lessons. Mid-year reflection and observation feedback • **January-February:** PCC will revisit norms and protocols and adjust pacing guides and instructional plans based on 1st semester data • **March-April:** Teachers will begin compacting and remediation activities based on common assessments • **May:**	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By February 2026, 70% of students will demonstrate proficiency on common math assessments administered after instructional adjustments. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • **Data monitoring** • **Common Assessments** **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ at the completion of each unit **Data Analysis Plan:** **PCCs will:** • Collect all common formative and summative data in the data monitoring • Meet weekly to discuss data findings from common formative assessments. ○ Identify gaps in learning to plan for interventions ○ Identify strengths to plan for enrichment. • Meet at least weekly to discuss student performance from common formative(s) to summative assessment(s).	

	Teachers will identify standards needing reteaching before summative assessments & EOC. **Artifacts to be Collected:** PCC Documents Lesson Plans Data monitoring documents **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** **Weekly during each PCC meeting** **PCC Observation by Academic Coach**	○ Identify student areas of strength and growth ○ Plan remediation for priority standards **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

U.S. HISTORY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24	SY25		
Administrations	**Winter 21**	**Spring 22**	**Winter 22**	**Spring 23**	**Winter 23**	**Spring 24**	**Winter 24**	**Spring 25**
Level 4	5%	7%	5%	3%	5%	7%	4%	3%
Level 3	26%	34%	32%	35%	33%	32%	36%	38%
Level 2	34%	33%	36%	39%	38%	36%	27%	38%
Level 1	36%	26%	27%	23%	24%	26%	32%	21%

U.S. HISTORY – By Domain of Focus – Current Year

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	Colonization through Constitution		New Republic Through Reconstruction		Industrialization, Reform, and Imperialism		Establishment as a World Power		Post-World War II to the Present	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Met Target	77 (31%)	75 (32%)	75 (30%)	82 (34%)	40 (16%)	69 (29%)	46 (19%)	65 (27%)	63 (25%)	45 (19%)
Approaching Target	69 (28%)	91 (38%)	82 (33%)	51 (21%)	102 (41%)	53 (22%)	69 (28%)	81 (34%)	68 (27%)	69 (29%)
Below Target	102 (41%)	72 (30%)	91 (37%)	105 (44%)	105 (42%)	116 (49%)	133 (53%)	92 (39%)	117 (47%)	124 (52%)

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

US History EOC (3-year trends)	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
• **What trends exist for all students in the:** o Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no	• Between 2022 and 2025, the U.S. History EOC proficiency rate increased from 36% to 41%, reflecting a gradual upward trend in student achievement over the three-year period	• Between 2022 and 2025, the overall pass rate on the U.S. History EOC remained steady at 75% during the 2022–2023 and 2023–2024 school years. However, a slight decline was observed in 2024–2025, with the pass rate decreasing to 73%.

increase or decrease)? o US History EOC domain increases or decreases? • **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	• During the 2024–2025 school year, student performance on the U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) assessment demonstrated relative strength in Domain 1 (Colonization through the Constitution) and Domain 2 (New Republic through Reconstruction) • **ELL Performance Trends** o In School Year (SY) 2025, English Language Learner (ELL) students achieved a 44% pass rate and a 14% proficiency rate on the U.S. History EOC assessment. While both metrics remain below overall averages, they represent a gradual improvement in performance since SY 2022. o Proficiency rates for ELL students have shown consistent growth over the past four years and although the gap between ELL an non-ELL students remains significant, there seems to be an upward trend in ELL proficiency **SWD Performance Trends** • **SY25:** 37% of students scored within the Proficiency rate for Students with Disabilities—which shows a significant increase in proficiency rate from the previous 3 years	• Performance data indicates ongoing challenges in Domain 3 (Industrialization, Reform, and Imperialism) and Domain 5 (Post–World War II to the Present), with 50% of students scoring below the proficiency target in Domain 5. These areas will require targeted instructional support and intervention moving forward. **ELL Trends** • **Winter 2024:** 11% proficiency, compared to 40% for non-ELL students • **SY 2024:** 10% proficiency, compared to 41% for non-ELL students • **SY 2023:** 9% proficiency, compared to 39% for non-ELL students • **SY 2022:** 9% proficiency, compared to 40% for non-ELL students **SWD Performance Trends** • **SY 2024:** 18% proficiency, compared to 42% proficiency for students without disabilities • **SY 2023**: 16% proficiency, compared to 40% proficiency for students without disabilities • **SY 2022:** 17% proficiency compared to 42% proficiency for students without disabilities
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**

• **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness • **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	• **USWA** ○ Students were most successful in the last two units for USWA. These units covered international organizations and terrorism and it's impact on Foreign policy. In both of these units, over 90% of the students passed the summative assessments • **World History** ○ According to a common summative assessment covering all of the World History standards, Students performed well on the following standards (85% or more of the students answering the questions correctly: ▪ SSWH4d: Analyze the factors that led to the collapse of the Western Roman Empire ▪ SSWH9d: Gutenberg and the printing press ▪ SSWH10b: Columbian Exchange ▪ SSWH17: Impact of Treaty of Versailles ▪ SSWH19ab: Analyze impact of WWII • **Economics/US Government** ○ Students in US Government performed well, with 79% of the students scoring above 80% on the Final Exam ○ Students in Economics performed well in the Fundamentals of Economics domain as well as the Personal Finance Domain, with students performing at an average of 80% on those summative assessments.	• **USWA** ○ Students struggled the most with the 1st Unit: Introduction to Foreign Policy. For this assessment, 37% of the students were in the beginning category, scoring below a 70%. ○ **ELL Students** ▪ ELL students scored an average of 62% on the final exam while non ELL students scored an average of 70% ○ **SWD** ▪ SWD students scored an average of 62% on the Final Exam while non SWD students scored an average of 68% • **World History** ○ According to a common summative assessment covering all of the World History standards, Students struggled on the following standards (60% or more of students missed questions on these standards) ▪ SSWH2d: Explain how geography contributed to the movement of people and ideas, include: Silk Roads and Indian Ocean Trade ▪ SSWH9: Analyze change and continuity in the Renaissance and Reformation ○ **ELL students:** ▪ ELL students in World History Scored an average of 65% on the World History Summative assessment while non ELL students scored an average of 74% ○ **SWD Students:** ▪ SWD students in World History scored an average of 59% while non SWD students scored an average of 74%

	○ **ELL Students:** ELL students performed at the same level in Macroeconomic (79%)and Microeconomics(71%) summative assessments	• **Economics/US Government** ○ Students struggled the most with the Microeconomics Domain, with 37% of the students performing in the "beginning" range ○ **ELL Students:** students performed lower than non ELL Students on the Fundamentals of Economics Units (ELL 73% Non ELL 86%) and Personal Finance Units (ELL:76%, Non ELL: 81% ○ **SWD Students:** SWD Students performed lower than Non SWD Students on all summative assessments ▪ Macroeconomics: SWD 76% Non SWD 80% ▪ Microeconomics: SWD: 64% Non SWD: 72% ▪ Fundamentals: SWD: 81% Non SWD: 85% ▪ Personal Finance: SWD: 73% Non SWD: 73%
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The most significant area of need in Social Studies remains the development and application of visual literacy and historical thinking skills among students. Many students struggle to accurately interpret and analyze visual sources, such as maps, charts, graphs, political cartoons, tables, and photographs, which significantly impacts their ability to comprehend historical context, draw inferences, and apply critical reasoning to EOC-level questions. In addition, students often lack proficiency in core historical thinking skills, including sourcing, contextualization, and making cause-and-effect connections. These skill gaps hinder overall performance on complex assessment items and have contributed to stagnant proficiency rates, preventing the Social Studies PCC from fully reaching its targeted growth goals. To address this area of need, the department will need to implement targeted, research-based strategies to improve students' visual literacy and historical thinking. These strategies include explicit instruction in how to read and analyze different types of visuals within the context of each unit, guided practice in sourcing and corroborating evidence, structured academic discussions around visual documents, and the integration of historical reasoning tasks into instruction, checks for understanding, and	

	formative assessments. Teachers will also embed visuals and related questions into SOAR Week activities and use formative data to monitor student growth and adjust instruction accordingly. Teachers will require additional support and monitoring of the implementation of the research based strategies. This will be done through professional development, targeted coaching, and instructional walks with feedback to support growth in teaching and learning Each PCC will continue to conduct weekly data analysis with a focused lens on student misconceptions related to visual interpretation and historical thinking, ensuring that instructional shifts are timely, intentional, and aligned with student learning needs.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – US HISTORY • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during US HISTORY walks?** • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during US HISTORY walks?**	**Strengths** Teachers consistently have a learning target posted on the board and consistently use instructional strategies to support student learning. Students are oftentimes compliant in the learning process	**Weaknesses** Instructional/learning tasks are oftentimes not completely aligned to the learning target. Students are in need of more scaffolds and time to practice the skills required for historical thinking
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** ▪ **Teachers are provided with Clear planning expectations and regular PD on instructional best practices.** ▪ **Students are often compliant but not fully engaged** o Instructional strategies may focus more on compliance than active thinking. Contributing Factors: Limited student choice, relevance, or opportunities for deep thinking. ▪ **Tasks are not always aligned to the learning target.** o Teachers may post targets but lack support aligning tasks to them due to gaps in backward planning, unclear success criteria, or overuse of pre-made materials. ▪ **Students need more scaffolding and practice with historical thinking skills.**	

	○ Historical thinking is complex and often under-scaffolded. Contributing Factors: Limited time for modeling, guided practice, and gradual release of skills.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	
Additional Data Analysis **(If needed)** Other(s): ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	

SOCIAL STUDIES IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: SOCIAL STUDIES	During the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of US History EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC will increase from 41% (approximately 223 students) to 44% (approximately 245 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 US History EOC During the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 45% (approximately 600 students) to 50% as measured by the 2024-2025 summative assessments
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students have limited academic vocabulary, weak reading comprehension skills, lack of background knowledge, difficulty interpreting maps, graphs, charts, and tables. English language proficiency for Els, and assessment literacy. Teachers require more structure and support in implementation of effective instructional strategies to support the student areas of need as well as support in ensuring that their instructional tasks and success criteria align to learning targets
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 Social Studies teachers will implement evidence-based instruction with an emphasis on building visual literacy skills (maps, charts, tables, graphs, and images), reading comprehension skills, and historical thinking skills. **Implementation Plan:** **Pre-Planning (Before School Starts)** Focus: Set up foundational tools and shared expectations. • Post clear learning targets for each lesson, aligned with historical thinking skills.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By February 2026, 50% of students will demonstrate proficiency on common assessments administered after data-informed modifications to instruction. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Walk-Through Observation Tool (for classroom implementation) • Formative Assessment Data (for student progress tracking) • Student Feedback (for student perceptions of learning)	CTLS ELLevation Strategies Academic Coaches District Coaches OneDrive Vocabulary Strategies

1.Social Studies teachers will implement weekly skill building and literacy strategies during instruction as indicated by walk-through data	• Use vertical planning across grade levels to create: ○ Shared key vocabulary ○ Thematic-based learning targets (e.g., cause and effect, continuity and change) **August – September** Focus: Build classroom routines and foundational skills. • Use anchor charts to model and reinforce key historical thinking skills (e.g., sourcing, contextualization). • Start writing tasks for each unit that connect to course themes and learning targets. • Implement skill-building strategies within each unit of study, such as: ○ Analyzing primary sources ○ Evaluating cause and effect ○ Making claims supported by evidence **October – December** Focus: Deepen thinking routines and assess student progress. • Introduce historical thinking routines (e.g., "I used to think… Now I think," claim-evidence-reasoning). • Embed at least one thinking routine in each unit • Administer common formative assessments that include: ○ A writing prompt ○ A visual or source analysis component ○ Utilize PCC meetings to review assessment data, identify trends, share strategies, and adjust instruction accordingly.	• Summative Assessment Analysis (for end-of-year evaluation) **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks (Informal Assessments) ☒ Monthly (Formal Assessments) ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ Other **Data Analysis Plan:** 1. Data Collection 2. Data Organization 3. Data Analysis 4. Interpretation & Action 5. Reporting **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

	January – February Focus: Advance analysis skills and standardize grading. • Implement visual source activities (e.g., maps, political cartoons, historical images) for each instructional unit of study. • Conduct rubric calibration across the department to ensure consistent grading of writing tasks. • Assign at least one DBQ (Document-Based Question) or structured debate where students: • Make historical claims • Support arguments with evidence **March – April** Focus: Strengthen skill integration across content areas. • Continue embedding reading and writing strategies, especially in relation to: ○ Geography and map interpretation ○ Visual source analysis ○ Text interpretation and literacy tasks **May** Focus: Reflect and refine instructional practices. • Teachers complete a strategy reflection survey to: • Evaluate which strategies were most effective • Provide feedback for future planning • Share successful tools or lessons with the department **Artifacts to be Collected:** 1. PCC Calendar 2. PD Calendar and Sign In Sheet		

	3. Walk-through Form 4. Common Vocabulary/Thematic Anchor Charts 5. Lesson Plans w/ skill building strategies embedded 6. Formative & Summative Assessment Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** • Academic Coach and AP will monitor lesson plans every 2 weeks • Academic coach and AP will review PCC documents weekly • Academic Coach will conduct walkthroughs monthly to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of instructional strategies that address the academic needs of students		

BIOLOGY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24		SY25	
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	0.2%	3%	4%	4%	6%	5%	3%	6%
Level 3	22%	27%	31%	31%	26%	41%	29%	31%
Level 2	30%	30%	29%	34%	34%	29%	33%	35%
Level 1	48%	40%	35%	31%	34%	24%	36%	28%

Biology – By Domain of Focus – Current Year

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	**Cells**		**Cellular Genetics and Heredity**		**Classification and Phylogeny**		**Ecology**		**Theory of Evolution**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Met Target %	79 (20%)	76 (23%)	100 (26%)	108 (33%)	99 (26%)	121 (37%)	63 (16%)	73 (22%)	71 (18%)	115 (35%)
Approaching Target %	150 (39%)	67 (21%)	104 (27%)	76 (23%)	133 (34%)	76 (23%)	92 (24%)	84 (26%)	122 (32%)	91 (28%)
Below Target %	157 (41%)	183 (56%)	182 (47%)	142 (44%)	154 (40%)	129 (40%)	231 (60%)	169 (52%)	193 (50%)	120 (27%)

,m

BIOLOGY DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS (if applicable)

BIOLOGY EOC (3-year trends)	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
• **What trends exist for all students in the:** o **Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?**	**All Students:** Based on EOC trend data, there has been a steady increase in student proficiency over the past three years. The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency rose from **26.1% in FY22 to 34.5% in FY25**. Additionally, the percentage of students scoring in the **Distinguished category increased from 1.6% to 4.5%** during the same	**All Students:** Based on EOC trend data, student proficiency initially showed significant improvement, increasing by nearly **15 percentage points from 26.5% in FY22 to 41% in FY24**. However, this upward trend did not sustain, as the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency **declined to 34% in FY25**, indicating a need to examine factors that may have contributed to the recent decrease.

○ **Biology ECrOC domain increases or decreases?** • **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	period, indicating growth not only in overall performance but also in higher-level achievement. **Biology EOC Domain Data:** During the 2024–25 school year, Biology EOC domain data shows positive movement, particularly in the **Classification domain**, where an increased number of students met the target. Subgroup performance also demonstrated growth: • **English Learners (EL)** showed a 7%-point increase in proficiency from FY23 to FY24. • **Students with Disabilities (SWD)** demonstrated a 6%-point increase in proficiency over the same period.	**Biology EOC Domain Data:** Biology EOC domain data for the 2024–25 school year indicates a decline in the number of students meeting the target in the Ecology domain. This downward trend suggests a need to revisit instructional strategies and supports related to this content area to address potential gaps in understanding and performance. **EL:** Biology EOC trend data for English Learners showed a notable increase in proficiency from 9.6% in FY23 to 16.5% in FY24. However, this growth was not sustained, as proficiency declined sharply to 4% in FY25. This fluctuation highlights a need to examine the consistency and effectiveness of instructional support and interventions for EL students. **SWD:** Biology EOC trend data for SWD students indicated a 6%-point increase in proficiency, rising from 22.7% in FY23 to 28.2% in FY24. However, this progress was followed by a significant decline to 12.5% in FY25, signaling a need to evaluate the sustainability of support and the instructional approaches used with EL students.
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year • **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ **Percentages mastering standards aligned to science domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness** • **How do the trends differ for EL students?**	**Strengths** **All Students:** Based on 9th and 10th grade common summative assessment data, students demonstrated a proficiency rate of 50% or higher across assessments. This suggests that while a foundational level of understanding is being met by at least half of the students, there is an opportunity to increase the number of students reaching higher levels of mastery through targeted instructional support and enrichment.	**Weaknesses** **All Students:** According to the Data Monitoring Document, **students in Environmental Science demonstrated the lowest proficiency (25%) on SEV4, which focuses on obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information to analyze human impact on natural resources.** Similarly, **students in Physics showed the lowest proficiency (59%) on SP2**, which involves obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information about how forces affect the motion of objects.

• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	**EL:** **SWD:**	These trends indicate a need for strengthened instructional strategies and literacy support in scientific analysis and communication skills related to these core standards. **EL & SWD:** Data for English Learners (EL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) revealed trends consistent with the overall student population, particularly in standards with lower overall proficiency. This pattern suggests that existing instructional challenges are magnified for these subgroups, emphasizing the need for differentiated supports, scaffolded instruction, and targeted literacy strategies to close performance gaps. Specifically, students struggled with: • **Environmental Science (SEV4):** *Obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information to analyze human impact on natural resources.* • **Physics (SP2):** *Obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information about how forces affect the motion of objects.*
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: **X** Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The fluctuation in Biology EOC proficiency scores appears to stem from several interconnected, literacy-related challenges that impact students' ability to fully engage with and master course content. One of the most prominent factors is limited proficiency in **Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic vocabulary**, which is essential for accessing complex biological concepts. Many students struggle with both general academic language (Tier 2) and subject-specific terminology (Tier 3), which affects their comprehension of instructions, assessment items, and classroom discourse. Additionally, **gaps in reading comprehension skills and background knowledge** make it difficult for students to process informational texts, lab scenarios, and performance tasks. These gaps also impact their ability to connect new	

	learning with prior knowledge. As a result, students often struggle to analyze and interpret data from graphs, charts, and tables—skills that are essential for both daily instruction and EOC success. Without strong literacy skills, students are less equipped to extract relevant information, identify patterns, or apply scientific reasoning—core competencies within the **Science and Engineering Practices** (such as analyzing data and constructing explanations). They also struggle to grasp **Crosscutting Concepts** like *patterns*, *cause and effect*, and *systems*, which are necessary for making sense of scientific phenomena. These challenges highlight the need for **intentional, literacy-focused support within science instruction**, beginning with direct instruction in academic vocabulary. Strengthening vocabulary lays the foundation for improving comprehension, applying content knowledge, and building confidence in data interpretation. This focus will, in turn, support the development of reading strategies and scaffolded practice that can lead to measurable gains in student performance and proficiency.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – BIOLOGY • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during BIOLOGY walks?** • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during BIOLOGY walks?**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	1. **Positive classroom culture** that encourages engagement and participation 2. **Clear learning targets** communicated in student-friendly language **3.** Use of **evidence-based literacy strategies** to support comprehension **4.** Ongoing **spiraling of graph, table, and chart interpretation and analysis** 5. Regular opportunities for **student collaboration** 6. Use of **visuals and real-world examples** to enhance understanding	1. Lack of consistent **use of etymology strategies** to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary development 2. **Ineffective checks for understanding during instruction**, such as relying on broad questions like “Did you get it?” or only calling on volunteers, rather than using strategies that assess all learners in real time. 3. **Limited use of informal assessments** to consistently monitor individual student progress

	7. **Data-driven instruction** guiding lesson adjustments & reteaching 8. **Consistent pacing & depth of explicit instruction** of standards across the team	and ensure accountability during whole-group instruction.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** As we've reflected on current instructional practices, it's clear that student learning and proficiency are being affected by gaps in informal assessments and vocabulary development. One area of concern is the **inconsistent use of etymology strategies**, which makes it harder for students to fully access and apply critical Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary—key to understanding content deeply. Additionally, **checks for understanding are often limited to general questions or directed only at a few students**, which doesn't give us a clear picture of where all learners are. When **informal assessments aren't used consistently during whole-group instruction**, we miss valuable opportunities to monitor progress and adjust at the moment. Together, these patterns can impact individual accountability and limit our ability to respond to student needs in real time.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ **Teacher Survey** ☐ **Parent Survey** ☐ **Professional Learning Survey** ☐ **_____**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	
Additional Data Analysis	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**

(If needed) **Other(s):** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	

SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #4: SCIENCE	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 34% (243 students) to 38% (269 students) as measured by 2025-2026 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 43% to 47% as measured by the 2025-2026 Summative Assessments.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Limited academic vocabulary, weak reading comprehension skills, lack of background knowledge, difficulty interpreting science text structure, English language proficiency for ELs, and assessment literacy
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 implement evidence-based strategies with an emphasis on building Tier 2 & Tier 3 vocabulary skills as evidence by instruction walks. **Implementation Plan:** **1ST SEMESTER** • **Preplanning:** - Identify Tier 2 & Tier 3 science vocabulary - Select Science Dept. vocabulary strategies - Develop a walk-through look-for tool - Set calendar for biweekly PCC planning sessions • **August-September:** - Launch vocabulary strategies in classrooms - Model lessons as needed - Conduct initial walk-throughs weekly - Set baseline using formative assessments • **October-December:** - Continue biweekly planning sessions - Monitor consistency and effectiveness of strategies - Adjust strategies based on data trends	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By February 2026, 55% of students will demonstrate proficiency on common assessments administered after data-informed modifications to instruction. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Walk-Through Observation Tool (for classroom implementation) • Formative Assessment Data (for student progress tracking) • Student Feedback (for student perceptions of vocabulary learning) • Summative Assessment Analysis (for end-of-year evaluation) **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Frequent check including the administrator **Data Analysis Plan:**	**CTLS** **ELLevation Strategies** **Academic Coaches** **District Coaches** **Vocabulary Strategies in OneDrive**

1. Science teachers will implement weekly vocabulary-building strategies during instruction as indicated by walk-through data.	**2ND SEMESTER** • **January-February:** - Deepen vocabulary use in writing and discussion - Introduce higher-level tasks using vocabulary (analysis, argumentation) - Focus on test-aligned vocabulary routines • **March-April:** - Reinforce key terms for EOC and summative assessments - Conduct mini-reviews with embedded vocab tasks - Provide focused feedback to teachers • **May:** - Celebrate progress - Reflect on what worked - Gather feedback from teachers and students - Recommend strategies to carry forward **Artifacts to be Collected:** 1. PCC Calendar 2. Walk-through Form 3. Tier 2 & Tier 3 Vocabulary terms 4. Lesson Plans w/Vocabulary Strategies 5. Formative & Summative Assessment Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** **Weekly with content administrator**	1. Data Collection 2. Data Organization 3. Data Analysis 4. Interpretation & Action 5. Reporting **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

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, 2025) Parents will learn about Title I, including how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, descriptions of the curriculum and assessments used, our school's compacts and policies, the professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement, such as the use of the family resource center.	**9/16/25**		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline (November 3, 2025) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	**10/28/25**		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2026) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	**4/28/26**		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
Required TWO Building Staff Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) – Deadlines: September 26, 2025, and February 16, 2026 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 4.	**Fall PL- 9/18/25** **Spring PL- 2/11/26**		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
5. Required Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit 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:** The Rising 9th Grade Meeting provides parents with information about the school, Freshman U Orientation, and the technology tools necessary to monitor student progress academically, attendance, and other relevant details. Transition to Adulthood- Provides parents with additional information on post-high school options in the military, technical/4-year college, and/or workforce.	Rising 9th Grade Parent Mtg. - **5/12/26**	Transition to Adulthood Parent Mtg. - **5/14/26**	☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/program meetings in a format and language parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d*	*List documents translated for parents:* • FE Policy, compact, • Meeting handouts, • Presentations and flyers.		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

Academically Based **School Developed Family Engagement Activities *(Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)***							
Academically Based **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.**	**Team Lead**
Fall 'Digital Skills' Class (Part I)- to educate parents on the importance of using ParentVue & CTLS Parent to help with monitoring their student's progress in school.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4			9/30/25	**CTLS/Website advertisement, sign-in sheets, Meeting Evaluation feedback from participants, and presentation slides.**	Holder
Spring 'Digital Skills' Class (Part II)- to reinforce the importance of using ParentVue & CTLS Parent in monitoring student progress. Also, aspects of the CTLS Learn module will be introduced to parents.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4			4/30/26	**CTLS/Website advertisement, sign-in sheets, Meeting Evaluation feedback from participants, and presentation slides.**	Holder
Building Staff Capacity (Fall & Spring)- Professional learning for teachers and staff will help continue to build a deeper understanding of the contributions that parents bring to the 'teacher-parent' partnership, enabling students to perform and learn effectively in school.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4			Fall PL-9/18/25 and Spring PL- 2/11/26	**Sign-in sheets, meeting evaluations, and group activity worksheet feedback from faculty and staff.**	Holder

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's signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings**. *Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)*
3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remain 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**: The schoolwide improvement plan was developed in coordination with federal, state, and local services to ensure effective use of resources that address academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs. Title I funding is used to support instructional staff, technology integration, and professional learning that aligns with district goals and student needs.

Current data sources, including Beacon for mathematics and I-READY for English Language Arts drive instructional planning and intervention. In addition, the use of ELLevation strategies enhances instructional practices not only for English learners but also supports access and engagement for all students.
The plan is further supported by wraparound services, such as school social workers, Communities in Schools, counseling teams, and the school nutrition program, to remove non-academic barriers to success. Coordination with district leaders also ensures alignment with any Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) or Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) activities under Section 1111(d), when applicable.
Through this collaborative approach, the SIP reflects an integrated strategy that leverages multiple funding sources and support systems to improve student outcomes across the school community.

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: Pebblebrook High School regularly monitors schoolwide data (EOC and six-week Course Pass Rates) and the implementation of results achieved. The various schoolwide programs are shared with all stakeholders. Data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement are posted on the school's website. Social Media is an additional stream of information that is used by the principal. CTLS Parent and printed media is shared with parents electronically and by the United States Post Office. A weekly dial out from the principal is made on Sunday evenings

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: Pebblebrook High School evaluates the effectiveness of its schoolwide program by analyzing a broad range of data points, including EOC and ACCESS scores, graduation rates, common formative assessments, and student promotion data. These metrics are used to identify areas of growth and challenge, particularly for students who are further from meeting state academic standards.
Throughout the summer months, teachers engage in collaborative planning sessions during June and July to prepare for the upcoming school year. These discussions focus on targeted strategies to reduce the number of students performing at the "Beginning" level on EOC assessments and to increase the number of students progressing from "Developing" too "Proficient" and from "Proficient" to "Distinguished."
Pebblebrook considers the success of these efforts as evidence of the impact of its schoolwide program, particularly when reflected in gains on key indicators, including CCRPI outcomes. Special attention is given to components such as the School Climate Survey, which also informs the school's continuous improvement process.

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: The schoolwide plan is treated as a living document and is revised as needed to support continuous improvement. Every six weeks, following the release of progress reports, teachers analyze student performance data and reflect on instructional practices. They identify students who have not mastered specific standards and develop targeted strategies for remediation and grade improvement.
When data reveals performance gaps, adjustments are made to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to address emerging needs. These revisions are made with all student groups in mind to ensure equity and effectiveness. Additionally, Pebblebrook Collaborative Communities (PCCs) play a vital role in monitoring student progress, sharing effective practices, and determining next steps that align with and support the schoolwide goals.

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: At Pebblebrook High School, we believe that all students can learn—ALL means all. To support this belief, we implement a comprehensive Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) designed to address both academic and behavioral needs. MTSS is a data-informed framework that enables educators to evaluate student response to core instruction and provide targeted support based on individual needs.
Our MTSS model consists of three tiers:
Tier 1 – Core Instruction: High-quality instruction and behavioral support for all students.
Tier 2 – Targeted Group Interventions: Supplemental interventions for students who require additional support.
Tier 3 – Intensive Individualized Interventions: Customized support plans with involvement from support staff for students who demonstrate significant need.
To strengthen our interventions, school counselors hold regular team meetings to review RTI (Response to Intervention) data, including historical records from elementary and middle school. Instructional decisions are supported by ongoing assessments in CTLS and other tools that track progress and inform the next steps.

Pebblebrook also coordinates efforts with programs and services aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to ensure students with disabilities receive appropriate early intervention and support.
In addition to academic interventions, students are connected to college and career pathways through Advanced Placement (AP) courses, Dual Enrollment, Work-Based Learning, and college and military readiness activities. For example, our JROTC program administers the ASVAB annually to support students exploring military careers.
Through the MTSS model, Pebblebrook ensures that every student has equitable access to instruction, resources, and opportunities for postsecondary success.

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 development at Pebblebrook High School is designed to enhance instructional practices, deepen understanding of academic standards, and improve the effective use of assessment data. These learning opportunities are provided to all educators—including new and veteran teachers, paraprofessionals, and specialized instructional staff—to promote consistent, high-quality instruction across all content areas.

Teachers regularly engage in data analysis to monitor student progress, evaluate instructional effectiveness, and determine strategies for remediation or enrichment. Key instructional practices emphasized in professional learning include:

- Small group instruction tailored to individual student needs
- Scaffolding to support learning acquisition
- Explicit teaching and modeling of concepts
- Using formative assessment data to guide instruction and inform small group practices

Professional learning also focuses on establishing a shared understanding of proficiency for each standard, developing unit assessment plans, and creating a schoolwide calendar that aligns assessments with instructional pacing and goals.

To support career-long development, Pebblebrook High School implements research-based professional development practices that:

- Provide ongoing learning opportunities for all staff
- Improve teaching and learning outcomes
- Target measurable student achievement goals
- Allow time for implementation and collaborative planning
- Encourage the formation of professional study groups (e.g., book studies, article reviews)

These efforts also support the recruitment and retention of highly effective teachers, particularly in high-need areas, by fostering a collaborative and growth-oriented professional culture that includes all staff members—special education, ESOL, paraprofessionals, and specialists alike.

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: N/A

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: Pebblebrook High School is committed to preparing students for postsecondary education and workforce readiness through a variety of programs and opportunities. Students are introduced to college and career pathways through Dual Enrollment, Advanced Placement (AP) courses, and counseling-led initiatives such as college visits and career planning workshops.
For the 2025–2026 school year, students will also have access to Work-Based Learning opportunities, allowing them to gain hands-on experience in professional settings. In addition, students can develop real-world skills by working in the school-run business, The Brook Spot.
Our JROTC program administers the ASVAB test annually, offering students insight into potential military careers. Pebblebrook also hosts job fairs and career shadowing experiences to expose students to a variety of professions and industries they may not otherwise encounter.
To support college access, college recruiters regularly visit campus to meet with students interested in two-year colleges, four-year universities, or technical schools. These efforts ensure that all students—regardless of their postsecondary path—are informed, supported, and equipped to make confident decisions about their future.

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?**
ELA Academic Coach	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The ELA Academic Coach will support Coherent Instruction by guiding teachers in using I-READY data to tailor instruction that addresses both foundational literacy skills and higher-order comprehension. The coach will lead collaborative planning to ensure instructional tasks are aligned with standards and emphasize reading, writing, and critical thinking. By mentoring teachers and leading professional learning focused on best literacy practices, the coach helps expand Professional Capacity. To foster a Supportive Learning Environment, the coach encourages strategies that amplify student voice, provide structured feedback, and create engaging, culturally relevant learning experiences.
Math Academic Coach	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The Math Academic Coach will play a critical role in ensuring Coherent Instruction by aligning lesson planning and instructional delivery with the rigor of state standards and district pacing guides. Through regular data analysis, including Beacon and common assessments, the coach will help teachers identify gaps in student understanding and adjust instruction accordingly. By facilitating job-embedded professional learning and modeling effective strategies during PCCs, the coach will build Professional Capacity across the department. Additionally, the coach supports a Supportive Learning Environment by promoting instructional practices that build student confidence in mathematical reasoning and problem-solving.
Social Studies Academic Coach	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The Social Studies Academic Coach will promote Coherent Instruction by assisting teachers in designing rigorous, inquiry-based lessons that are standards-aligned and grounded in real-world applications. By facilitating vertical and horizontal planning, the coach ensures that instruction builds coherently across grades and courses. The coach supports Professional Capacity by providing training on document analysis, DBQs, and performance tasks, while also modeling instructional strategies that support critical thinking. In building a Supportive Learning Environment, the coach emphasizes student engagement through collaborative discussions, civic learning, and culturally responsive pedagogy.

Science Academic Coach	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The Science Academic Coach will enhance Coherent Instruction by supporting teachers in the development of phenomenon-based learning experiences that integrate state standards, lab activities, and CTLS resources. The coach will lead data-driven conversations that inform instructional next steps and provide feedback through instructional walkthroughs and coaching cycles. By organizing and leading content-specific professional development, the coach builds teacher efficacy and supports Professional Capacity. To help establish a Supportive Learning Environment, the coach promotes inquiry-based learning, hands-on exploration, and student-centered discussions that make science meaningful and accessible to all learners.

School Improvement Goals ***Include goals on the parent compacts and policy***	
Goal #1	The percentage of students scoring at or above level reading Lexile scores will increase from 70% to 74% as measured by the EOC assessment data. The non-EOC ELA courses for the FY26 school year will have 65% of students score at or above level on the final reading comprehension exam.
Goal #2	The percentage of math students scoring proficient will increase from 33% (approximately 177 students) to 36% (approximately 201 students) as measured by the EOC data. The non-EOC math courses for the FY26 school year will have 61% (approximately 530 students) to score in the proficient and distinguished level on the final exam.

Goal #3	During the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of US History EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC will increase from 41% (approximately 223 students) to 44% (approximately 245 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 US History EOC During the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 45% (approximately 600 students) to 50% as measured by the 2024-2025 summative assessments
Goal #4	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 34% (243 students) to 38% (269 students) as measured by 2025-2026 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 43% to 47% as measured by the 2025-2026 Summative Assessments.